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ABSTRACT

PREPARING KOREAN MISSIONARIES FOR CROSS-CULTURAL EFFECTIVENESS

Hyung Keun Choi

The growth of the missionary movement of the Korean Protestant church has been remarkable in the past two decades along with the rapid growth of the churches. Today, Korean churches send more than 8,000 missionaries to 145 countries. As the number of Korean missionaries has increased the difficulties they face in their cross-cultural ministry have become more noticeable.

This study began by recognizing critical problems that Korean missionaries face in mission today. The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. The hypothesis of this study is that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training is related to a missionary's poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry. Moreover, this study demonstrates that missionaries with inadequate missionary training and poor cross-cultural adjustment will have a high rate of missionary attrition. The data for testing the hypothesis were collected through a questionnaire devised for Korean missionaries (QFKM) and the
Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) translated for Korean missionaries, plus interviews with directors of eight missionary training centers in Korea, twenty-four Korean missionaries, and twelve nationals in the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and Bangladesh.

In this research, the theoretical foundations for missionary training and cross-cultural adjustment were developed from biblical insights and anthropological understanding. From a biblical perspective, cross-cultural missionary training aims toward cross-cultural adaptation for incarnational witness. From an anthropological perspective, understanding Korean values and worldview helps monocultural and monolingual Korean missionaries adjust to other cultures for effective cross-cultural ministry.

The research findings show a strong relationship between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment. Missionaries trained in more effective training centers adjusted better to the host culture than did the missionaries trained in less effective training centers. Missionaries who were better adjusted cross-culturally had more effective ministry as a consequence. The research also discovered that poor cross-cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries leads to higher missionary attrition. This study also demonstrates the positive and mostly negative impact of Korean cultural values on Korean missionaries’ cross-
Based on the findings from this study, a holistic cross-cultural missionary training model with particular emphasis on cross-cultural adjustment skills is proposed. This holistic training model focuses on a balance between three modes of training methods—formal, informal, and non-formal—in order to develop cross-cultural adjustment skills, such as cross-cultural knowledge, cultural awareness, and interpersonal relationship skills.
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CHAPTER 1

Overview of the Study

Introduction

The Korean Protestant church has emerged as one of the major forces among Two-Thirds World missions during the last two decades. The phenomenal growth of the Korean missionary movement during the last two decades may be attributed to several factors: rapid church growth, high enthusiasm and strong commitment for mission and evangelism, fervent prayer lives, and until recently plentiful human and financial resources following the rapid growth of the Korean economy, and the strong motivation of the Korean church leaders and their members to engage in world mission and evangelism.

In spite of these various positive factors, today Korean missionaries encounter many difficulties on the mission field and face frequent criticism that they are inclined to be ethnocentric and subsequently make the mistake of replicating their own cultural values on the mission fields where they labor. As a result, some Korean missionaries are regarded as those who do "money mission" and "visible outcome-centered mission." Because many mission leaders in Korea are dimly aware of their mistakes and missionaries’ difficulties on the mission field, it is hard to find the root problems.

Under the economic crisis of South Korea which began in November 1997, an emerging voice of Korean church leaders insisted that the year 1998 must be a turning point for the Protestant churches in Korea. In 1998 the economic crisis of South Korea influenced all areas of the nation. The cold wave of IMF (the International Monetary Fund) hit the whole country. The Korean church was not exempt from the influence of the economic crisis. In fact, the Protestant churches in Korea grew rapidly for two decades since the late 1960s. However, since the late 1980s Korean church growth has been in decline. This trend of plateauing or declining church growth has made the church leaders rethink the role of the church and its missionary movement. Particularly, the country’s severe economic crisis made the church rethink
and reconsider how to renew the church and her missionary work.

In 1998, as the Korean government and civic organizations urged the populace through mass media that this national economic crisis required that all citizens tighten their belts in order to revive the economy, most churches' annual budgets were frozen at the level of the previous year. Some churches even reduced their annual budgets. The most frustrating thing for the churches was that the activity of Korean overseas missionaries was facing a crisis. Not only were many mission projects canceled, but also missionaries' livelihood itself was threatened. Regarding this situation, most Protestant denominational mission boards and para-church mission organizations directed their field leaders to immediately suspend most mission projects, and summoned home some missionaries who were expected on sabbatical or were in language programs. This economic crisis has given further impetus to direct the missionaries to do their best to establish indigenous, self-supporting churches and to train local church leaders (The Korean Christian Journal, January 18, 1998).

Bong Rin Ro, professor of Torch Trinity Graduate School of Theology, Seoul, Korea, pointed out three problems which have affected the work of foreign missions in Korea relating to the economic crisis.
First, the amount of church offerings in most churches will be reduced. The problem, combined with the devaluation of Korean currency by almost 66% will make it nearly impossible for the churches to continue the same rate of support for their missionaries. In addition, it will be increasingly difficult for new missionaries to raise support. Second, since the government has applied more stringent restrictions for sending money overseas, it will be increasingly difficult for churches to send missions money overseas to support their own missionaries. A third problem is the fact that many of the 5,500 Korean missionaries did not go to the mission field through the official denominational foreign mission agencies which are recognized by the government for sending money to the missionaries. Therefore, those missionaries who are commissioned by interdenominational mission agencies or through local churches will have difficulty receiving money from the home country due to the recent government currency restriction. This means that some of the missionaries may have to return home for the lack of financial support. (1998:5)

Why were these things happening to the Korean church mission? What were the primary causes of this turmoil in the Korean church, especially in overseas mission work? It seems that the economic crisis of Korea revealed the deeper problems of Korean missionaries that probably relate to their ineffective mission work. What are the factors hindering them from doing cross-cultural ministry?

Darrell L. Whiteman, professor in the E. Stanley Jones School of World Mission and Evangelism at Asbury Theological Seminary, indicates the Korean missionaries' difficulties with cross-cultural adjustment.

As more and more Korean Christians go as missionaries to other
cultures, they are discovering the challenge of separating the gospel they wish to proclaim from their peculiar Korean understanding and practice of Christian faith. They are discovering the difficulties of cross-cultural living and experiencing the damaging effects of culture shock. Many are returning to Korea discouraged and bewildered, wondering what went wrong with their ministry. (1996:137)

Craig Storti writes about the difficulties of cultural adjustment:

Many, perhaps most, people who go abroad to live and work genuinely want to adapt [adjust] to the local culture. And most of them do not. It’s not that they don’t appreciate the reasons for adapting to the culture or know that it is all but essential to being successful in their work and at ease in the society, but rather that true cultural adjustment and effective cross-cultural interaction are more elusive than we might imagine. (1990:xiii)

Here I see the most important thing to enable Korean missionaries to adjust to another culture is cross-cultural missionary training. As mentioned above, I assume that to a large extent the problems of Korean mission work are related to the lack of cross-cultural missionary training that contributes to Korean missionaries’ failure to adjust to other cultures. This in turn, I believe, increases the attrition rate of Korean missionaries. It is important for us to recognize that unless the Korean Protestant church provides missionaries with effective cross-cultural missionary training, there will be an increasing number of missionary drop-outs who do not understand the relationship between the gospel and culture and are victims of culture shock.
David Harley points out, "The growth of the church in the Two-Thirds World has had considerable impact on the world missionary movement. As churches have grown in the newly developed countries, they have begun to assume a greater responsibility for world evangelism" (1995:3).

With this unprecedented surge of missionaries from the Two-Thirds World (cf. Pate 1989), many people have begun to see the urgent need to address the training of non-Western missionaries. Non-Western missionaries have a strong zeal for mission but they lack experience. The emerging missionary forces from these countries are ready to serve and are seeking effective cross-cultural missionary training for the task of world mission and evangelism. In cross-cultural missionary activities, training can have a direct bearing on success or failure. At the least, untrained missionaries operate at a great disadvantage. Even more, David Harley says,

If missionaries are sent out without adequate preparation, the consequences can be disastrous on themselves, their families and their ministry. The high rate of attrition among missionaries is proof of that. Many go out without being warned beforehand of the difficulties they may face. They are unable to speak the language. They have little understanding of the culture and the way things should be done. (1995:7)

In this sense, one of the most important issues for the missionaries from the Two-Thirds World to tackle is cross-cultural missionary preparation and the
development of training programs to facilitate easier transition into mission contexts.

The purpose of cross-cultural missionary training is not to keep trainees from experiencing culture shock but to help them to develop the tools and skills to overcome the stress and shock of living in a different culture. Also, it can help them to be aware of the causes and symptoms of culture shock so they can understand what is happening to themselves and manage the culture shock and finally adjust to the local culture for effective cross-cultural ministry (Brewster and Brewster 1972:42).

In fact, the cross-cultural adjustment of the missionary relates to the theological principles and practical applications of incarnational ministry. Missionary adjustment to another culture is simply a vehicle to help in understanding incarnation, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us (John 1:14)." Thus, cross-cultural missionary training enables the missionary to begin to understand what the incarnation really means.

Background to the Problem

The Korean Protestant church sent its first cross-cultural missionaries to Shantung, China, in 1913. Before the church sent its missionaries to
Shantung, the church had sent its first missionary to Cheju Island in 1907, located between the Korean peninsula and Japan. The mission to Cheju was a kind of home mission because the culture of Cheju Island was regarded as a subculture of Korean culture. Also, the church sent its missionaries to Vladivostock, Siberia, in 1909, Japan in 1909, and Manchuria in 1910 for evangelizing Korean immigrants. In this respect, during the years 1910 to 1930, the Korean Protestant mission is characterized by work that was mostly directed at Korean nationals living abroad (T. Park 1991:29-97). During this time there was little concern about the local people of the target countries. Thus there was no effort to understand the target culture prior to the dispatching of the missionaries. Nor was there any cross-cultural missionary training program for missionary candidates.

From the 1940s until the mid-1960s, after World War II, the missionary movement of the Korean church halted for a while. During this period, the Korean church underwent the turmoil of losing vision and enthusiasm for world mission due to the following events: severe persecution by the Japanese government (1940-1945) that closed many churches; rebuilding the churches in the midst of the ideological conflict between democracy and communism (1946-1949) due to the Korean War (1950-
1953); and facing strong concern about the theological interpretation that caused debates between conservatives and liberals (1954-1965). This era marked a long period of hibernation of Korean missions.

The Korean church began to awake from its hibernation in the mid-1960s. Around this time, in 1968, the Inter-Mission International (IMI), Korea’s first mission agency and cross-cultural missionary training center, was established. In the same year Korea’s first professional mission newspaper, The Christian Herald, came fresh off the printing press. The Christian Herald contributed greatly to the recharging of the missionary movement of the Korean church; thus the mission torch was rekindled. The missionary movement of the Korean church had its heyday in the 1980s and 1990s.

Today, as indicated above, the Korea World Mission Association (KWMA) estimates that there are more than 8,000 Korean missionaries sent around the world in spite of the influence of the economic crisis (Kukmin Ilbo [The People’s Daily Newspaper] 2 January 2000). In particular, from the 1980s the Korean church initiated a remarkable mission expansion. With the explosive increase in the number of missionaries dispatched abroad, myriad problems relating to mission agencies, sending churches, and missionaries
inevitably began to surface.

Bong Rin Ro (1994:11-15) points out the problems of Korean missionary work. First, most Korean missionaries have not developed good relationships with each other, nor with the sending church and its leaders. Furthermore, the degree of conflict and struggle between them has increased. Second, Korean missionaries have been criticized because their use of financial resources is unclear. Third, Korean missionaries have been regarded as colonialistic or “military style missionaries” by the local people. Fourth, Korean missionaries seldom have cooperated with missionaries from other countries or even with fellow Koreans for effective mission work. Fifth, there have been various family problems, especially MK (missionary kid) problems, in missionary homes. Sixth, the initiative of the overseas mission has been taken by each sending church rather than by denominational mission boards and interdenominational mission agencies. This means that there has been little cooperation between mission agencies and sending churches. And finally, the lack of adequate and proper missionary preparation through cross-cultural training has produced the most serious problems.

I fully agree with Ro’s opinion above. To be sure, Korean missionaries are following the steps of the colonialistic, imperialistic, and paternalistic
missionary attitudes that previously were seen among many Western missionaries. Ironically, Koreans do not see our blind spots but place the blame on the faults of Western missionaries.

In a personal interview Timothy Ki-Ho Park, a former Korean Presbyterian missionary to the Philippines for twenty years and a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, mentioned some of the problems of Korean missionary work (1997). First, most Korean missionaries do not follow mission principles such as incarnational ministry, indigenous church planting, cooperation with others, and so on. Rather, they try to do mission work through the use of abundant material resources. Because Koreans have a monolingual and monocultural background, it is not easy for them to learn other languages and to adjust to other cultures. They usually employ paid national ministers and interpreters. Thus, the national workers can be spoiled easily by money, are not mobilized for doing successful ministries, and easily can leave the Korean-sponsored mission for another mission organization to receive more material benefits if conflicts arise between them and the missionaries. This has been named a “grasshopper spirit.” In many cases, this practice encourages the paid workers to be “rice Christians” and to rely on missionaries rather than on God.
Second, Park notes one of the prominent characteristics of a Korean mission is that it operates as a “congregational mission.” The local sending congregations expect immediate visible results from their missionaries. Thus, missionaries are burdened to show the sending church and mission agencies the visible outcome as fast as they can. The results are immature fruit and a missionary mentality of seeking visible outcomes rather than the importance of the process.

Third, according to Park, most Korean missionaries barely understand the relationship between the gospel and culture. So, they usually plant westernized Korean denominational churches.

Fourth, there are conflicts among Korean missionaries, and between missionaries and local church leaders, Park observes. Furthermore, because of the factional spirit and strong individualistic competitive attitude of the Korean church, these people find it hard to cooperate with other foreign mission organizations. Finally, the history of Korean church mission is short, so that they have made many mistakes through trial and error on the mission field. To a certain degree these problems may be attributed to the lack of missiological education, and the lack of cross-cultural missionary training in particular.
Some Korean church leaders and missiologists regard inadequate missionary training as a cause of many problems in Korean mission. David Tae-Woong Lee, director of the Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC) in Seoul, quotes one Western mission leader who says, "Most of the problems which happened in the Two-Thirds World mission were caused by Korean missionaries" (1991b:38). He goes on to point out further the problems caused by Korean missionaries who have not received adequate cross-cultural missionary training. He says,

When a Korean missionary is sent to overseas mission field without a proper cross-cultural missionary training, not only can he or she be facing difficulties, but also it will harm the sending agency and other missionaries and other mission organizations. This is the reason why we do strongly stress the necessity of an appropriate cross-cultural missionary training. The local churches in which Korean missionaries serve expect Korean missionaries' understanding of their culture for good missionary activities because they already heard the Korean church's rapid growth and maturity. However, the fame of the Korean church could be harmed by the colonialistic missionary activities done by inadequately trained or untrained impersonal Korean missionaries. (1991b:38)

As has been noted above, probably the root problems of Korean missionary activity are found largely in the lack of missionary preparation for cultural adjustment. In his research of Korean mission work, Jong-Koo Park points out that lack of appropriate training programs is the most serious of
three issues contributing to problems of Korean missionaries (1994:109). Park’s research points out that the problems of Korean missionaries are caused significantly by the lack of cross-cultural missionary training and connected to the high rate of missionary attrition.

Through participating with ReMAP (Reducing Missionary Attrition Project) as a member of new missionary sending countries, the Korea Research Institute for Missions (KRIM) surveyed Korean missionary attrition under the supervision of Steve Sang-Cheol Moon, chief researcher of KRIM. In his research about missionary attrition among Korean missionaries during the period 1992-1994, Steve Moon points out that thirty-five units (families or singles) terminated missionary work before the expected time in 1992, followed by seventy-one cases in 1993 and seventy-nine cases in 1994. This indicates that 185 units out of the 832 units terminated missionary work during the three-year period of 1992-1994. However, when we count on dual and triple memberships, and membership transfer, the actual units of missionary attrition are 153 units out of the 833 units during the three-year period 1992-1994. Among the 153 units, roughly 101 units came back home for preventable reasons for the period (1997:134). Moon analyzes these statistics,
This means that each mission agency lost an average of 2.4 missionary families or singles) for the period. The attrition rate of the 153 units out of the 833 units is 18.4%, implying that if 100 missionaries go out, 18 will come back early. Twelve of these would come back for undesirable reasons. If we estimate the annual loss of the missionaries to be 65 units, the estimated annual attrition rate for the year 1994 becomes 3.6%. (1997:135)

In Steve Moon’s research there are twenty-six reasons for attrition. From the twenty-six reasons, the respondents, seventy-three mission agencies, were asked to select the seven most important items and prioritize these according to the degree of importance. The major causes of missionary attrition that emerged were problems with fellow missionaries, health problems, change of job, lack of call, weak home support, disagreement with the sending agency, and poor cultural adaptation (1997:136).

In my opinion, though “poor cultural adaptation” is ranked last among the seven most important reasons of missionary attrition in Korea, the other six problems are closely connected to the problem of Korean missionaries’ poor cultural adjustment. It is a fact that cross-cultural adaptation or adjustment starts from an understanding of one’s own culture. For example, “problems with peer missionaries” and “disagreement with sending agency” indicate that many Korean missionaries are seldom aware of Korean cultural values such as the top-down, authoritarian and autocratic Korean leadership
pattern, factionalism, and a hierarchical social system. As another example, Korean missionaries' "health problems" are largely considered to be a result of poor cultural adaptation, so-called "culture shock." In this respect, it seems that the problem of poor cross-cultural adaptation is connected to many problems of Korean missionaries. For instance, Rick Leatherwood, a veteran American missionary to Mongolia, evaluates the Korean missionary work in Mongolia:

The phenomenal wave of missionaries coming out of Korea has played a significant role in Mongolia due to the fact that the Korean and Mongolian languages are structured similarly. To some extent the Korean missionary must simply substitute new vocabulary and they are often preaching within a year. These Korean missionaries are highly consecrated and very focused. They bring a discipline to their work and a zeal in prayer that is absolutely amazing. However, though Korean missionaries are usually well trained theologically, they tend not to be well trained missiologically. They seem to possess little understanding of contextualization and have exhibited no real desire to plant indigenous churches in Mongolia. They are of the mind that what has worked well in Korea will work all over the world if only everyone would follow suit. But that is not the way God is working. The Koreans are exceptionally dear brethren and have been greatly used by God in Mongolia, but their mono-cultural ways are beginning to frustrate the emerging Mongol leadership. Bringing white gloves, ecclesiastical robes, and a golden chalice from Korea to serve communion is not sitting well with Mongol leadership who would like to see the church become more Mongolian. (1998:16)

Beyond Steve Moon's items, I also believe that sending churches and Korean mission agencies' poor understanding of Korean cultural values is a
stumbling block for Korean mission work. Usually effective mission policies can guide missionaries to effective cross-cultural adjustment through adequate cross-cultural missionary training. In the Korean context, hierarchical, authoritarian, and autocratic leadership patterns of mission sending agencies can produce ineffective mission policy and administrative structure. Subsequently, it can produce inadequate cross-cultural missionary training and, consequently, poor cross-cultural adjustment. In other words, poor mission policy and administration are closely related to Korean missionaries' poor cross-cultural adjustment. In this sense, one of the urgent tasks of the Korean church is to challenge the hierarchical leadership pattern and to transform the mission structure of the sending agencies as well as the sending churches through effective missiological education. Understanding incarnational ministry must be done at the level of sending agencies and churches as well as with missionaries. Unless mission policies and administrative structures are challenged by kingdom values and transformed into an incarnational model of ministry, the problem of cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment cannot be solved.

Missiologists (Mayers 1974; Reed 1985; Whiteman 1996; Kraft 1996;
Kyeong-Sook Park 1996; Timothy Park 1997) also emphasize that a monolingual and monocultural background and perspective\textsuperscript{10} hamper the effectiveness of mission work. Particularly, a monocultural perspective hinders missionaries from adjusting to other cultures. Then, how do Korean missionaries' monolingual and monocultural background impact their missionary activities? How can Korean missionaries adjust to other cultures without missionary preparation through an appropriate cross-cultural missionary training, especially in the area of cultural learning and missiological anthropology?\textsuperscript{11}

Previous research and studies on cross-cultural missionary training (David Lee 1983, 1991a, 1997; J. K. Park 1994; Kang 1995, 1997; Steve Moon 1997) have made contributions to developing training programs and facilitating the effectiveness of cross-cultural ministry. However, one of the most important things missing in the area of studies on cross-cultural missionary training, is research data on the importance of missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment or adaptation to other cultures in relation to their ministry effectiveness as a result of cross-cultural missionary training. Therefore, there is an urgent need for in-depth study in this area in order to strengthen Korean missionaries' cross-cultural ministry as they understand and perform
incarnational ministry, and for development of cross-cultural missionary training programs.

Statement of the Problem

With the increased awareness of the importance of cross-cultural missionary training, the need has become urgent. There have appeared many models of cross-cultural missionary training for churches in the Two-Thirds World. The problem of this study is to research how missionary preparation through cross-cultural training is related to Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment.

Can missionary preparation through cross-cultural missionary training help Korean missionaries adjust to other cultures? I hypothesize that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training or no training at all is related to a missionary's poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry. Consequently, inadequate missionary training and poor cross-cultural adjustment predict a high rate of missionary attrition. This research was conducted through the investigation of eight missionary training centers in Korea in order to evaluate their training programs, and subsequent examination of Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment.
I anticipated that this study could develop good models for training Korean missionaries to be able to cross cultural barriers with a proper understanding of different cultures in order to communicate the gospel message more effectively.

**Missiological Assumption**

A missiological assumption of this study is that understanding the nature of cross-cultural missionary training and missionary adjustment to another culture must be sought in the model of incarnational ministry. An incarnational model of cross-cultural witness presupposes that cross-cultural missionaries must identify with the host culture in order to understand it and be understood in sharing the Christian faith. The basic missionary attitude toward the local people they serve is seen in Jesus Christ’s incarnation, “The Word became flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1:14).

With this basis of the principle of incarnational ministry, the methodologies of cross-cultural missionary training can be designed and developed. Incarnational ministry is the concept underlying what missionaries must learn through missionary training in order to adjust to other cultures for effective mission work.
Data Needed

The data needed in this study to find the relationship between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment are in two parts. The first data evaluates the effectiveness of missionary training programs in Korea. It was gathered from interviews with directors of eight missionary training centers in Korea (See Appendix B), and from interviews with Korean missionaries who are working in Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Bangladesh (See Appendix C). The second group of data helps clarify the problem of Korean missionaries' cross-cultural ministry and cross-cultural adjustment. The data was collected from the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (See Appendix E), the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (QFKM) who were trained in ten missionary training centers in Korea (See Appendix A), and interviews with Korean missionaries and nationals in four countries—Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Bangladesh—where I visited for my field research (See Appendix C and D).

First, in order to evaluate the programs of missionary training centers in Korea in relation to Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment, I needed to learn if they provide Korean missionaries with adequate knowledge,
practical cultural adjustment skills, and experience of cultures (cf. David Lee 1991a:73-74). I asked the following questions:

1. Do the missionary training programs provide training in missiological anthropology, understanding Korean beliefs, customs, values and worldview, cross-cultural communication, and conflict management skills?

2. Do the missionary training programs provide informal training methods to improve character qualities and develop interpersonal relationship skills?

3. Do the missionary training programs provide appropriate culture learning activities and cultural adjustment skills through experiential learning?

Second, in order to examine Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment in relation to the missionary training they received, I needed:

1. to learn if Korean cultural values and worldview have influenced Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment.

2. to measure Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adaptability.

3. to determine in what ways Korean missionaries adjust to the host culture because of their training.
In order to find the above data I used the "Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory" (CCAI)\textsuperscript{12} (Kelley and Meyers 1995), the questionnaire for Korean missionaries, and interviews with the directors of the eight missionary training centers in Korea, Korean missionaries, and nationals.

Third, in order to discover a relation between cross-cultural missionary training programs in Korea and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment, I needed to carefully analyze and interpret the data I collected through the field research mentioned above. This led me to develop a cross-cultural missionary training model for the Korean Protestant church to train well-prepared missionaries.

**Data Collection and Research Methodology**

Given the nature of this study, this dissertation uses qualitative and quantitative research methodologies such as questionnaires, interviewing, and observation. Data collection for my research study was proceeded by three stages: (1) library research, (2) conducting questionnaires and an inventory, and (3) interviewing and ministry observation.

**Library Research**

Because of the paucity of books, articles, and journals relating to cross-
cultural missionary training, collecting data for my research study through library research was difficult. During the summer of 1997, in the B. L. Fisher Library of Asbury Theological Seminary I could find no more than thirty books and articles regarding missionary training issues. During my visit to Korea in the summer of 1997, I collected some materials in Korean language regarding Korean missionary training through some missionary training centers and some seminary libraries. In August, 1997, I contacted William D. Taylor, director of the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) Missions Commission. He sent me a copy of the book that he edited, Too Valuable to Lose: Exploring the Causes and Cures of Missionary Attrition (1997). This book provided me with a broad picture of missionary training issues. Also, it informed me of the current problems of Korean missionaries and the importance of missionary training.

During my visit to Fuller Theological Seminary in the first week of June 1997, I found several dissertations about cross-cultural missionary training and curriculum design. Also, I acquired dissertations through interlibrary loan regarding cross-cultural missionary training and missiological education and curriculum design for missionary training. Finally, I used the University of Kentucky library to do research looking particularly for books
and articles about non-mission cross-cultural training.

**Questionnaires and Inventory**

My research question was to determine if inadequate missionary training is related to poor cross-cultural adjustment which then affects a high rate of Korean missionary attrition. In order to find Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment skills, I used a Self-Administered Research Questionnaire and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI). These measurements were given to Korean first-term (one to five years), second-term (six to ten years), and few third-term (eleven to fifteen) career missionaries who have been trained in the eight missionary training centers (five denominational and three interdenominational missionary training centers) and currently at work in mission fields. The CCAI developed by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers (1995) was used as a major tool to measure cross-cultural adaptability (See Appendix E). The Self-Administered Research Questionnaire was used as a secondary measurement (See Appendix A).

**On-Site Interviews and Observation**

In order to find the relationship between missionary training and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment, first I interviewed the
directors of eight missionary training centers in Korea to evaluate if they provided programs for missionaries' effective cultural adjustment (See Appendix B). Also, I followed up the questionnaires for Korean missionaries by in-depth interviews (See Appendix C and D) with Korean missionaries and nationals living in Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Bangladesh where I visited for my field research during the summer and the fall of 1999. The purpose of this interview was to find whether and to what degree cross-cultural missionary training affects the cross-cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries.

Before I conducted this interview, I also visited the Philippines for three weeks to do preliminary field research by focusing only on Korea Evangelical Holiness Church (KEHC) missionaries who are trained in the KEHC missionary training center (KMTC) and their national ministers. During my second field research in 1999, I interviewed twenty-four missionaries and twelve local ministers.

Observation was also another important method in my research that significantly contributed to my data collection in which I could see the critical impact of cross-cultural missionary training on relationships between missionaries and nationals. I observed Korean missionaries' ministry and
their relationship with the local ministers as I participated in their worship services, seminary education, and evangelism. These data were collected in the countries mentioned above.

**Theoretical Framework for Interpretation of the Data**

The theoretical framework to interpret the data was drawn from theological, cultural, and educational sources. In this study I examined models from various disciplines as the means by which to interpret the data. This was done in order to finally develop a cross-cultural missionary training program in the Korean context. The models that I used in this research are not automatically valid for applying cross-culturally with the exception of the incarnational model and conversion model of cross-cultural ministry. Rather, "Models are developed within specific cultural contexts for particular purposes and must, therefore, be interpreted first within that context and then evaluated for their cross-cultural potential" (Kraft 1979:33). In this respect, the models that I used need to be critically examined in order to find some important implications.

In this study the data was interpreted by using seven theoretical perspectives. Those seven perspectives are as follows: (1) Incarnational
model of cross-cultural ministry; (2) conversion model of cross-cultural witness; (3) Hofstede’s model of five value dimensions; (4) Nida’s model of missionary identification; (5) Grove and Torbiorn’s model of intercultural adjustment and training; (6) Formal, informal and non-formal training model; and (7) Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model for cross-cultural training.

The seven theoretical perspectives which follow fall under three academic areas: theology, behavioral sciences, and education. The theories were presented first, then aspects were integrated into a cross-cultural missionary training model.

**Theological Understanding of Cross-Cultural Missionary Training**

**Incarnational Model of Cross-Cultural Ministry.** In order to understand the nature of cross-cultural missionary training and missionary adjustment to another culture I needed to lay a theological foundation which I believe is an incarnational model of cross-cultural witness. The basic missionary attitude toward the people they serve is seen in Jesus Christ’s incarnation, “The Word became flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). Darrell Whiteman points out, “The Incarnation is not simply the miracle of God becoming a human being, but God becoming man immersed in a specific culture. If our cross-cultural communication of the Gospel is to be an effective ministry, then we must
understand the importance and meaning of God’s Incarnation in culture” (1981:236-237).

Thomas and Elizabeth Brewster, in their book *Bonding and the Missionary Task: Establishing a Sense of Belonging* (1982), insist that incarnational ministry begins with the missionaries’ experience of bonding with the local people. They equate the process of missionaries bonding to a new culture to the bonding between infant and mother. This bonding occurs immediately after birth when the infant and mother are most sensitive. They insist that for new missionaries the timing is critical for establishing a sense of belonging to a new culture. During the first couple of weeks new missionaries can cope with and are excited by the new environment so that they can easily bond with the local people. They say, “Culture shock is predictable for the missionary who has not bonded with the local people of his new community, but it is much less likely for the bonded person. The one who feels at home does not experience culture shock” (1982:7).

They suggest that new missionaries immediately become totally immersed in the new culture, live with a local family, dress as they dress, eat the same food which has been prepared in the same way, and emulate completely their way of life. In this way the new missionary becomes an
insider to some extent, being more readily accepted by the local people, and will have a more effective cross-cultural ministry. They, in this method, encourage the incarnational model of ministry, an ideal model of cross-cultural adjustment and a means for overcoming culture shock by becoming bi-cultural persons.

The incarnation and Scripture are God’s special revelation which can demonstrate God’s general revelation. The communication of the Christian faith to the other people requires us to be incarnated in a given context, that of the people’s real life. In this sense, missionary preparation through cross-cultural training as a method puts its foundation on incarnational ministry. In fact, missionary adjustment to another culture means nothing in itself; it is only for the sake of incarnational ministry. As mentioned above, missionary bonding or identification with the local people must not remain at a surface level, but rather be established at a deep level so that missionaries can overcome their ethnocentrism and become multi-cultural persons in sharing Christian faith.


In Cornelius’ conversion account, we can see God’s sovereign
intervention in that Peter broke the cultural barriers to preach the gospel. Cornelius did not need to change his culture to become a Christian. Rather, the conversion of Peter (cf. Hahn 1965; Bevans 1998) made him change his worldview and go to Cornelius. What Luke demonstrates in the event of the conversion of Cornelius is that the conversion of Peter, representing the Jewish Christians, must precede Gentile conversions (Gaventa 1986:107ff).

The central theme of the conversion of Cornelius is brought to the Jerusalem council. In the Lucan missionary paradigm the most important event is the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35). This event was the opening of mission to the Gentiles through official recognition by the Jerusalem church. Dollar describes the cultural reflection on the Jerusalem Council as the theological high point of Acts, as “a revolutionary cultural adaptation” (1993:229-230). “Paul’s mission to Gentiles cannot get underway until the apostles have implicitly ratified such a mission. The Cornelius episode and its sequel (Acts 10-12) are therefore interpolated between Paul’s conversion and the beginning of his mission to Gentiles” (Bosch 1991:120). In other words, both Acts 10-11 and Acts 15 contain the essence of Luke’s theological understanding that Gentiles are accepted by faith in Jesus Christ without the traditional requirement of circumcision, and they have table
fellowship with the Jews.

Biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural training cannot be separated from God's special involvement in human history, the incarnation of Jesus Christ and Scripture. In the conversion model we can see God's incarnational nature breaking down the cultural barriers between Jews and Gentiles. The conversion of Peter (Acts 10-11) shows that missionaries must not bring their cultural baggage and force the local people to accept it under the name of Christian conversion. Rather, missionaries must adapt to the local culture to proclaim the universal gospel message effectively. In fact, incarnational ministry requires us to undergo a radical conversion as the messengers of the gospel. The above two foundational models of cross-cultural training show how it is important to understand our own and other cultures in order to cross the barriers to incarnate among the people.

Cultural Understanding of Cross-Cultural Missionary Training

Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Values. Understanding Korean cultural values and worldview lays the foundation for cross-cultural training in general. In other words, "The first step toward understanding another culture is becoming aware of one's own cultural values so that they will not
interfere with learning those of the new culture” (Sikkema and Niyekama 1987:7). The more we become conscious of the worldview that governs our behavior, the better we are able to deal with the values we encounter in others. In other words, without seeing one’s own worldview, one cannot see another culture. Ironically, unless one lives in another cultural context, it is difficult to see and be aware of one’s own cultural values and assumptions.

Examining Korean worldview and cultural values is one of the most important foundations for cross-cultural missionary training. There are various models for examining cultural values, attitudes, and beliefs, the hidden parts of culture. If we are consciously aware of our own culture, we can often understand why we behave as we do.

In his book, Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind (1991), Hofstede suggests a conceptual model to understand national cultures that gives us an understanding of values of ourselves and of the people with whom we interact. Hofstede identifies five value dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and long-term and short-term orientation. These five values dimensions are as follows.

First, power distance can be defined as the extent to which the less
powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect
and accept that power is distributed unequally. Thus, the dimension of power
distance is explained from the value systems of the less powerful members
while the way power is distributed is usually explained from the behavior of
the more powerful members (Hofstede 1991:28).

Second, individualism and collectivism relate to the relationship
between the individual and the collectivity in a given society. Thus,
individual and collective society can be classified by the degree to which
people in a given society rely upon and give allegiance to the self or to the
group. Hofstede explains that individualism pertains to societies in which the
ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself
or herself and his or her immediate family while collectivism as its opposite
pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into
strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to
protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty (1991:51).

Third, regarding masculinity and femininity, Hofstede says that
masculinity pertains to societies in which social gender roles are clearly
distinct (i.e., men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on
material success whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender,
and concerned with the quality of life); femininity pertains to societies in which social gender roles overlap (i.e., both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life) (1991:82-83).

Fourth, uncertainty avoidance can be defined as the degree to which people feel threatened by ambiguity and try to clarify uncertainties by establishing new structures. Feelings of uncertainty can be expressed through nervous stress and in need of predictability (Hofstede 1991:113).

Lastly, Hofstede identifies long-term and short-term orientation with the “Confucian dynamism.” This value orientation covers issues for economic development and leadership of Confucian countries. Hofstede indicates that the values of long-term orientation are persistence (perseverance), ordering relationships by status and observing this order, thrift, and feeling a sense of shame whereas values of short-term orientation are personal steadiness and stability, protecting one’s face, respect for tradition, and reciprocation of greetings, favors and gifts (1991:165-166).

These five major variables of national cultures as a model provide a framework to interpret the Korean worldview and values. To a larger degree, Korean society has been dominated by Confucian values for about 600 years. Of course, there are some different Korean national values that have had the
influence to shape Korean social character and mind, and behavior of the Korean people such as Shamanism, Buddhism, and Taoism. However, the leading Korean scholars relating to Koreanology insist that today Confucian values still dominate Korean society (Jae Un Kim 1991; Kyung Il Kim 1999; Jun Sik Choi 1997). In this sense, careful examination of Confucian values is a way to find reasons why Korean missionaries experience difficulty in doing their mission work, especially in cross-cultural adjustment.

Nida's Model of Missionary Identification. In his book, Message and Mission (1990), Eugene Nida describes the incarnation as the deepest "identification" as he emphasizes that "Jesus also communicated by life, in utter identification with men and women" (1990:33). Nida's view of incarnation as identification is seen in his description of "degrees of identification in terms of levels of communication" (1990:214). At the first level of communication, the message has no significant effect on behavior and the substance of the message is essentially self-validating. At the second level, the communication significantly affects a receptor's immediate behavior. At the third level, the communication impacts a receptor's behavior and value system. On the last level, the receptor becomes the new source (1990:214-216).
Also, in relation to these four levels of communication, Nida offers a discussion of “Basic Ingredients in Effective Identification” (1990:218-221) to show how to be an incarnational witness. They are:

1. Identify with specific individuals [national workers].
2. Recognize inherent limitations.
3. Know ourselves [understand one’s own culture and worldview].
4. Know [understand and respect] others [Empathize with people].
5. Participate in the lives of people as co-laborers.
6. Be willing to be known [being respected and being vulnerable].
7. Have genuine love for people.

The first principle of missionary identification is that the missionary identify with specific persons; for example, national workers. In fact, missionary identification begins from relationships with national workers. So, missionary adjustment can be measured by the relationship with national workers. In my field research, interviews with nationals can fit this category.

In the second level of identification, Nida helps us recognize inherent limitations to identification. The missionary can never completely identify with the local people. Being a missionary does not mean being like a local person, but being a bi-cultural or multi-cultural person. For missionaries, becoming bi-cultural or multi-cultural is to remove barriers to the relationships with the local people in order to witness the Christian gospel effectively. In this respect, missionaries must be aware of “inherent
limitations” to identification for effective adjustment to another culture (Nida 1990:219).

Nida insists that missionaries must know themselves, that is, “fully recognize our own motivations” as the third principle of identification (1990:219). Understanding our own cultural values and worldview is a way to avoid ethnocentrism. In fact, this stage of missionary identification is the starting point for measuring missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment.

In the fourth principle of identification, “knowing others,” Nida points out, “one very effective tool is a familiarity with the field of anthropology and the techniques whereby customs and cultures different from our own can be understood” (1990:220). Effective cultural adjustment cannot be done without understanding the local people’s thoughts and feelings (including verbal and nonverbal communication), and respecting the local people. In other words, the missionary should have empathy toward the host.

In the fifth principle, “participating in the lives of people as co-laborers,” Nida points out “a genuine interpersonal experience.” (1990:221). This stage is related to interpersonal relationships between the missionary and national workers without paternalistic or ethnocentric attitudes. This level also relates to the missionary’s lifestyle and ministry.
In missionary identification, it is not enough for the missionary to know others. The missionary must be known or respected by nationals. There should be a mutual empathy. Finally, Nida characterizes the deepest level of missionary identification, “having genuine love for people.” He says,

This love must not be a sentimental romanticizing about a certain group of people in general, but a profound appreciation of certain individuals in particular. We must genuinely enjoy their presence and experience a growing sense of mutual indispensability. Only in this way can we really identify, for we become like those we love. (1990:221)

Grove and Torbiorn’s Model of Intercultural Adjustment and Training.

In their article, “A New Conceptualization of Intercultural Adjustment and the Goals of Training” (1993), Grove and Torbiorn develop the essential features of a new theory of the adjustment process and its relevance to intercultural training. They employ three psychological constructs as a theory of the adjustment process: applicability of behavior, clarity of the mental frame of reference, and level of mere adequacy. Figure 1 shows the relationships between frame of reference, behavior, and environment.

“Applicability of behavior” is the degree to which a person’s own behavior is consistent with his or her environment. “Frame of reference” refers to cognitive elements advising for or against behaviors. In other words, this term indicates people’s worldview. The term “clarity of mental frame of
reference” refers to the extent to which behavior is consistent with recommendations of the frame of reference. “Level of mere adequacy” refers to an internal standard or benchmark against which people evaluate, implicitly or explicitly, their levels of applicability and of clarity. But different people have differing levels of mere adequacy with respect to both applicability and clarity.
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**Figure 1. The Relationships among a Person’s Frame of Reference, Behavior, and Environment (Grove and Torbiorn 1993:100)**

This model proposes four stages of adjustment cycle in relation to the degree of training. Figure 2 shows the relationship between cross-cultural training and cultural adjustment. The first stage shows that applicability is less than adequate and clarity is more than adequate at the moment of arrival, the so-called “honeymoon period.” The second stage shows that applicability
and clarity are less than adequate, which is characterized by culture shock.

The third stage indicates that applicability is more than adequate and clarity is less than adequate, which is characterized by progressive recovery from culture shock, a period of adjustment. The fourth stage indicates that both applicability and clarity are more than adequate, which is characterized by the completion of the process of adjustment.

Figure 2. The Person in a Highly Unfamiliar Environment with the Benefit of a Comprehensive Intercultural Training Program Both to Arrival and During Stages I and II of the Adjustment Cycle (Grove and Torbiorn 1993:106)
In this model, a second stage should be considered because this stage cannot be eliminated or skipped. We must develop a coping strategy with this culture shock stage. The purpose of this model is "to reduce the severity and shorten the duration of the newcomer's passage through stage II of the adjustment cycle" (Grove and Torbiorn 1993:84). The authors propose some models of intercultural training in order to reduce the culture shock stage as follows (1993:88-89):

1. Fact-Oriented Training: In this relatively traditional approach, the trainees are presented with facts about the host country and culture through lectures, panels, videotapes, films, readings, workbooks, case studies, critical incidents, community descriptions, culture capsules, dramatizations, question-answering sessions, and discussions.

2. Attribution Training: Most closely associated with the culture-assimilator technique (but not limited to it), this approach helps the trainee learn to explain events and behaviors from the point of view of host nationals. The objective is for the trainees to internalize values and standards of the host culture so that their attributions will become increasingly similar (isomorphic) to those of their hosts.

3. Culture-Awareness Training: With philosophical underpinnings in
cultural relativism, this approach introduces trainees to the culture concept and the nature of cultural differences; often the vehicle for accomplishing these ends is study of the trainees' own home culture in anthropological perspective. Specific techniques include value-orientation checklists, value-ranking charts, self-awareness building, and the contrast-culture technique. Similar objectives may be attained by culture-general approaches such as communication and nonverbal activities, perceptual exercises, simulation games, and studies of the nature of cross-cultural adjustment.

4. Cognitive-Behavior Modification: This little-used approach applies certain principles of learning to the special problems of cross-cultural adjustment. For instance, trainees are asked to list what kinds of activities they find rewarding (or punishing) in their home environment; then they carry out a guided study of the host culture to determine how they can duplicate (or avoid) those activities there. Trainers may attempt to help the trainees feel positively challenged by those features of the host culture that the trainee fears the most.

5. Experiential Learning: This type of intervention will be limited to activities focused on learning about a specific host culture. Experiential techniques are those that involve the trainees emotionally and physically as
well as intellectually; the trainees learn through actual experience. Role plays, situation exercises, community investigations, field trips, and total immersion are examples of host-culture-specific experiential learning.

6. Interactional Learning: This type of training involves structured or unstructured interaction between the trainers on the one hand, and host nationals and/or "old hands" (experienced expatriates) on the other. The objective is for the trainees to feel more and more comfortable with the host nationals and to learn details about life in the host country from them and/or the old hands.

Grove and Torbiorn’s model provides an understanding of the nature of the cultural adjustment cycle according to stages and a balanced approach of formal, non-formal, and informal training. Also, it provides what kind of training programs trainees really need for effective adjustment to the host culture.

Educational Models for Developing a Cross-Cultural Missionary Training Program

Three Umbrella Classifications of Training Models: Formal, Informal, and Non-Formal Training. The nature of this research is to examine the relationship between Korean missionaries’ adjustment to other cultures and
their missionary training. Therefore, the evaluation of the missionary training centers needs to focus on the effectiveness and appropriateness of the training programs to increase trainees' adaptability to other cultures. The importance of non-formal education has been emphasized by mission educators such as Ted Ward (Ward and Herzog 1977). In fact, missionary preparation through cross-cultural missionary training is closer to non-formal and informal training methods than to formal schooling methods. But in order to make the missionary training program holistic, formal, informal, and non-formal training methods need to be balanced to increase the effectiveness of training programs. Today, most mission educators and missionary trainers use these three models in their training programs. As has been stated, these three models are a developmental model of training and are an attempt to overcome the limits of the traditional Western schooling education system.

The characteristics of these three modes of training are as follows (Clinton 1984:136, 140, 149; cf. David Lee 1991a:73-74). First, formal training model refers to training that takes place in institutions that offer programmatic instruction leading to degrees, certificates, or diplomas. It usually utilizes a schooling model as its basic educational philosophy. Also, it emphasizes completion of requirements for the program and is organized to
train groups rather than individuals. In the teaching and learning process it focuses on teaching rather than learning so the teacher’s authority is the major power base. There is a high degree of competition in course work in the formal training model.

Second, non-formal training refers to organized non-programmatic functional training. It stresses cognitive information and skill training which can be immediately applied to ministry situations. It relies on the usefulness of its product and is a learner-centered approach. In this model, the teacher’s power base is not legal authority but spiritual authority. In the cross-cultural missionary training setting examples include seminars and workshops, field experiences, group dynamics, and so on.

Third, informal training refers to the deliberate use of life activities in a communal setting. It takes place in the context of normal life activities such as communal living, leadership and discipleship training, personal counseling, evaluation, and so on. Thus it utilizes imitation modeling as a major experiential model and can be individualized and self-initiated. Table 1 shows the comparison of the three modes of education.
Table 1
Comparison of Forms of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>NON-FORMAL</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term and</td>
<td>Long-term and specific</td>
<td>Immediate and specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential based</td>
<td>Non-credential based</td>
<td>Life task related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long cycle</td>
<td>Short cycle</td>
<td>Noncyclic, continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>Recurrent</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows sequence,</td>
<td>Shows sequence, continuity,</td>
<td>Non-sequential, no continuity, not integrated</td>
<td>Non-formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuity, and</td>
<td>and integration over single units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integration over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input centered</td>
<td>Output centered</td>
<td>Context centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Serendipitous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution based</td>
<td>Environment based</td>
<td>Relationship based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Community related</td>
<td>Person related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidly structured</td>
<td>Flexibly structured</td>
<td>Structured within daily life experiences</td>
<td>Non-formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher centered</td>
<td>Learner centered</td>
<td>Interpersonal centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Externally controlled</td>
<td>Self-governing</td>
<td>Not controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Clientele determined by entry requirements</td>
<td>Entry based on relationships, not academic achievement</td>
<td>Non-formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Resource intensive</td>
<td>Resource saving</td>
<td>Resource saving—often resource not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>NON-FORMAL</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to generalized nonspecific future situation</td>
<td>Relevant to immediate context</td>
<td>May or may not be relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child oriented</td>
<td>Adult oriented</td>
<td>Non-age specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized futuristic preparation</td>
<td>Specific present preparation</td>
<td>May focus on specific and immediate needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops institutions involved</td>
<td>Develops both communities and individuals involved</td>
<td>Develops relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides theoretical base</td>
<td>Provides experiential base</td>
<td>Provides relational base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited by outsiders</td>
<td>Accredited by insiders</td>
<td>Not accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost</td>
<td>Low cost</td>
<td>No or low cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>May be culturally, economically and educationally dislocative; expensive in finances, personnel, time, material; may be immediately irrelevant</td>
<td>May lack theoretical base; may not be relevant in a different situation; Learning time for comparable content and skills may be longer than formal approach</td>
<td>Difficult to assure learning of specified content, skills or attitudes; Accountability difficult to include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elliston 1989:241-242

Sikkema and Niyeawwa’s Model for Cross-Cultural Training. In their book, Design for Cross-Cultural Learning (1987), Sikkema and Niyeawwa propose an integrated cross-cultural training model. This model also uses a balanced approach with formal, non-formal, and informal modes of training as
a developmental model of training. They define the major aim of this model as "to prepare students to function effectively in any culture or subculture and to help them grow toward becoming more flexible and creative through experiential learning" (1987:7). "Experiential learning" refers to how the trainees learn another culture to overcome the mono-cultural ethnocentric perspectives.

The major characteristic of this model is that in a pre-field training setting this model covers three domains of a training program: pre-field training, on-field training, and post-field training. First, pre-field training emphasizes the dimension of cognitive learning as a framework of the trainees' affective learning. Second, on-field training provides meaning to theoretical considerations. In this stage, trainees can experience culture shock in an unknown cultural context. Resolving and recovering from culture shock, cross-cultural adjustment is fundamental to this model. During the period of field experience, the trainees learn about another culture through various learning experiences such as personal relationships, daily journal, and field seminars. Third, post-field training or seminar is a time for the trainees to analyze their field learning and to integrate affective with cognitive learning. This training program extends for twelve months as an accredited
training program. The period or length of pre-field training can be adjustable according to given situations when taking into account the importance of on-field training.

How the Data Was Organized and Interpreted

As mentioned above, the components of the theoretical framework of my research are theological, cultural, and educational. In the section "theological understanding of cross-cultural missionary training," the incarnational model of cross-cultural ministry and the conversion model are basic models for interpreting the data. These models are used for evaluating mission philosophy and cross-cultural missionary training goals in a proposed cross-cultural missionary training program.

Investigation and Evaluation of Missionary Training Centers in Korea.

In this area of investigation, I used formal, informal, and non-formal training models to find what training factors influence the cross-cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries. This showed the degree of effectiveness of eight training programs for facilitating Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment skills for effective mission work.

As stated above, the three modes of training—formal, informal and non-formal education—should be balanced according to a given learning
context in the training setting. Each of these modes has its weaknesses and strengths. Thus a balanced approach must be contextually developed. In fact, the Korean education system has been dominated by a formal education model. Korean education is characterized as teacher-centered and dominated by rote memory as a "banking style" teaching and learning method, with its main focus on passing the university entrance exam (David Lee 1991a:73).

Missionary training in Korea is no exception. Most Korean missionaries are ordained, highly educated ministers and have enough biblical and theological knowledge and monocultural ministry experience. I believe that their weakest area of education for cross-cultural ministry is cultural sensitivity training which can be learned through non-formal and informal training. These two modes of training are important for Korean missionaries to learn how to adjust to a new culture.

Steve Moon points out, "The importance of the informal and non-formal aspects of missionary education cannot be overemphasized in the current Korean situation" (1997:139). Ferris and Fuller (1995) emphasize the validity of informal and non-formal education for missionary training. They say:

Informal education is the normal—and most effective—way we acquire
our values and learn to express them as relational skills. In missionary training, informal education will be important to achieving those goals at developing character qualities. . . . Like informal education, non-formal education is practical; it addresses students’ needs or interests. Because of its practical orientation, non-formal education often entails teaching by example and practice. For the same reason, it also often occurs “in the field” or uses teaching methods which simulate “field” situations. . . . In missionary training, most cross-cultural, communication, and ministry skills will be learned best through non-formal education. (1995:54)

The emphases of Sikkema and Niyekawa’s cross-cultural training model are not different from the above perspectives with the emphases on informal and non-formal education. They propose the basic principles of the curriculum as follows. First, the program is organized so there is an intermingling of intellectual and experiential learning opportunities. Second, the program places students at the center of the educational process, functioning in unstructured situations that require them to evolve their own strategies for making choices, decisions, and evaluations. Third, the program, since the goal is intercultural competency, uses a “culture-general” approach15 to cross-cultural learning (in contrast to “culture-specific” study of a particular culture). The intent is to help students learn so they can apply it in a broad range of cross-cultural situations. Fourth, the program design provides students with opportunities to gain insight into the relationship
between theory and practice as spiral, not linear. Lastly, the program is designed to avoid closure so that students will maintain the capability for cross-cultural learning throughout their lives (Sikkema and Niyekawa 1987:21-22).

**Investigation and Evaluation of Korean Missionaries’ Cross-Cultural Adjustment.** As stated above, Nida’s model of missionary identification provided factors to evaluate Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment through seven principles of effective missionary identification (1990:218-221). These factors such as understanding cultural values, worldview, language, interpersonal relationships, living among the host, being known and respected, etc., enabled me to cluster items by classifying interview questions with Korean missionaries and nationals and in designing the questionnaire for Korean missionaries.

Hofstede’s model was used to understand Korean missionaries’ cultural values and worldview as the starting point for evaluating their cultural adjustment (See Chapter 4). This model helped me examine trainees’ cultural values and worldview, and teaches trainees how one’s cultural values and worldview function in a cross-cultural setting.

As has been stated above, Grove and Torbiorn’s model provided an
assumption about the relationship between intercultural training and the adjustment in a highly unfamiliar environment. This model can be applied to understanding Korean missionaries’ adjustment level. As stated above, one of the strengths of this model is that according to one’s adjustment cycle an effective on-field training program can be given. This model also shows that “intercultural training is most effective when it is begun prior to the trainees’ departure from their home culture and continued periodically during the sojourn in the host culture” in order to reduce the culture shock stage (Grove and Torbiorn 1993:97).

Finding the Relation Between Cross-Cultural Missionary Training and Korean Missionaries’ Cross-Cultural Adjustment. Through investigating both cross-cultural missionary training programs in Korea and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment, I analyzed the data in order to find the relation between the training programs and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment. This helped me propose and develop a cross-cultural missionary training program. Thus, in this dissertation research, this part is the most significant because all the elements I examined and investigated were put together for proposing a cross-cultural missionary training model.

In fact, the Korean church must discover what the missionaries really
need to be and to do and then invest more energies to train missionaries because cross-cultural missionary training is closely connected to the success or failure of mission work. The above models would be valuable for developing a training model as it proposes effective cultural adjustment skills through various kinds of training approaches. In other words, a proposed model of cross-cultural missionary training could be developed through integration of theological, cultural, and educational models.

In the proposed cross-cultural missionary training model, the incarnational model and the conversion model formed the foundation. The incarnation of Jesus Christ is the example of how missionaries should behave in the host culture. The conversion of Paul, Cornelius, and Peter, and the decision of the Jerusalem Council also provide reasons why we must cross cultural barriers to be incarnational witnesses.

In cognitive learning methods, examining Korean cultural values and worldview compared with others as a subject of missiological anthropology is the way to know oneself. This should accompany studying culture. In this sense, Hofstede’s model gives important insights for Korean missionaries to see themselves. This was the basis for understanding others as the starting point for adjusting to the host culture as Nida’s model of missionary
need to be and to do and then invest more energies to train missionaries because cross-cultural missionary training is closely connected to the success or failure of mission work. The above models would be valuable for developing a training model as it proposes effective cultural adjustment skills through various kinds of training approaches. In other words, a proposed model of cross-cultural missionary training could be developed through integration of theological, cultural, and educational models.

In the proposed cross-cultural missionary training model, the incarnational model and the conversion model formed the foundation. The incarnation of Jesus Christ is the example of how missionaries should behave in the host culture. The conversion of Paul, Cornelius, and Peter, and the decision of the Jerusalem Council also provide reasons why we must cross cultural barriers to be incarnational witnesses.

In cognitive learning methods, examining Korean cultural values and worldview compared with others as a subject of missiological anthropology is the way to know oneself. This should accompany studying culture. In this sense, Hofstede’s model gives important insights for Korean missionaries to see themselves. This was the basis for understanding others as the starting point for adjusting to the host culture as Nida’s model of missionary
dominated by a formal traditional schooling model of education. Today the Korean church needs to renew its education system. In its very nature, missiological education requires that acquiring cognitive knowledge through formal education necessarily needs to be related to various socio-cultural, political, and economic contexts which can be learned by informal and non-formal dimensions of education. In other words, missiological education articulates the contextual dimensions of theological education—learning by doing, a strong tension between action and reflection and a balance between being, knowing, and doing.

In this respect, cross-cultural missionary training is contextual in its very nature. Cross-cultural missionary training programs must recognize the importance of informal and non-formal aspects of education. Missionary training competency and the program design should be considered by this dimension in order to increase the trainees’ ability to adjust in a new cultural milieu, because effective missionary adjustment to the host culture can result in incarnational ministry. Thus every formal training method must be interconnected to informal and non-formal training methods. In cross-cultural missionary training, informal and non-formal education can never be overemphasized. In this sense, a balanced approach of three modes of
identification showed. In fact, cognitive learning in a formal class setting
"stems from the belief that some relevant theoretical knowledge of cross-
cultural learning will give meaning to observation, reactions, and interactions
of students in the field experiences—in short, provide a framework for their
affective learning" (Sikkema and Niyekawa 1987:22).

Nida's model showed how missionaries' identification with the local
people affects their ministry. Along with using the Cross-Cultural
Adaptability Inventory, this model was used for measuring Korean
missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment levels.

Grove and Torbiorn's model helped bridge between cross-cultural
adjustment and training. On the one hand, it helped people to overcome
culture shock and shorten the culture shock stage. On the other hand, this
model provided various training methods in the pre-field setting, such as fact-
oriented training, attribution training, culture-awareness training, cognitive-
behavior modification, experiential learning, and interactional training (Grove

A proposed model of cross-cultural missionary training in my research
attempted to create a balanced between formal, informal, and non-formal
aspects of education. As mentioned above, theological education in Korea is
research data collection, and theoretical framework to interpret the data.

**Table 2**

The Process of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems &amp; Stages</th>
<th>Data Needed &amp; Methodology for Data Collection</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework to Interpret the Data Two Basic Models: Incarnational Model &amp; Conversion Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong> Analyzing the Relation between Cross-Cultural Missionary Training and Cross-Cultural Adjustment</td>
<td>Analysis of findings through data collected and developing a cross-cultural missionary training program</td>
<td>Using the models for constructing a cross-cultural missionary training program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Importance of the Study**

This study is important for Korean Protestant churches in four ways. First, it will help Korean churches to realize the importance of cross-cultural missionary training and to facilitate the development of missiological
dominated by a formal traditional schooling model of education. Today the
Korean church needs to renew its education system. In its very nature,
missiological education requires that acquiring cognitive knowledge through
formal education necessarily needs to be related to various socio-cultural,
political, and economic contexts which can be learned by informal and non-
formal dimensions of education. In other words, missiological education
articulates the contextual dimensions of theological education—learning by
doing, a strong tension between action and reflection and a balance between
being, knowing, and doing.

In this respect, cross-cultural missionary training is contextual in its
very nature. Cross-cultural missionary training programs must recognize the
importance of informal and non-formal aspects of education. Missionary
training competency and the program design should be considered by this
dimension in order to increase the trainees’ ability to adjust in a new cultural
milieu, because effective missionary adjustment to the host culture can result
in incarnational ministry. Thus every formal training method must be
interconnected to informal and non-formal training methods. In cross-cultural
missionary training, informal and non-formal education can never be
overemphasized. In this sense, a balanced approach of three modes of
secular and missionary training programs, unlike secular cross-cultural training programs, missionary training programs contain distinct elements: personal Christian disciplines, strong relationship with local churches, formal and non-formal biblical and theological studies, formal and non-formal cross-cultural studies, pre-field training by the mission agency as formal, informal, and non-formal training, on-field career training, and post-field training (cf. William Taylor 1991:3-10). In this respect, cross-cultural missionary training aims for Christian ministers to do effective mission work by being prepared fully through training programs.

Cross-Cultural Adjustment or Adaptation

"Cross-cultural adjustment" refers to a process by which one overcomes culture shock in a culture different from one's own. It means that sojourners temporarily give up themselves and do what the host society expects. Being able to think and do like the national is the crucial aspect of cross-cultural adjustment rather than merely looking like the national. The words "adapt" and "adjust" might be used interchangeably. The terms "are intended to mean the process of learning the new culture and its behaviors and language in an effort to understand and empathize with the people of the culture, and to live among and interact successfully with them" (Storti
education can equip people of God who cross cultural barriers in order to be incarnational witnesses.

In this research, a proposed model of cross-cultural missionary training focuses its concern for informal and non-formal aspects of education and presumes that dependence on formal education can provide valid cognitive knowledge and theoretical framework.

Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model is integrated into a proposed cross-cultural missionary training program along with the research findings and the above models. As formal, informal, and non-formal education, this model proposes a balanced approach to cross-cultural training. The locus of this model is its emphasis on an integration of cognitive, affective, and experiential learning in order to increase the effectiveness and appropriateness of cross-cultural training.

In Chapter 7, a cross-cultural missionary training model is proposed with particular emphasis on cross-cultural adjustment. The model integrates research findings along with formal, informal, and non-formal models of education plus Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model.

Table 2 summarizes all the different dimensions of this research process. It includes each stage of the research procedure, methodologies for
In the past thirty years the term has been used to describe almost any physical or emotional discomfort experienced by those adjusting to a new environment. Symptoms of culture shock may range from mild emotional disorders and stress-related physiological ailments to psychosis. To a large extent, culture shock is measured in terms of a so-called “attrition rate” of sojourners.

In general, the term “culture shock” refers to the transition period and the accompanying feelings of stress and anxiety a person experiences during the early period upon entering a new culture different from his or her own. Culture shock is a person’s strong reaction of anxiety to unfamiliar cultural circumstances.

Juffer (1993:205-207) categorizes the prevailing definitions of culture shock using the following causal schema: Culture shock is caused by (1) confronting a new environment or situation; (2) the ineffectiveness of intercultural or interpersonal communication; (3) a threat to the emotional or intrapsychic well-being of the sojourner; (4) the need to modify behavior to regain positive reinforcement from the new environment; and (5) growth experience. Although culture shock is most often associated with negative consequences, it can be an important aspect of culture learning, self-
research data collection, and theoretical framework to interpret the data.

Table 2

The Process of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems &amp; Stages</th>
<th>Data Needed &amp; Methodology for Data Collection</th>
<th>Theoretical Framework to Interpret the Data Two Basic Models: Incarnational Model &amp; Conversion Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III Analyzing the Relation between Cross-Cultural Missionary Training and Cross-Cultural Adjustment</td>
<td>Analysis of findings through data collected and developing a cross-cultural missionary training program</td>
<td>Using the models for constructing a cross-cultural missionary training program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of the Study

This study is important for Korean Protestant churches in four ways. First, it will help Korean churches to realize the importance of cross-cultural missionary training and to facilitate the development of missiological
Jesus’ incarnation is not a perfect analogy for what we do. By using Jesus’ incarnation as a model there are some dangers for detracting and demoting the important theological dimensions of Jesus’ incarnation. However, aspects of an incarnational model of ministry give us important insights on how to do missions. The incarnation of God in Jesus provides the foundational model for the practice of Christian mission. From a missiological perspective, the concept of incarnation focuses on the development of scriptural principles as it is applied to Christian mission through understanding the relationships between missionaries and the host people. When incarnation is applied to mission work, it is usually described in missiological terms such as bonding, identification, adaptation, indigenization, and contextualization.

From the perspective of incarnational ministry, cross-cultural missionary training is the method of facilitating the incarnation of the missionary. It aims to find ways by which missionaries adjust to another culture in order to be heard and trusted by the people they serve for the sake of announcing God’s salvation in Christ and his kingdom.

Missiological Education

“Education” is used in a general and broad meaning in contrast to “training.” Training suggests specific orientation for a defined situation. The
education through churches and seminaries.

Second, this study will enable missionary trainers and mission educators to increase and improve their training competency. It will also help them to develop contextualized missionary training programs and missiological education curricula.

Third, this study will help missionaries and mission educators to understand the nature of contextualization through the process of learning cultures and building or designing contextualized missionary training curricula.

Fourth, this study will help Korean missionaries learn how to develop their ability to adjust to other cultures in order to be incarnational witnesses.

Definition of Terms

Cross-Cultural Missionary Training

In general, “cross-cultural training refers to all programs that train people to live, work, study or perform effectively in a cultural setting different from their own” (Hoopes and Pusch 1979:7). The purpose of cross-cultural missionary training is to equip and prepare the people of God for effective cross-cultural ministry. Even though many training skills overlap between
perceptions belong to this deep level. In this sense, worldview is "the central set of concepts and presuppositions that provide people with their assumptions about reality. People in different cultures often have very different worldviews or views of the natural and supernatural world" (Whiteman 1983:478). Thus worldview, internal culture or core culture, dominates people's everyday behavior, their external culture. We are usually unaware of our own worldview until we leave it and interact with those who are culturally different. This interaction and cross-cultural conflict raises aspects of our own culture to our conscious awareness. In fact, we often discover our worldview by leaving our culture.

In this regard, cross-cultural training is very important because, first of all, it makes trainees aware of their own worldview through contrasting and comparing cultures. Especially, cross-cultural missionary training is most important for the missionary because through the training to some extent they can see their values and worldview and understand how much they are culturally conditioned. Furthermore, through it they can learn how to begin with a biblical perspectives, the norm by which we understand and critique all realities, to resolve cross-cultural conflicts in our cross-cultural ministry. Charles Kraft says,
secular and missionary training programs, unlike secular cross-cultural training programs, missionary training programs contain distinct elements: personal Christian disciplines, strong relationship with local churches, formal and non-formal biblical and theological studies, formal and non-formal cross-cultural studies, pre-field training by the mission agency as formal, informal, and non-formal training, on-field career training, and post-field training (cf. William Taylor 1991:3-10). In this respect, cross-cultural missionary training aims for Christian ministers to do effective mission work by being prepared fully through training programs.

Cross-Cultural Adjustment or Adaptation

"Cross-cultural adjustment" refers to a process by which one overcomes culture shock in a culture different from one's own. It means that sojourners temporarily give up themselves and do what the host society expects. Being able to think and do like the national is the crucial aspect of cross-cultural adjustment rather than merely looking like the national. The words "adapt" and "adjust" might be used interchangeably. The terms "are intended to mean the process of learning the new culture and its behaviors and language in an effort to understand and empathize with the people of the culture, and to live among and interact successfully with them" (Storti
but to focus on cross-cultural awareness and adjustment skills in pre-field training. The study is also limited to the relationship between Korean missionaries’ preparation through cross-cultural training and their cross-cultural adjustment to other cultures which has been examined through field research. Thus, in this study the issues of on-field and post-field training were delimited, but suggested for further research.

I limited my research to examining how pre-field missionary training in Korea helps Korean missionaries to learn cross-cultural adjustment skills for effective mission work through investigating eight missionary training centers in Korea and their effects as seen in missionaries and mission work on the field.
Central to the concept of cross-cultural adjustment are questions about how people overcome culture shock and how they are changed by the stages of overcoming it. There are patterns to describe the cross-cultural adjustment of sojourners over time such as U-curve, the W-curve and the inverted U-curve (Furnham and Bochner 1986).

From a missiological perspective, cross-cultural adjustment or adaptation of the Christian missionary is incarnational by its very nature. In this respect, cross-cultural adjustment or adaptation is seen as the missionary's bonding to the people in the target culture, that is, a sense of belonging with the local people (Brewster and Brewster 1982). Also, it can be seen as the missionary's identification with the local people at a deep level (Reyburn 1978).

Culture Shock

"Culture shock" was first used in cross-cultural literature by anthropologist Kalervo Oberg (1960) to describe problems of acculturation and adjustment among Americans who were working in a health project in Brazil. He viewed it as an occupational disease of people who have suddenly been transported abroad which "is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse"
(421.2% growth), 5,001,491 members in 1977 (56.7% growth), 6,489,282 members in 1985 (29.7% growth), 8,037,464 members in 1991 (23.9% growth), and 8,146,556 members in 1994 (1.4% growth) (Sung-Soo Kwon, 1997:9-10). In the 1990s, the annual growth rate is only 0.4%. This means that today the annual growth rate of the Korean Protestant church is minus because the population growth rate is more than this. The Korean churches are no longer growing.

5. The term “rice Christian,” refers to people who were only involved in the church to get economic help from Western missionaries. It was first used to describe the Protestant mission to China in the nineteenth century. John L. Nevius, missionary to China, criticized the “old method” which produced “rice Christians” and depended on paid native workers. In this situation, Nevius suggested the “new method,” so-called “three-self” formula which was first formulated by Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson (cf. Nevius 1958).

6. See the definition of “missiological education” in the section, Definition of Terms (pp. 66-67).

7. In Jong-Koo Park’s survey question to mission agencies, missionaries, and supporting church leaders—“What is the most serious problem regarding the missionaries?”—43.8 % of the missionaries, 42.4 % of the local church leaders, and 35% of the mission agencies responded “lack of proper training.” In the other two areas, 33.5% of the church leaders, 30% of the mission agencies, and 30% of the missionaries pointed to the “misguided motivation.” 35% of the mission agencies, 26.3% of the missionaries, and 24.1% of the church leaders identified “lack of qualifications” (1994:109-110).

8. ReMAP (Reducing Missionary Attrition Project) was created by the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) Missions Commission. It used the WEF Missions Commission’s extensive global network to collect data from fourteen of the most prominent missionary sending nations (six old sending countries-Australia, Denmark, Germany, UK, Canada, and USA, and eight new sending countries-Brazil, Costa Rica, Nigeria, India, Korea, Philippines, and Singapore). The collected data from the fourteen countries about missionary attrition were published as a book Too Valuable To Lose: Exploring Causes and Cures of Missionary Attrition in 1997. William D. Taylor, editor of the book, explains the purposes of ReMAP: “(1) It is to identify the core causes of undesirable long-term (career) missionary attrition and to determine the extent and nature of the problem; (2) It is to explore solutions to the problem; and (3) It is to deliver products and services to mission agencies and churches worldwide that will help reduce undesirable attrition” (1997:xiv).
In the past thirty years the term has been used to describe almost any physical or emotional discomfort experienced by those adjusting to a new environment. Symptoms of culture shock may range from mild emotional disorders and stress-related physiological ailments to psychosis. To a large extent, culture shock is measured in terms of a so-called “attrition rate” of sojourners.

In general, the term “culture shock” refers to the transition period and the accompanying feelings of stress and anxiety a person experiences during the early period upon entering a new culture different from his or her own. Culture shock is a person’s strong reaction of anxiety to unfamiliar cultural circumstances.

Juffer (1993:205-207) categorizes the prevailing definitions of culture shock using the following causal schema: Culture shock is caused by (1) confronting a new environment or situation; (2) the ineffectiveness of intercultural or interpersonal communication; (3) a threat to the emotional or intrapsychic well-being of the sojourner; (4) the need to modify behavior to regain positive reinforcement from the new environment; and (5) growth experience. Although culture shock is most often associated with negative consequences, it can be an important aspect of culture learning, self-
to increase self-awareness regarding the factors and qualities that influence cross-cultural effectiveness; (3) to improve skills in interacting with people from other cultures when an individual is already in a new culture or a multicultural setting; (4) to decide whether to work in a culturally diverse or multinational company, whether to live abroad, and so on; and (5) to prepare to enter another culture (1995:2).

13. The eight missionary training centers in Korea are divided as five denominational missionary training centers and three interdenominational missionary training centers. The denominational missionary training centers are: Missionary Training Center of Korea Evangelical Holiness Church (KMTC), Global Missionary Training Institute of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Hapdong) (GMTI), Center for World Mission of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap) (CFWM), International Missionary Training Institute of Korea Methodist Church (IMTI), and Kosin Missionary Training Institute (KMTI). The interdenominational missionary training centers are: Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC), OM Missionary Training Center (OMMTC), Missionary Training Institute (MTI).

14. As models are identified with perceived reality rather than reality and are therefore open to criticism, Robert Clinton defines the term "model" as follows: (1) a concept or set of concepts asserted as being true of a certain limited portion of reality; (2) a concept or set of concepts asserted as a heuristic device to stimulate discovery of reality; and (3) a set of principles, guideline or constraints, more or less related into a cohesive unit, which are used as an interpretive framework for viewing a relatively larger portion of reality (1984:134).


15. Culture-general approaches to interaction describe general cultural contrasts that are applicable in many cross-cultural situations. For example, Lingenfelter and Mayers’ model (1986) of different cultural values and Edward T. Hall’s definition of high and low context cultures (1976) are culture-general approaches. This approach would be useful in any cross-cultural situation, especially in cultural adaptation strategies and cultural self-awareness. Also, this approach, based on more abstract categories and generalizable skills, is the
development, and personal growth.

**Incarnational Ministry**

The term “incarnation” is a vital and balanced presentation of the Christian message. It is particularly important in that it provides both a way of looking at God’s action in the world and of understanding the action of the Word in different cultures and traditions. In this respect, incarnational ministry refers to the missionary’s deep relationship with the people in the culture where he or she serves as “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). In other words, as Christ chose to relate to the people in a particular time and space, missionaries must do their ministry in the context of the people. Paul Hiebert describes incarnational ministry as the missionaries’ identification of themselves with the people they serve as they must live among them, adopt cultural ways, and work alongside them (1994:371).

According to Hiebert, “Christ remained fully God when he became fully human. Missionaries, too, reflect this. They are both socio-cultural insiders and outsiders. They must be insiders to be heard and trusted, but they must also be messengers sent by Christ to announce his salvation and his kingdom” (Hiebert 1994:371).

In fact, Jesus’ incarnation is an important theological doctrine. But,
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Jesus' incarnation is not a perfect analogy for what we do. By using Jesus' incarnation as a model there are some dangers for detracting and demoting the important theological dimensions of Jesus' incarnation. However, aspects of an incarnational model of ministry give us important insights on how to do missions. The incarnation of God in Jesus provides the foundational model for the practice of Christian mission. From a missiological perspective, the concept of incarnation focuses on the development of scriptural principles as it is applied to Christian mission through understanding the relationships between missionaries and the host people. When incarnation is applied to mission work, it is usually described in missiological terms such as bonding, identification, adaptation, indigenization, and contextualization.

From the perspective of incarnational ministry, cross-cultural missionary training is the method of facilitating the incarnation of the missionary. It aims to find ways by which missionaries adjust to another culture in order to be heard and trusted by the people they serve for the sake of announcing God's salvation in Christ and his kingdom.

Missiological Education

"Education" is used in a general and broad meaning in contrast to "training." Training suggests specific orientation for a defined situation. The
Neither is he himself interested in mission; he is only interested in destruction” (1991:17).

The reason we cross socio-cultural barriers to proclaim the gospel message is because God incarnated himself among us (John 1:14; Philippians 2:5-8). Charles Kraft, in his book, *Communication Theory for Christian Witness* (1994), discusses the concept of “receptor-oriented communication” as the incarnational nature of the Christian message. He says,

In adopting the receptor’s frame of reference, God entrusts himself to us, becoming dependent on and vulnerable to us. It is our life he lives, our foods he eats, our homes in which he sleeps, our difficulties that he shares, our emotions that he feels. He employs our language and culture to get his ideas across to us, agreeing to the meanings that we attach to those symbols. So the first thing we learn concerning God’s strategy is that God is receptor-oriented, seeking to reach his receptors by entering their frame of reference and by participating in their life, in order to be maximally intelligible to them. (1994:16)

Kraft suggests five steps in relating to receptors: (1) try to understand our receptors; (2) empathize with our receptors; (3) identify with our receptors; (4) participate in the lives of our receptors; and (5) have self-disclosure to our receptors (1994:150-153).

Kraft also supports the concept of the incarnational nature of missionary identification through the stages of cross-cultural adjustment. In fact, cross-cultural missionary training is for the purpose of incarnational
term "missiological education" contains both an academic discipline of
missiology and the church's discipline for equipping men and women to
lead others into the kingdom of God. Elliston says, "Missiological education
necessarily addresses the development of all people to be able to cross
cultural, economic, spiritual, and other barriers with appropriate attitudes and
spiritual maturity" (1996:233). In this sense, missiological education is not a
single discipline but multi-disciplinary, including theology, history, education,
evangelism and church growth, religious studies, anthropology, sociology,
linguistics, economics, geography, psychology, and so on. In other words,
missiological education should be drawn from both the text and the contexts
of Christian ministry, and must be holistic.

Worldview

Culture consists of two levels: the surface behavior level and the deep
worldview level. The surface behavior level is called "external culture"
which is explicitly learned, conscious, and more easily changed. Customs
such as verbal communications, typical foods, and dress belong to this
surface level. The deep level is called "internal culture" or "core culture" and
is implicitly learned and difficult to change. Values, thought patterns and
attitudes, non-verbal communication, assumptions, allegiances, and
was an epoch-making event, the highest important event in the Lucan missionary paradigm. The Council of Jerusalem can be regarded as the result of the conversion of Paul and Cornelius. Also, the preaching of the gospel to Cornelius and his household led to the cross-cultural conversion of Peter (1988:282). It seems that this contextual nature of the Council of Jerusalem reinforced the urgent need for Paul to train or disciple missionaries. In other words, the contexts for mission to the Gentiles determined discipling and training people for cross-cultural mission work. Paul's life and ministry as a cross-cultural witness are related to his conviction, through encountering the risen Christ, that Jesus Christ is lord of universe and of the church. Paul lived out the gospel in new cultures to convert people to Christ and to transform their cultures, not just adapt to a culture's deep level. Indeed, Paul's cross-cultural adjustment is a perpetual adaptation as he strongly desires to be like Jesus Christ. In this respect, Paul trained his disciples through showing his lifestyle in Christ. In cross-cultural missionary training, cross-cultural adjustment at the level of lifestyle is an important issue which indicates perpetual, practical, and existential dimensions of missionary work. For cross-cultural witnesses, living out the gospel is critical for cross-cultural adjustment for effective mission work.
perceptions belong to this deep level. In this sense, worldview is "the central set of concepts and presuppositions that provide people with their assumptions about reality. People in different cultures often have very different worldviews or views of the natural and supernatural world" (Whiteman 1983:478). Thus worldview, internal culture or core culture, dominates people's everyday behavior, their external culture. We are usually unaware of our own worldview until we leave it and interact with those who are culturally different. This interaction and cross-cultural conflict raises aspects of our own culture to our conscious awareness. In fact, we often discover our worldview by leaving our culture.

In this regard, cross-cultural training is very important because, first of all, it makes trainees aware of their own worldview through contrasting and comparing cultures. Especially, cross-cultural missionary training is most important for the missionary because through the training to some extent they can see their values and worldview and understand how much they are culturally conditioned. Furthermore, through it they can learn how to begin with a biblical perspectives, the norm by which we understand and critique all realities, to resolve cross-cultural conflicts in our cross-cultural ministry. Charles Kraft says,
Jesus had a worldview. It consisted of His "Kingdom perspectives" integrated into His first-century Hebrew worldview. Our task is to follow His example by integrating those same perspectives into our cultural worldview. We are to assume Christian assumptions and live habitually by them, each within his or her own cultural context, just as Jesus did within His context. (1996:68)

Also, Paul Hiebert argues that a biblical worldview, "particularly as it manifests itself in the New Testament, is the norm whereby we understand and critique all realities" (1994:11). He writes,

A Christian worldview begins with the reality that God has revealed himself in Scripture, in the person of Jesus Christ, and in the work of the Spirit in the church and the world. It includes: God’s superintendence of history; God’s creation of perfect humans and their fall through sin; God’s work of salvation within those who believe in Christ—God himself among us; and Christ’s return to establish his kingdom of righteousness throughout the created universe. These are part of a biblical worldview that defines for us the essential reality and history of the cosmos. (1994:11)

For cross-cultural witnesses to follow the example of Christ means undergoing radical worldview change to what Jesus views this world (John 3:16) for the sake of the kingdom of God.

**Delimitation**

The purpose of this study is not to examine overall training issues for missionaries such as biblical and theological studies, spiritual formation, leadership and discipleship, church planting, evangelism strategy, and so on,
but to focus on cross-cultural awareness and adjustment skills in pre-field training. The study is also limited to the relationship between Korean missionaries’ preparation through cross-cultural training and their cross-cultural adjustment to other cultures which has been examined through field research. Thus, in this study the issues of on-field and post-field training were delimited, but suggested for further research.

I limited my research to examining how pre-field missionary training in Korea helps Korean missionaries to learn cross-cultural adjustment skills for effective mission work through investigating eight missionary training centers in Korea and their effects as seen in missionaries and mission work on the field.

2. Ki-Hong Kim criticizes the type of mission project which relies heavily on money, "I cannot think of a single case in which a money-oriented mission project has not failed. Mission projects to India, Bangladesh, the Philippines, and mainland China are a few examples that come to mind. Korea is now on the verge of replicating the same mistakes in Russia and the three Baltic countries. Korean mission organizations still suffer the illusion that everything can be achieved with money. They generously send money to build churches in the region and hand out money to the natives as part of the mission funds. What is more remarkable is that they take no measure to ensure that their money is being spent for their specified use" (1993:101-104).

Regarding "visible outcome-centered mission" or "project-oriented mission," this term indicates one of the many problems of Korean missionaries. There are examples of some missionaries boasting about their achievement such as building a church, hospital, and seminary in spite of their poor and ineffective condition. They try to show them to the sending churches and agencies to ask for more mission funds.

3. 1997 ended with the devastating news that the government of South Korea was bankrupt. Korean debts to foreign banks mounted up to $157 billion, of which $92 billion was due in 1998. The Korean stock market plunged by 49 percent and the Korean currency was devalued by 66 percent between July 4 and December 1997. Due to these circumstances, the Korean government requested help from the International Monetary Fund to salvage the Korean economy. The Korean government predicted that during 1998 most of the essential commodity prices would rise and that about two million workers would be laid off from their jobs (Ro 1998:5). This did happen as predicted in 1998.

4. From the 1950s to the 1990s, the growth rate of a number of the Korean Protestant churches is as follows: 3,114 churches in 1950 to 5,011 churches in 1960 (60.9% growth), 12,114 churches in 1970 (157% growth), 21,243 churches in 1980 (65.1% growth), 35,819 churches in 1990 (68.8% growth), and 42,859 churches in 1993 (18.9% growth). And, from the 1950s to 1990s, the growth rate of Korean Protestant church members is as follow: 500,198 church members in 1950 to 623,027 members in 1960 (24.6% growth), 3,192,621 members in 1970
(421.2% growth), 5,001,491 members in 1977 (56.7% growth), 6,489,282 members in 1985 (29.7% growth), 8,037,464 members in 1991 (23.9% growth), and 8,146,556 members in 1994 (1.4% growth) (Sung-Soo Kwon, 1997:9-10). In the 1990s, the annual growth rate is only 0.4%. This means that today the annual growth rate of the Korean Protestant church is minus because the population growth rate is more than this. The Korean churches are no longer growing.

5. The term “rice Christian,” refers to people who were only involved in the church to get economic help from Western missionaries. It was first used to describe the Protestant mission to China in the nineteen century. John L. Nevius, missionary to China, criticized the “old method” which produced “rice Christians” and depended on paid native workers. In this situation, Nevius suggested the “new method,” so-called “three-self” formula which was first formulated by Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson (cf. Nevius 1958).

6. See the definition of “missiological education” in the section, Definition of Terms (pp. 66-67).

7. In Jong-Koo Park’s survey question to mission agencies, missionaries, and supporting church leaders—“What is the most serious problem regarding the missionaries?”—43.8% of the missionaries, 42.4% of the local church leaders, and 35% of the mission agencies responded “lack of proper training.” In the other two areas, 33.5% of the church leaders, 30% of the mission agencies, and 30% of the missionaries pointed to the “misguided motivation.” 35% of the mission agencies, 26.3% of the missionaries, and 24.1% of the church leaders identified “lack of qualifications” (1994:109-110).

8. ReMAP (Reducing Missionary Attrition Project) was created by the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) Missions Commission. It used the WEF Missions Commission’s extensive global network to collect data from fourteen of the most prominent missionary sending nations (six old sending countries-Australia, Denmark, Germany, UK, Canada, and USA, and eight new sending countries-Brazil, Costa Rica, Nigeria, India, Korea, Philippines, and Singapore). The collected data from the fourteen countries about missionary attrition were published as a book Too Valuable To Lose: Exploring Causes and Cures of Missionary Attrition in 1997. William D. Taylor, editor of the book, explains the purposes of ReMAP: “(1) It is to identify the core causes of undesirable long-term (career) missionary attrition and to determine the extent and nature of the problem; (2) It is to explore solutions to the problem; and (3) It is to deliver products and services to mission agencies and churches worldwide that will help reduce undesirable attrition” (1997:xiv).
9. The Korea Research Institute for Missions (KRIM) is the research arm of Global Missionary Fellowship, Inc., an umbrella organization for seven different agencies.

10. A monocultural perspective is naive and looks at reality in a very narrow sense. In this sense, a monocultural perspective is ethnocentric, absolutistic, and colonialistic. In contrast, a cross-cultural perspective has three principles as follows: existing patterns of right and wrong in every culture, existing ways of solving problems in every culture, and the adequacy and worthiness of every cultural practice in a given context. (cf. Kraft 1996:69-81; Mayers 1974:227-244)

11. The term “missiological anthropology” was first used by Louis J. Luzbetak in his book The Church and Cultures (1988). He describes the close relationship between missiology and anthropology as follows: missiological anthropology “is a blend of missiology and anthropology. Its scope and purpose are missiological, whereas the processes and analyses are anthropological. Missiology suggests the issues, parameters, and goals. Anthropology provides the particular (culturological) perspective, approach, and standards for studying the issues” (1988:12). Darrell L. Whiteman (1996:140) prefers the term “missiological anthropology” over missionary anthropology because he believes it is more appropriate for the post-colonial age of mission.

12. In my research, as a quantitative research method “Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory” (CCAI) was used for measuring Korean missionaries’ adaptability and for finding weak areas of Korean missionaries to adjust to a new environment. The results of the findings were used for developing a missionary training program in my research.

In their book, The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory: Manual (1995), Kelly and Meyers say that the CCAI is designed for every individual regardless of the cultural background or the characteristics of the target culture. The CCAI as the “culture-general approach” (see endnote 13) addresses the universal aspects of culture shock and cultural adjustment (1995:1). The authors insist that the CCAI can be used for increasing one’s own readiness to interact with people from other cultures, acquiring cultural adjustment skills, and as a basis for understanding research findings, assessing one’s capacities, and planning for self-improvement (1995:1). The inventory contains fifty items under four dimensions; emotional resilience, flexibility/openness, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy.

Also, the authors suggest five purposes of the CCAI as follows: (1) to understand the factors and qualities that facilitate cross-cultural effectiveness; (2)
to increase self-awareness regarding the factors and qualities that influence cross-cultural effectiveness; (3) to improve skills in interacting with people from other cultures when an individual is already in a new culture or a multicultural setting; (4) to decide whether to work in a culturally diverse or multinational company, whether to live abroad, and so on; and (5) to prepare to enter another culture (1995:2).

13. The eight missionary training centers in Korea are divided as five denominational missionary training centers and three interdenominational missionary training centers. The denominational missionary training centers are: Missionary Training Center of Korea Evangelical Holiness Church (KMTC), Global Missionary Training Institute of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Hapdong) (GMTI), Center for World Mission of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap) (CFWM), International Missionary Training Institute of Korea Methodist Church (IMTI), and Kosin Missionary Training Institute (KMTI). The interdenominational missionary training centers are: Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC), OM Missionary Training Center (OMMTC), Missionary Training Institute (MTI).

14. As models are identified with perceived reality rather than reality and are therefore open to criticism, Robert Clinton defines the term "model" as follows: (1) a concept or set of concepts asserted as being true of a certain limited portion of reality; (2) a concept or set of concepts asserted as a heuristic device to stimulate discovery of reality; and (3) a set of principles, guideline or constraints, more or less related into a cohesive unit, which are used as an interpretive framework for viewing a relatively larger portion of reality (1984:134).


15. Culture-general approaches to interaction describe general cultural contrasts that are applicable in many cross-cultural situations. For example, Lingenfelter and Mayers’ model (1986) of different cultural values and Edward T. Hall’s definition of high and low context cultures (1976) are culture-general approaches. This approach would be useful in any cross-cultural situation, especially in cultural adaptation strategies and cultural self-awareness. Also, this approach, based on more abstract categories and generalizable skills, is the
intercultural equivalent of "etic" cultural analysis. In contrast, culture-specific approach describes specific cultural contrast between two particular cultures which are assessed for their likely impact on communication between people of those cultures. This approach would be used for a group of missionary candidates who will be sent to the same culture. Also, it can be used as a training tool on the mission field as an on-field training (Bennett 1998:9).

16. The term "equip" can be translated from the Greek word katartizo. The term katartizo used in Ephesians 6:11-12 can be translated as "equip," "train," or "prepare." The term contains the idea of contextually outfitting, mending, or fitting together. From the missiological educational perspective, the equipping must focus on the whole church—men, women, and families—in order to accomplish God's mission (cf. Elliston 1996:255).
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Missionary Training: Biblical Roots and Missiological Foundations

It is not easy to find the concept of cross-cultural missionary training in the Bible. Particularly in the Old Testament, due to the centripetal nature of the Old Testament message, there was no attempt to cross the cultural boundary of Israel to proclaim God’s salvation. David Bosch points out, “Israel would not actually go out to the nations. Neither would Israel expressly call the nations to faith in Yahweh. If they do come, it is because God is bringing them in. So, if there is a ‘missionary’ in the Old Testament, it is God himself who will bring the nations to worship him” (1991:19).

Because there was no intentional cross-cultural dimension of missionary activity in the Old Testament, it is not possible to find the concept of cross-cultural missionary training. But, Hedlund insists, “The Book of Jonah is truly a missionary tract establishing the divine prerogative of centrifugal mission, that is, going out to the nations, in the Old Testament period” (1991:126). Unlike Hedlund, Bosch insists that the book of Jonah “has nothing to do with mission in the normal sense of the world. The prophet is sent to Nineveh not to proclaim salvation to non-believers but to announce
Neither is he himself interested in mission; he is only interested in destruction” (1991:17).

The reason we cross socio-cultural barriers to proclaim the gospel message is because God incarnated himself among us (John 1:14; Philippians 2:5-8). Charles Kraft, in his book, *Communication Theory for Christian Witness* (1994), discusses the concept of “receptor-oriented communication” as the incarnational nature of the Christian message. He says,

In adopting the receptor’s frame of reference, God entrusts himself to us, becoming dependent on and vulnerable to us. It is our life he lives, our foods he eats, our homes in which he sleeps, our difficulties that he shares, our emotions that he feels. He employs our language and culture to get his ideas across to us, agreeing to the meanings that we attach to those symbols. So the first thing we learn concerning God’s strategy is that God is receptor-oriented, seeking to reach his receptors by entering their frame of reference and by participating in their life, in order to be maximally intelligible to them. (1994:16)

Kraft suggests five steps in relating to receptors: (1) try to understand our receptors; (2) empathize with our receptors; (3) identify with our receptors; (4) participate in the lives of our receptors; and (5) have self-disclosure to our receptors (1994:150-153).

Kraft also supports the concept of the incarnational nature of missionary identification through the stages of cross-cultural adjustment. In fact, cross-cultural missionary training is for the purpose of incarnational
ministry. Thus, a missionary training program as a method of preparing for cross-cultural ministry should be judged by the incarnational model of ministry. Here we can find why we prepare for and equip the people of God through cross-cultural missionary training. We are called as followers of Jesus Christ as we strive to accomplish the Great Commission. The Great Commission explicitly proposes that we cross cultural barriers to reach the people whom we serve. In this sense, the Great Commission can never be achieved without the mind of Jesus Christ, loving people and living among them, the so-called "Great Commandment." In other words, unless the missionary incarnates among and loves the people, it is impossible for the missionary to be faithful to the Great Commission.

The other biblical root of cross-cultural missionary training is seen in the book of Acts. The concept of cross-cultural missionary efforts should be traced through Paul's conversion and call (Acts 9:1-31), the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 9:32-11:18), and the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35). In the Lucan missionary paradigm the most important event is the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35). This event was the opening of mission to the Gentiles as the official recognition of the Jerusalem church. F. F. Bruce, in his commentary, *The Book of Acts*, points out that the Council of Jerusalem
was an epoch-making event, the highest important event in the Lucan missionary paradigm. The Council of Jerusalem can be regarded as the result of the conversion of Paul and Cornelius. Also, the preaching of the gospel to Cornelius and his household led to the cross-cultural conversion of Peter (1988:282). It seems that this contextual nature of the Council of Jerusalem reinforced the urgent need for Paul to train or disciple missionaries. In other words, the contexts for mission to the Gentiles determined discipling and training people for cross-cultural mission work. Paul’s life and ministry as a cross-cultural witness are related to his conviction, through encountering the risen Christ, that Jesus Christ is lord of universe and of the church. Paul lived out the gospel in new cultures to convert people to Christ and to transform their cultures, not just adapt to a culture’s deep level. Indeed, Paul’s cross-cultural adjustment is a perpetual adaptation as he strongly desires to be like Jesus Christ. In this respect, Paul trained his disciples through showing his lifestyle in Christ. In cross-cultural missionary training, cross-cultural adjustment at the level of lifestyle is an important issue which indicates perpetual, practical, and existential dimensions of missionary work. For cross-cultural witnesses, living out the gospel is critical for cross-cultural adjustment for effective mission work.
The following theologians and missiologists give significant insights on this subject. Harold Dollar, in his book, *St. Luke’s Missiology: A Cross-Cultural Challenge* (1996), articulates the implications of Paul’s conversion and call, Cornelius’ conversion, and the Council of Jerusalem from missiological perspectives. Dollar argues that the first-century Jewish Christian community had become a radically universal Jesus community. Dollar emphasizes that the early Christian movement “represents one of the most revolutionary and difficult changes in the entire story of salvation history” (1996:22). This occurred through a radical paradigm shift, conversion of the apostles.

In her book, *From Darkness to Light* (1986), Beverly Roberts Gaventa offers a great deal on the subject of conversion in the book of Acts from a biblical and theological standpoint. Gaventa understands conversion as a process transforming an individual’s perception and the boundaries of communities. Gaventa discusses how individuals’ conversions initiated by God expanded the boundaries of the early church through an analysis of narratives in Acts. She insists that “conversion has to do with individuals, but it also incorporates those individuals into the larger community. Conversion is not an end in itself but, in Luke’s stories, it is a beginning” (1986:147).
Thus, Luke’s conversion narratives provide important insights on how it is important for cross-cultural witnesses to give up their preconceived ideas through radical conversion which might be a long process.

In Decision Making in the Church: A Biblical Model, Luke T. Johnson (1983) deals with an epoch-making decision in the history of Christianity, the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35), with its background narrative, the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10:1-11:18). The experiences of cross-cultural encounters and the narrative of those experiences provide invaluable missiological insights. That is, those events mentioned above indicate that the cross-cultural adjustment of cross-cultural witnesses is critical for effective cross-cultural ministry. Also, the Jerusalem Council accepted the church’s mission to the Gentiles and accelerated cross-cultural ministry.

the perspective of Paul's conversion and calling to the Gentile mission, his training and education "at the feet of Gamaliel" (Acts 22:3) was used in his mission work even though that training was not intended for cross-cultural mission work.

In *Pre-Christian Paul*, Martin Hengel and Deines (1991) deal with Paul's family and educational background. Paul's family and educational background provide a clue about Paul's training of his missionary band. Hengel says that Paul was educated and lived in "two different language-areas and cultures" (1980:81-82; Hengel and Deines 1991:18-39).

Conybeare and Howson also say that Paul came to Jerusalem for education and he lived at the rabban's house in a multicultural environment with other students from Egypt, Babylonia, the coasts of Greece, and his native Cecilia (1886:61-62). This means that Paul was "brought up" in the Jewish school under the teaching of Gamaliel. Also, in modern educational terms, his education included formal, informal, and non-formal education. His training might have enabled him to understand other cultures or subcultures because he lived with other Jewish students from various cultures or subcultures.

From the perspectives of cross-cultural missionary training methods, Paul's missionary training method is not separate from how he was trained by
Gamaliel. The method Paul used as his earliest paradigm of ministry formation was apprenticeship or mentoring that refers to a personal relationship between a teacher and one or more students (cf. Van Engen 1996:241-242). Howell mentions that Paul used his missionary band; for example, Timothy and Titus (1998:84-87). The context of the early church for mission to the Gentiles drove Paul to train others for effective cross-cultural ministry. Especially Timothy, as a bicultural person, was used effectively for difficult and sensitive missions (1 Thessalonians 3:6-10; Philippians 2:19-24).

In dealing with the issue of cross-cultural missionary training, missiological foundations relate to how missiology functions in missiological education on the basis of the biblical roots stated above. In fact, theological education for cross-cultural ministry must place missiology at its center (cf. Bosch 1991). In this respect, missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training present the contextual nature of missiological education in order to equip by people of God who cross socio-cultural barriers.

Cross-cultural missionary training must lay its foundation on missiological education. Missiology is the center of theology and the church is missionary in its very nature (Bosch 1991; Rowen 1996). Missiological
education helps us understand cross-cultural missionary training that involves serious reflection on cross-cultural adjustment.

Edgar J. Elliston (1996) provides new paradigms of missiological education that the church urgently needs, drawn from both the text and the contexts of Christian ministry. Elliston states the purpose of missiological education that provides an authentic foundation of cross-cultural missionary training as follows:

While missiology is emerging as an academic discipline, the purpose of missiological education is not just for the advancement of the discipline. It must equip men and women to lead others into the kingdom of God, so they may become mature citizens of the kingdom as they lead others also. Missiology provides a wide range of reflective and theoretical perspectives to assist in explaining both God’s revelation and the phenomena we encounter, verifying our observations, and projecting reliable courses of action. God’s servants in mission would be wise to learn these theoretical perspectives as very practical means to help achieve the mission to which God calls his people. Missiological education necessarily addresses the development of all people to be able to cross socio-cultural, economic, spiritual, and other barriers with appropriate attitudes and spiritual maturity. Missiology primarily involves the communication of the gospel across the barriers that exist between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world, where issues of society, culture, language, world view, and diverse roles and status come into play. (1996:233)

In this sense, missiological education is multidisciplinary in nature as it involves theology, history, education, evangelism and church growth, religious studies, anthropology, psychology, sociology, economics, politics,
and so on (cf. Van Engen 1996:18-22). Also, missiological educational excellence occurs in the context of a holistic approach to education, including being (character qualities), knowing (understanding), and doing (cross-cultural ministry skills) (Hoke 1995b:72-73). Missiological education enables us to develop effective cross-cultural missionary training programs in a given context. Authentic missiological foundations for cross-cultural missionary training help us avoid inadequate or inappropriate missionary training.

**Anthropological Foundations of Cross-Cultural Missionary Training**

In training cross-cultural missionaries, anthropological understanding is critically important to develop a culturally relevant training program. In this study, Hofstede’s model of national cultural values is adopted as a theoretical framework for examining the Korean worldview and values. There are several valuable books and articles that support Hofstede’s model for examining the Korean values and worldview. In his book, *The Koreans: Their Mind and Behavior* (1991), Jae-Un Kim, professor of psychology at Ehwa Women’s University in Seoul, provides various perspectives of studying Korean cultural values and beliefs through reviewing a broad area of related documents, literature, and results of surveys. He classifies the related
literature and documents into seven categories to examine Korean culture according to their method of approaches: (1) historical-ecological studies; (2) analysis of culture and ideas; (3) studies of values; (4) psychological and sociological approaches; (5) subjective interpretations; (6) anecdotal observations; and (7) studies and reports of foreign visitors (1991:29).

The value of Kim’s survey is that Kim uses an empirical survey and factor analysis for analyzing data as well as content analysis of various documentary materials. In other words, Jae-Un Kim discusses the content of the mind and value orientations of the Korean people empirically and objectively. Most of the findings of Kim’s survey related to Confucianism support Hofstede’s five dimensions of national values.

Kim indicates that twelve basic factors through the result of factor analysis are: self-centeredness, authoritarianism, order-conscious behavior, endurance, self-centered showing-off, warm personality, closedness, traditionalism, face-consciousness and formalism, and orderly behavior (1991:221).

Among Hofstede’s five dimensions of national cultures (1991): power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and collectivism, masculinity and femininity, and long-term and short-term orientation, collectivism is the
most decisive factor in describing values, attitudes, and behavior of the Korean people. To a large extent, these Korean values are connected to Korean mission work. In this sense, an emphasis on examining Korean values and worldview must not be underestimated in training Korean missionaries.

It is obvious that the basic values of the Koreans are rooted in the five relationships of Confucianism: ruler/subject, father/son, husband/wife, older brother/younger brother, and between friends. In Korean society, collectivism still dominates social relationships.

Regarding individualism and collectivism, studies on this issue (Harry C. Triandis 1995; Yoon and Choi 1994) deal with the constructs of collectivism and individualism. These studies provide more detailed and extended discussion of Hofstede’s model in the area of collectivism and individualism. In dealing with the Korean values, Traindis provides an analysis of the attributes of collectivism and both the advantages and disadvantages of collectivism. Also, he suggests some valuable methods of cross-cultural training in relation to collectivism and individualism such as experiential training, culture assimilator training, and behavior modification training (1995:148-152). Yoon and Choi (1994) indicate a strong
collectivistic character of the Koreans from psychological and sociological perspectives. Korean scholars (Choi and Choi 1994; Tae-Rim Yoon 1994) insist that we-ness is an indigenous discourse of Korean collectivism. In fact, ingroup-ness is a intrinsically pertinent characteristic of Korean collectivism. Choi and Choi say that “the widely reported social relationships among Koreans in ingroup based social networks, the highly sophisticated genealogical system and people’s general concern with it, the power of school connections, or regionalism, to name a few, may provide apparent support to such a claim” (1994:65). This ingroup based social structure is connected to hierarchical social structure and authoritarian leadership style of Korean society (cf. Hofstede 1991).

There are two major sources for examining Korean culture from biblical perspectives. In their book, Ministering Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Personal Relationships (1986), Lingenfelter and Mayers suggest a conceptual model to understand culture. Their model of basic values discusses personal and cross-cultural roots of tension or conflict in interpersonal relationships by understanding something about the reality of our experience. Also, this model suggests a solid foundation to resolve cross-cultural conflict for successful cross-cultural ministry through suggesting
Jesus’ incarnational ministry and biblical perspectives or values. In their model, they suggest twelve key elements of basic values which were first proposed by Marvin Mayers in his book, *Christianity Confronts Culture: A Strategy for Cross-Cultural Evangelism* (1974). In the model are six pairs of contrasting traits: time versus event orientation, dichotomistic versus holistic thinking, crisis versus non-crisis orientation, task versus person orientation, status focus versus achievement focus, and concealment of vulnerability versus willingness to expose vulnerability.

As mentioned, this model can lay a foundation for developing a missionary training model in Korea because it gives important insights on how to resolve cross-cultural conflicts with people in another culture through comparing and contrasting cultural values with biblical principles, a so-called “incarnational model of human relationships.” Lingenfelter and Mayers’ model can provide criteria for evaluating Korean cultural values in the light of an incarnational model for human relationships.

Margo Lyn Menconi’s article entitled, “Understanding and Relating to the Three Cultures of Cross-Cultural Ministry in Russia,” provides important biblical values in comparison with other cultures. She adopts Geert Hofstede’s dimensions of culture continuums (1986, 1991) as a framework.
This study can encourage one to “re-evaluate and think through at a possibly deeper level one’s own native culture-based presupposition, especially, in contrast to the target culture and the biblical culture. New insights into scriptural teachings will undoubtedly be gained along the way as a result of such a study” (Menconi 1996:530). In this sense, understanding the biblical culture or kingdom culture is a crucial way to see and understand in comparison with the target culture for effective cross-cultural ministry.

In fact, examining values and worldview by comparing and contrasting them with other cultures is an important matter in cross-cultural training and intercultural education. In this respect, John C. Condon and Fathi Yousef’s book, An Introduction to Intercultural Communication (1975), provides us with the concepts of values and value orientations following a study on value orientation and cultural beliefs by Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck (1961) in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 in this volume. Condon and Yousef developed twenty value and belief orientations in six categories. Three categories of value orientation are the self, the family, and society; those of belief orientation are human nature, nature, and the supernatural (1975:63-121). This “culture general approach” which “describes general cultural contrasts that are applicable in many cross-cultural situations” (Bennett 1998:9) in the
process of cross-cultural training, provides a framework of comparing national cultures.

**Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Its Relation to Cross-Cultural Training**

Black and Mendenhall (1990) conducted an exhaustive review of cross-cultural training effectiveness studies prior to 1990. Their findings clearly indicate that cross-cultural training positively affects the overall success of overseas job assignment. They examined the results of twenty-nine empirical studies of cross-cultural training effects. Ten of these studies examined the effectiveness of cross-cultural training in helping trainees better manage cross-culture stress. All ten found a positive relationship between cross-cultural training and effective management of cross-culture stress. Nine of the studies looked at the effects of cross-cultural training on long-term psychological adjustment. All nine found a positive relationship between training and increased psychological adaptation to the foreign living experience.

Black and Mendenhall suggest a positive "relationship between cross-cultural training and the following dependent variables: cross-cultural skill development, cross-cultural adjustment, and performance in a cross-cultural
setting” (1990:119-120). In short, cross-cultural training has been shown to develop cross-cultural adjustment skills that affect subsequent success in overseas assignments, improve expatriates’ psychological comfort and satisfaction with living and working in a new culture, and improve task accomplishment in the cross-cultural environment.

In cross-cultural ministry different cultural backgrounds have many inherent problems due to the differences in values and worldview. Missionaries are change agents who are involved in people’s decision making for Christian conversion. In order to be an effective change agent a missionary must be sensitive to cultural differences to adjust to the host culture. The purpose of pre-field training is to provide knowledge and various interaction skills and to develop Christian character qualities and spirituality in order to facilitate a missionary’s adjustment to the new culture for effective cross-cultural ministry.

In their article, “Training for Multicultural Education Competencies,” Margaret D. Pusch, et al. say, “Overall goal of cross-cultural training is to provide a framework within which people can develop skills and acquire the knowledge that increases their ability to function effectively in a bi- or multicultural environment and to derive satisfaction from the intercultural
experience” (1979:95). More specifically, the goals of cross-cultural training are: (1) to expand cultural awareness, to provide a trainee with an understanding of his or her own culture and of the degree to which he or she is conditioned by it; (2) to increase tolerance and acceptance of different values, attitudes, and behavior; (3) to foster the affirmation of all cultures; (4) to develop intercultural communication skills; (5) to integrate cognitive and affective (or experiential) learning; (6) to prepare for effective personal adjustment to the stresses of intercultural experience such as disorientation, weakened self-esteem, culture shock, frustration, and anger; (7) to open avenues of learning and growth; and (8) to develop the ability to seek information about the host culture (Push et al. 1979:96).

When we deal with the issues of cross-cultural adjustment, first of all we must articulate the concept of culture shock, its symptoms and the reactions of sojourners to it in order to develop coping strategies and training methods. Many people have defined the concept of culture shock in the field of cross-cultural education and psychology (Oberg 1960; Smalley 1963; Loss 1983; Furnham and Bochner 1986; Weaver 1993; Juffer 1993; Kohls 1996).

Robert Kohls (1996) lists the multiple reactions which people normally have to culture shock in Table 3. In Culture Shock: Psychological Reactions
to Unfamiliar Environment (1986), Furnham and Bochner provide definitions and typologies of culture shock. Also, this volume suggests various levels of coping strategies and culture-learning and training skills according to the symptoms of culture shock. They point out that lacking the social skills of the host country produces culture shock. So it is necessary to train people in the skills that are appropriate for effective interaction in those situations (1986:201).

Table 3
Symptoms of Culture Shock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Symptoms</th>
<th>Withdrawal Symptoms</th>
<th>Aggressive Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Physical and/or psychological</td>
<td>Compulsive eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness</td>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td>Compulsive drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>Spending excessive amounts</td>
<td>Exaggerated cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>of time reading</td>
<td>Irritability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Need for excessive amounts</td>
<td>Family tensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>of sleep</td>
<td>Marital stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
<td>Only seeing other Americans</td>
<td>Excessive chauvinism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of inadequacy</td>
<td>Avoiding contacts with host</td>
<td>Stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplained fits of weeping</td>
<td>nationals</td>
<td>Hostility toward host nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoia</td>
<td>Short attention span</td>
<td>Verbal aggressiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ailments and</td>
<td>Diminished productivity</td>
<td>Physical aggressiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychosomatic illnesses</td>
<td>Loss of ability to work or</td>
<td>Deciding to stay but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study effectively</td>
<td>permanently hating the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quitting and returning to</td>
<td>country and its people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your home country early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Kohl 1996:92

Kristin Juffer (1993), in her article “The First Step in Cross-Cultural
Orientation: Defining the Problem,” conceptualizes the problem of cross-cultural adjustment for intercultural training. Juffer insists that the goal of cross-cultural training is cultural adaptation which is defined as ameliorating the sojourner’s culture shock experience, improving the sojourner’s psychological adjustment (comfort, satisfaction with the stay), and increasing the sojourner’s effectiveness in the new culture (1993:203). In identifying the nature of the problem for cross-cultural adjustment to culture shock, Juffer categorizes the prevailing definitions of culture shock, more than thirty-five of them, using five schema (1993:206-207): Culture shock is caused by (1) confronting a new environment or situation; (2) ineffectiveness of intercultural or interpersonal communication; (3) a threat to the emotional or intrapsychic well-being of the sojourner; (4) the need to modify behavior to regain positive reinforcement from the new environment; and (5) growth experience.

In his article “Understanding and Coping with Cross-Cultural Adjustment Stress,” Gary Weaver (1993) provides a brief definition of culture shock, causes of culture shock, and coping strategies with cross-cultural adjustment stress. He delineates the process of coping with cross-cultural adjustment stress: understand the process of cross-cultural adjustment, control the symptoms or reactions to cross-cultural adjustment stress, develop coping
strategies that facilitate adjustment, learn something about the new culture before leaving home, and develop skills which will facilitate cross-cultural understanding, communication, and adaptation (1993:149-156). Weaver gives an insight to understand the process of people’s reaction to the new environment that can “give us a sense of control and predictability and allow us to cope better with the symptoms and achieve some level of cross-cultural skills” (1993:164, cf. Storti 1990, Kohls 1996).

In his book, Culture Shock: Dealing with Stress in Cross-Cultural Living (1983), Myron Loss deals with the issue of missionary stress in cross-cultural situations that affects the effectiveness of missionary activities. He articulates the influence of the missionary’s ideal expectation to live and work in the new circumstance and low self-esteem as a result of culture shock which can contribute to a high rate of missionary attrition as well as many interpersonal relationship problems with others. Also, he suggests to missionary candidates fifteen tips for survival (1983:85-101). But the suggestions lack the theoretical basis for training missionary candidates to cope with the problem of culture shock in order to do effective mission work, even though from the perspective of cross-cultural ministry he offers important aspects of missionary adjustment to another culture.
Cross-cultural adjustment and cross-cultural training can never be separated from each other. Without appropriate cross-cultural training people can easily become victims of culture shock and lose the effectiveness of their work. Through examining the related literature on cross-cultural training skills, methods, and evaluation, we can find ways to develop a relevant cross-cultural training program or curriculum in a given context.

Richard Brislin and Tomoko Yoshida, in their book, *Intercultural Communication Training: An Introduction* (1994), suggest effective training programs from a broad perspective in the area of intercultural communication training. This volume discusses how to assess needs of trainees, establish goals that are relevant to a given training context, and suggests various skills of cross-cultural training for designing training programs and tools for the evaluation of training programs. In fact, the overarching goals of cross-cultural training are to increase the ability to manage culture shock, to communicate effectively, and to establish interpersonal relationships. Brislin and Yoshida suggest four-step training approaches: (1) Awareness; (2) Knowledge; (3) Emotions (includes attitudes); and (4) Skills (involving visible behaviors) (1994:26-56). In this respect, they offer various ways to develop trainees’ skills to adjust to a new environment.
Today in Korea the overwhelming majority of educational systems are utilizing the traditional schooling model under the influence of the Western mode of education. The same is true in theological education and missionary training in Korea. In this situation the Korean church urgently needs to develop a new model of theological education and missionary training. The early 1960s in the United States saw an effort to develop new models for intercultural sensitivity training and some educational change agents worked on the developmental model.

In contrast to the traditional schooling model, the developmental model of education sees “the process of learning as more fundamental than what is learned. It recognizes that learning should be integrated among three domains—affective, cognitive and experiential” (Clinton 1984:14). The goal of this approach is to enable a person to fully develop his/her gifts. In other words, this approach sees education as growth, not the acquisition of accumulated knowledge. The educational setting in this approach is a real life situation. The structure of this approach is holistic—formal, informal, and non-formal. Methods of this approach are experiential learning, so-called “action/reflection,” and being/doing/knowing dimensions.
# Table 4

A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETHNOCENTRIC STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Denial</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>No recognition of cultural difference. Tendency to dehumanize outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Separation from cultural difference protects worldview from change by creating the conditions of isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Defense</td>
<td>Denigration</td>
<td>Cognitive categories for construing cultural difference are isolated by evaluating them negatively, thus protecting worldview from change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>Existing worldview is protected by exaggerating its positive aspects compared to all other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>Tendency to view another culture as superior while maligning one's own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Minimization</td>
<td>Physical Universalism</td>
<td>Emphasis on commonality of human beings in terms of physiological similarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcendent Universalism</td>
<td>Emphasis on commonality of human beings as subordinate to a particular supernatural being, religion, or social philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Acceptance</td>
<td>Respect for Behavioral Difference</td>
<td>All behavior exists in cultural context. Ability to analyze complex interaction in culture-contrast terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect for Value Difference</td>
<td>Beliefs, values, and other general patterns of assigning “goodness” and “badness” to ways of being in the world all exist in cultural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Adaptation</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Ability to consciously shift perspective into alternative cultural worldview elements and act in culturally appropriate ways in those areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pluralism</td>
<td>Internalization of more than one complete worldview. Behavior shifts completely into different frames without much conscious effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Integration</td>
<td>Contextual Evaluation</td>
<td>Ability to use multiple cultural frames of reference in evaluating phenomena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive Marginality</td>
<td>Acceptance of an identity that is not primarily based in any one culture. Ability to facilitate constructive contact between cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M. Bennett 1993:29
Regarding this, Milton Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity described in his article entitled "Toward Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity" (1993) in Education for the Intercultural Experience, edited by R. Michael Paige, enables us to understand what happens in our minds and behavior when we encounter a completely different culture. Also, this model provides us with an effective training tool according to trainees' levels of cultural sensitivities described in Table 4.

The key of this training model is to assess which stage trainees are in and to provide appropriate activities to suit their levels of cultural sensitivities. Unless we carefully assess trainees' level of intercultural sensitivities, there will be negative results. The purpose of this model is "to transcend traditional ethnocentrism and to explore new relationships across cultural boundaries" (Bennett 1993:21). Bennett says three assumptions about this model are clear: (1) The phenomenology of difference is the key to intercultural sensitivity; (2) The construing of difference necessary for intercultural sensitivity is that of ethnorelativism, whereby different cultures are perceived as variable and viable constructions of reality; and (3) Ethical choices can and must be made for intercultural sensitivity to develop.
Bennett’s model is a non-mission training model which can help Korean missionaries overcome ethnocentrism and monocultural perspectives that may destroy personal relationships with local people. For Korean missionaries who are not sensitive to the local context because of their monocultural background, understanding cultural relativism can provide a basic framework by which to avoid the errors of ethnocentrism and premature judgement regarding different cultures. Cross-cultural missionary training aims for trainees to learn how to accept cultural differences, to adapt to the host culture and to become bi-cultural or multi-cultural persons for effective cross-cultural ministry. In this sense, the ethnorelative state in Bennett’s model gives us an important theoretical basis for cross-cultural adjustment.

From the missiological and anthropological viewpoint, however, the danger of the Bennett’s model is “cultural relativism.” Paul Hiebert points out the threat of cultural relativism to Christianity. “The price we pay in adopting total cultural relativism is the loss of such things as truth and righteousness. If all explanations of reality are equally valid, we can no longer speak of error, and if all behavior is justified according to its cultural context, we can no longer speak of sin” (1985:102). Thus the danger of
cultural relativism and cultural romanticism that threaten Christian mission
should be avoided. Because the ultimate goal of missionary training is
incarnational ministry, in the process of developing a contextualized
missionary training program, it needs both a critical examination of culture
and authentic biblical hermeneutics.

proposes "biblical relativism" as a way of overcoming both ethnocentrism
and the danger of cultural relativism in the process of missionary training. He
proposes four possible combinations when absolutism and relativism
encounter each other in the relationship between the Bible and culture:
biblical absolutism and cultural absolutism, biblical absolutism and cultural
relativism, biblical relativism and cultural absolutism, and biblical relativism
and cultural relativism. He affirms that the approach of biblical absolutism
and cultural relativism supports incarnational ministry (1974:231-244). In
fact, when biblical absolutism is combined with cultural relativism, it leads to
a position of mutual respect. This combination makes possible the potential
for a non-biased cultural relativity under the umbrella of the super-cultural
principles of the word of God. In other words, it puts form and meaning in
their proper perspective; that is, meaning is always more important than form
Valuable sources (William Taylor 1991, 1997; Harley 1995; Ferris, ed. 1995) focus on cross-cultural missionary training as a project of the World Evangelical Fellowship Missions Commission. In fact, the area of cross-cultural missionary training had been neglected for a long time by the church and mission organizations. For most missionary sending churches and agencies, the most important factors have been God’s call, motivation, and the spiritual maturity of the missionary. The importance of interpersonal relationships and adaptability of the missionary for more effective mission work came to be recognized in the late 1970s. The outcome of those results are the efforts of the WEF Missions Commission. Those four books might be considered textbooks for cross-cultural missionary training, though they contain some weaknesses in dealing with anthropological and missionary’s cross-cultural adjustment issues.

In *Internationalising Missionary Training: A Global Perspective* (1991) edited by William D. Taylor, director of the WEF Missions Commission, authors discussed various issues in cross-cultural missionary training such as the context of missionary training in the emerging missionary movement from the Two-Thirds World, models of missionary training, and educational
dimensions of missionary training. The contribution of this volume is to affirm the importance of cross-cultural missionary training, but it does not provide a systematic approach to cross-cultural missionary training. One of the most impressive things is that William Taylor proposes an integrated or holistic model of missionary training as a comprehensive overview (cf. 1991:3-10). Also, missionary training models suggested by both old and new sending countries remind us to develop effective training models and programs in a given context. This volume presents sixteen training models from the perspectives of the Two-Thirds World churches.

Among those training models, a Korean training model is suggested by David Taiwoong Lee (Lee 1991a:69-80). As Lee has been involved in Korean missionary training since 1986 as director of Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC) in Korea, his missionary training model is recognized as the most effective model in Korea. One of the strengths of this model is an emphasis on informal and non-formal training methods which is becoming emphasized in cross-cultural missionary training. Especially, unlike other missionary training programs in Korea, GMTC recognizes the importance of understanding Korean values and worldview. But a weakness of GMTC is the lack of overseas field experience program. However, Lee’s
model helped me to develop a cross-cultural missionary training model in this study.

In *Preparing to Serve: Training for Cross-Cultural Mission*, Harley (1995) provides a “comprehensive introduction to cross-cultural missionary training” rather than an in-depth study of any particular area (1995:v). Along with the first book, *Internationalising Missionary Training* (W. Taylor 1991), Harley delineates the current trend of cross-cultural missionary training both in the West and in the Two-Thirds World that focuses on experiential and developmental training methods rather than on formal schooling methods. In other words, today cross-cultural missionary training emphasizes informal and non-formal training methods in order to facilitate the trainees’ character qualities and adjustment skills rather than mere knowledge-based training. Also, he presents a comparative study of six missionary training programs of new missionary sending countries in its appendix. Among them the training program of the Global Missionary Training Center in Korea has been evaluated.

The book, *Establishing Ministry Training: A Manual for Programme Developers* (Ferris, ed. 1995), focuses particularly on missionary training program design, including defining training goals and objectives, developing
training and learning skills, and evaluating training programs. In other words, this book deals with the educational dimension of missionary training as most of the authors in this volume are involved in cross-cultural missionary training. Robert Ferris points out that “the key to developing effective missionary training is a person we shall term ‘the programme developer.’ The programme developer must have a vision for effective missionary training in his or her own context” (1995a:3). Also, he asserts that in developing missionary training programs the program developer must examine his or her assumptions and values in the light of the Bible. In fact, this book provides us with stages of missionary training curriculum design.

The book, Too Valuable to Lose: Exploring the Causes and Cures of Missionary Attrition (William D. Taylor, ed. 1997), is a monumental work in the area of cross-cultural missionary training. As mentioned in Chapter 1, this book as the result of the WEF Missions Commission venture called ReMAP (Reducing Missionary Attrition Project), shows a global perspective of the current trend of the missionary movement both in the West and in the Two-Thirds World. In fact, this volume provides sources for mission education and training through a wide range of research findings about missionary attrition. In this volume many authors propose effective training
methods and programs to overcome the high rate of missionary attrition.

I am convinced that the causes and cures of missionary attrition cannot be separated from cross-cultural missionary training. But in the ReMAP research, among the twenty-six reasons that missionaries from sixteen countries leave missionary service, "poor cultural adaptation" is ranked fourteenth and "inappropriate training" seventeenth. In the case of the new sending countries including Korea, the above reasons are ranked fifteenth and ninth (Brierley 1997:92). Also, the research says that in the case of the new sending countries, among the twelve most important reasons for preventing loss of career missionaries, "cultural adaptation" is ranked seventh and "appropriate and regular training" eleventh (Brierley 1997:99). One of the major weaknesses of the ReMAP research is that the research sample is not sufficient because they used only one portion of the mission population, mission administrators from mission agencies. The population of samples should have included both missionaries and nationals to increase the reliability and credibility of the research. So, the reliability and credibility of the research result might be challenged in the area of research methodology.

Nevertheless, the ReMAP research shows the urgent need for cross-cultural missionary training. I wonder whether or not they recognize that
missionaries' cultural adjustment is closely related to other factors even though missionaries’ clear call from God and mature spirituality must not be underestimated. In the case of Korea, poor cultural adaptation ranks seventh out of twenty-six reasons. What does this research administered by the questionnaire to 125 Korean missionaries show to be the reasons for Korean missionary attrition? Chapter 6 deals with this issue.

Finally, this research seeks to determine the relation between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment. In this respect, current studies on cross-cultural missionary training and cross-cultural adjustment help me strengthen the theoretical framework and analyze the research findings. In the next chapter, I examine the biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training in relation to cross-cultural adjustment.
1. The term "centripetal" refers to the nature of mission in the Old Testament. The centripetal nature of the mission of Israel is to draw the nations into the presence and fear of God by living life as the chosen people. Thus there is not the concept of cross-cultural mission to announce God’s salvation message. In contrast, the term "centrifugal" refers to the missionary nature of the New Testament (Matthew 28:18-20; Acts 1:8). It is the sacred sending and commissioning for the disciples to go to witness to the salvation of God through Jesus Christ beyond Israel’s cultural boundary. Johannes Blauw insists that the Old Testament missionary consciousness is centripetal. But when a missionary interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah is considered as the centrifugal nature of Israel’s mission to the nations, it is an eschatological expectation, which will be realized only in the future (1962:29-43).

2. The term “intercultural communication training” is the combined words of both intercultural communication and cross-cultural training. The terms are often used interchangeably because it is hard to think of cross-cultural adjustment in relation to training issues that does not involve communication among people. It refers to “formal efforts designed to prepare people for more effective interpersonal relations when they interact with individuals from cultures other than their own” (Brislin and Yoshida 1994:2-3).

3. The position of “cultural relativism” is that all cultural practices are equally valid and equally worthy of tolerance and respect so that all cultural values are relative. In this sense, the position of cultural relativism is very attractive. “It shows high respect for other people and their cultures and avoids the errors of ethnocentrism and premature judgements” (Hiebert 1985:102).

4. In his D.Min dissertation A Comparative Study of IMTF-Related Missionary Training Centers in the Two-Thirds World (1992), David Harley examined six non-Western missionary training centers: Antioch Mission Training Course (Brazil), Global Missionary Training Center (Korea), Nigeria Evangelical Missionary Institute (Nigeria), Outreach Training Institute (India), Africa Inland Church Missionary College (Kenya), and Asian Cross-Cultural Training Institute (Singapore). Areas of the research are as follows: historical background of the training centers, educational theories, training methods, concern for holistic training, the issue of contextualization, evaluation, and future development.

5. In ReMAP research, the new sending countries are Brazil, Costa Rica,
Ghana, Nigeria, India, Korea, the Philippines, and Singapore.
Ghana, Nigeria, India, Korea, the Philippines, and Singapore.
Cross-Cultural Missionary Training:
Biblical Roots and Missiological Foundations

Since this chapter concerns a missionary’s cross-cultural adjustment for effective mission work through cross-cultural training, it is appropriate that the biblical roots of cross-cultural training should be found and missiological foundations also be suggested. This is not a simple task because there are no specific perceptions in the Bible regarding the preparation of cross-cultural witnesses. So we need to try to find the biblical roots of cross-cultural missionary training and missiological foundations.

Roger E. Hedlund says, “Mission takes place in a world of cultures. The book of Acts shows the progression of the gospel from the ‘Jewish’ Jews of Jerusalem into the Judean countryside, then to the Samaritans and to the Hellenized Jews, and from the latter to the Gentiles at Antioch, and finally to the multiple cultures of the Roman Empire and the World” (1991:205; cf. Bevans 1998:2). In this sense, cross-cultural missionary training requires the missionary to experience cultural conversion before witnessing about the gospel message to peoples of another culture. This is a critical issue for the
missionary movement today as it was for the Jews in the first century. Cross-cultural missionary training today must be done by critical cultural learning on the basis of an incarnational model of Christian witness. As seen in Gentile and Jewish conversion narratives and in the epoch-making Jerusalem Council in the New Testament (Acts 8-10, 15), cross-cultural witness to the Gentiles could not have occurred without God’s intervention that created changes in people’s worldview. In fact, the mission to the Gentiles occurred through a gradual process. As cross-cultural missionary training aims to change the trainees’ minds and attitudes when they seem to be ethnocentric or prejudged toward people of other cultures, the biblical narratives in the book of Acts give us important insights on the process of change or transformation that takes place as God guided the Jewish movement in the first century into a universal and multi-cultural missionary movement (Dollar 1993:5).

In this chapter biblical roots and the missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training are discussed from the examination of narratives about conversion and the event of the Jerusalem Council in Acts. This chapter offers some crucial insights as to how first-century Christianity overcame Jewish particularism and became universal in its scope to embrace the Gentiles. In fact, the paradigmatic conversion events and the epoch-
making Jerusalem Council are considered the biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training.

Conversion Narratives in Acts


As we note in these three conversion events, each event succeeds the other. Gaventa insists that Luke placed the three conversion accounts deliberately in sequence to show the fulfilment of Acts 1:8 (1986:123-125). While the first two events involve individual conversions, the last event involves the conversion of an entire household along with Cornelius in Acts 10. These conversion accounts present the universal dimensions of the gospel. John Stott describes the conversion of both Paul and Cornelius as the opening events of the gospel for the Gentiles.

From the conversion of Saul to be the apostle to the Gentiles, Luke proceeds to the conversion of Cornelius, the first Gentile to become a
believer. Both conversions were essential foundations on which the Gentile mission would be built. And prominent in both was a leading apostle, the first conversion having Paul as its subject, the second having Peter for its agent. Both apostles (despite their different callings)² had a key role to play in liberating the gospel from its Jewish clothing and opening the kingdom of God to the Gentiles. (1990:181)

Luke’s understanding of conversion through three narratives is not a private matter, but a community matter. Individual converts in Luke’s narratives in Acts were connected to the faith community. We can see that the early chapters (Acts 2) constantly link those who repent and believe with the Christian community. In this sense “conversion is an aspect of God’s action in the world by which people are called to faithfulness in life together and in proclaiming the word” (Gaventa 1982:422).

Paul’s Conversion and Calling

The full development of the mission to the Gentiles that opened the door for taking the first step to achieve the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20) and Acts 1:8 is inseparably bound up with Paul’s conversion and call. It is necessary to understand Paul’s family and educational background in order to better understand his conversion and call because “knowledge of Saul the Jew is a precondition of understanding Paul the Christian” (Hengel and Deines 1991:xiii).
Paul was born in Tarsus of Cilicia in the Greek-speaking diaspora, but was brought up in Jerusalem as the son of a Pharisee and Palestinian Jew, who at the same time had Roman citizenship (Acts 22:3; 23:6; 26:5; Philippians 3:5f.). According to Luke, Paul was educated at the school of Gamaliel I in Jerusalem, not in the diaspora (Acts 22:3). This means that Paul learned to read and write, not just in Greek but also in Hebrew and Aramaic. Hengel and Deines insist that “in addition to Jews who spoke Greek as their mother tongue and who (like Saul/Paul) also understood Aramaic and Hebrew, there were a number of ‘Hebrews’ with a very good command of Greek” (1991:55). In the first century, Jerusalem was the great pilgrimage site for all Jews from the Syrian, Egyptian, and Western Diaspora who spoke Greek so that some of the great Jewish thinkers and educators visited or moved to Jerusalem.³

In relation to Paul’s evangelistic approaches as a missionary, it can be said that he would surely learn methods of debating or persuading non-Christians from his education and training. Also, his creative handling of Hebrew Scriptures to witness to Jesus Christ as the Lord and Savior came from his education too. Senior and Stuhlmueller (1983) discuss the influences on Paul as follows:
“Because Paul was a Greek-speaking Jew, trained in Palestinian tradition and active in the Gentile milieu of Greece and Asia Minor, he had access to diverse thought worlds whose own interrelationship in the first-century world was diffuse and complex” (1983:163).

Also, in contrast to the Judaizers Paul brought out the culturally-inclusive approach in his missionary work. In other words, Paul challenged and defeated the Judaizers by his lifestyle in preaching the gospel to the Gentiles (cf. Galatians 2:11-14). Today Paul’s lifestyle and attitudes toward Gentiles also challenge Korean missionaries attitudes toward the local people and lifestyle in the mission field.

Conybeare and Howson say that Paul came to Jerusalem for education and he lived at the Rabban’s house in a multi-cultural environment with other students from Egypt, Babylonia, the coasts of Greece, and his native Cecilia (1886:61-62). In modern educational terms, his education included formal, informal, and non-formal education. His training might enable him to understand other cultures or subcultures in the way that he lived with other Jewish students from various cultures or subcultures.

From the perspectives of cross-cultural missionary training methods, it does not seem that the apostles used formal schooling modes of education for
their disciples. This is not to say there was no educational process. Rather, the training methods of the apostles can be called "non-formal" and "informal" education. These training methods were carried out by Jesus. Pheme Perkins writes, "Jesus did not establish a school with a philosophical doctrine or special method of interpreting the Law. His followers learned by observing what he said and did in different situations" (1990:1). Jesus' teaching methods reflected the daily life and experience of people. Jesus' training made the learning of his disciples come to life. The learning of Jesus' disciples was by experiencing, doing, and reflecting.

In this regard, Jesus used mostly non-formal and informal methods in training his disciples which focused on change and transformation of life. He lived with his disciples as a role model and taught them in various places. What the disciples learned was through doing and experiencing. Jesus showed them examples and then sent them out to preach the good news.

Regarding this, Leighton Ford says,

Jesus' leadership [training methods] is not only important, but essential in our time. He was able to create, articulate and communicate a compelling vision; to change what people talk about and dream of; to make his followers transcend self-interest; to enable us to see ourselves and our world in a new way; to provide prophetic insight into the very heart of things; and to bring about the highest order of change. (1991:15)
Paul’s training methods were in much the same style as Jesus trained his disciples. From this point of view, Paul provides a good example of what is involved in missionary training (cf. 1 Timothy 1:12-16). He was a cross-cultural missionary as he had a universal missionary vision. Like Jesus, Paul was his fellow workers’ role model in word and deed. But it seems that Paul’s training method is not separate from how he was trained by Gamaliel.

The method Paul used as the earliest paradigm of ministry formation was apprenticeship or mentoring that refers to a personal relationship between a teacher and one or more students (cf. Van Engen 1996:241-242). He, throughout his missionary journey, trained many Christians ministers such as Timothy (2 Timothy 2:2), Titus, Silas (Acts 15:40ff), John Mark (Acts 13:5ff), and Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:18ff) (cf. Howell 1998:84-87). Paul taught them informally and non-formally through a powerful apprenticeship program just as Jesus had done. Paul was an excellent contextualizer in training men and women because he was sensitive to the recipient culture so that he might preach effectively and plant churches cross-culturally (1 Corinthians 9:19-23). The context of the early church for mission to the Gentiles drove Paul to train others for effective cross-cultural ministry. Especially Timothy, as a bi-cultural person, was used effectively for
difficult and sensitive missions (1 Thessalonians 3:6-10; Philippians 2:19-24).

In fact, Paul moves between two different worlds; that is, he lived in
two different language areas and cultures. His double Greek-Hebrew name,
Saul-Paul is an evidence that he belonged to two cultures. As mentioned
above, in Jerusalem, the holy city as Paul’s spiritual home, there were
evidently a large number of Greek-speaking Jews. They had been gathered to
the Greek-speaking synagogues (Acts 6:9) (Hengel 1980:82). He had much
in common with the Hellenists who were driven out of Jerusalem. “Against
this background, he, ‘the zealot for the law’ (Galatians 1:14; Philippians 3:6;
Acts 22:3), could have participated actively in the persecution of Stephen and
some time later have been sent to Damascus, to combat the disturbances
causcd by the Christians who had been driven out of Jerusalem” (Hengel
1980:82-83).

How did Paul, a Pharisee of the Pharisees (Galatians 1:4, Philippians
3:4-5) and a persecutor of the early Christian movement, become Christ’s
apostle to the Gentiles and the one whom we call “a model for frontier
missions” (Dollar 1996:129)? It was because of his encounter with the risen
Christ. Luke describes three versions of Paul’s conversion and calling
consider that Paul opened the door of the Gentile mission, Christian mission as a cross-cultural missionary endeavor would be started from Paul’s vision; namely, his own conversion and call. His conversion and call occurred in connection with the martyrdom of Stephen and as an enemy of the Christian movement (Acts 7:58-8:3).

What is the nature of Paul’s call and the understanding of that call to the Gentile mission? Through examining the three accounts of Paul’s conversion and call to mission, we can see how Paul understood his call. The three accounts of Paul’s conversion and call indicate that the first two (Acts 9:1-30; 22:1-21) are similar while the third account (Acts 26:1-32) is quite different. The heart of all three accounts is the dialogue between the risen Lord and Paul. All three tell about Paul’s call to the Gentile mission (cf. Dollar 1993:155-159; Gaventa 1986:52-95). In the first account, Jesus says to him: “Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do” (Acts 9:6). The call comes through Ananias and says: “Go! This man is my chosen instrument to carry my name before the Gentiles and their Kings and before the people of Israel” (Acts 9:15). In the second account, Ananias gave the commission in a general way: “You will be his witness to all men of what you have seen and heard” (Acts 22:15). This is followed by Paul’s later
experience in Jerusalem where it explicitly mentions the Gentiles (22:21). In
the third account, there is no mention of a human intermediary and the call
comes on the Damascus road where Paul is promised: “I will rescue you from
your own people and from the Gentiles. I am sending you to them” (26:17).
Dollar insists that these three accounts of Paul’s conversion refer explicitly to
his call to both the Jews and Gentiles. It can be seen from the key words in
the accounts: Israel, all men, your own people, and Gentiles (Dollar
1993:159).

These commission accounts can be seen in God’s call of a prophet
(Jonah 1:2; Amos 7:14-15). As we can see in the Old Testament, in fact,
Gentiles were becoming a part of God’s people from the time that God called
Abraham (Genesis 12, 17; Exodus 12:38). However, what Jews understood
about witnessing to Gentiles was that when Gentiles converted to Judaism
they could become Jews. So Gentiles would become socialized into the
culture of Israel and cease to be Gentiles (Dollar 1996:132). This is a form of
proselytism. It seems that Paul would know that Gentiles must give up their
culture and follow Jewish laws such as circumcision to be Jews. Bosch says
that “before he become a Christian, Paul had been well-acquainted with and
perhaps even actively involved in Jewish proselytism” (1991:127). Paul’s
positive attitude of Jewish proselytism could be traced from Paul’s background in that he was open to Hellenistic culture and came from the school of Hillel who came from the Babylonian diaspora (cf. Hengel 1983:53).

In what sense, then, did Luke understand Paul’s call to the Gentile mission? Paul’s mission was to evangelize the Gentiles without forcing them to give up their culture. “The presupposition for Paul’s mission is his doctrine of freedom from the law, which previously had separated Israel from the nations. It is a basic element of his gospel” (Hengel 1983:54). Then a question is raised: “Did Paul understand immediately that he was to evangelize Gentiles qua Gentiles?” (Dollar 1996:132). There are two opinions about this questions among New Testament scholars. One argues that Paul immediately understood his call to the Gentile mission after his conversion so that he went into Arabia to preach to the Gentiles, referring to Galatians 1 (Bruce 1969:243; Lake 1979:195; quoted in Dollar 1996:132-133; cf. Hahn 1965). The other argues that an understanding of the nature of Paul’s call is realized in a progressive manner (Dollar 1996). Luke does not mention Arabia at all in his account of Saul’s conversion. Paul, on the other hand, does not indicate what he did in Arabia while mentioning it (Galatians
Dollar insists that "there is no indication that Saul understood his call to the Gentiles as the abrogation of the cultural requirements traditionally made on Gentiles when they became converts to Judaism" (1996:133). In fact, Paul's conversion and call imply an important step to cross-cultural ministry. Paul's experience on the road to Damascus was a paradigm shift. It "caused a radical revision in his way of life and his world view" (Senior and Stuhlmueller 1983:167). Senior and Stuhlmueller argue that Paul's conversion experience through the risen Christ was instantaneous as Paul saw Jesus as the Lord of the universe and of the church (1983:168-169). In other words, Paul recognized that the risen Christ is above cultures and draws all cultures into God's universal salvation. But it seemed that Paul took years to grasp the full dimension of his call to mission to the Gentiles. As Luke in the book of Acts presents several stages of the development of cross-cultural mission, Paul's conversion and call are a decisive factor in opening the door of the gospel to the Gentiles.

The basis for Paul's openness to the Gentiles was his theology of the resurrection. From the theological perspectives, the starting point of Paul's mission theology came from his conversion experience "that gave a startling insight into the nature of the God of Israel and his Christ" (Senior and
Senior and Stuhlmueller insist that Paul’s conversion experience convinced him “that the God of Israel was indeed a God intent on the salvation of all humanity through the person of Jesus Christ and therefore apart from the law. Consequently, God was ‘impartial’ or, better, gracious to Jews and Gentiles alike” (1983:170-171).

Senior and Stuhlmueller write that it is seen in Colossians and Ephesians that “the horizons of the Christian mission are pushed beyond the ethnic boundaries of Jews and Gentiles to embrace the entire universe” (1983:191). In Colossians and Ephesians, Paul’s mission theology shows a cosmic Lord and cosmic scope of Christology in the use of such terms as “head,” “fullness,” and “mystery” concerning the universal nature of the church. In this sense, “the church in these letters is not the final goal but only a means and a sign of Christ’s own cosmic mission of salvation” (Senior and Stuhlmueller 1983:191). They point out four aspects of the cosmic Christology in Colossians 1:15-20: (1) It gives the risen Christ a central role in all creation; (2) It shows the connection between Christ’s lordship over the cosmos and his lordship over the church; (3) It emphasizes universal reconciliation through the death and resurrection of Jesus; and (4) It indicates that the cosmic lordship of Christ leads not simply or primarily to a renewed
nature but to a renewed humanity (1983:196-198).

God took into account Paul’s life development when he called Paul to be a missionary to the Gentiles. In looking at Paul’s life development, we can understand how God molded Paul and chose him as a cross-cultural witness. It might be argued that Paul received three years of private training in the Arabian desert by the Lord himself before he was accepted for missionary service. This might be a step toward an awareness of his call to mission to the Gentiles. All the previous years of his life did not go to waste. They helped him to fulfill his task of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 26:16-18). Paul’s conversion and call played the decisive role in making possible the Gentile mission. But his birth, education, upbringing, and Roman citizenship, as well as the development of his personality and gifts of leadership, were also all essential instruments. In Paul’s life and ministry we can see God’s training for the purpose of laying the foundation of world mission.

Conversion of Cornelius

As seen in the narratives of the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 7), the apostle Philip’s evangelization of the Samaritans, and the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8), the centripetal dynamic of the Christian gospel
had progressed through several stages in order to accomplish the Great Commission with the formation of the church. In the mission drama of the early church, as seen above, Acts chapter 9 is a kind of stepping stone for the Gentile mission. In this regard, Dollar insists, "Luke’s threefold repetition of Cornelius’ conversion is a part of his literary style in demonstrating its theological importance (10:1-48; 11:1-18; 15:8-11)" (1996:86).

Many scholars emphasize the importance of the conversion of Cornelius. Luke Timothy Johnson describes the conversion narrative of Cornelius as "the most critical phase of the expansion of God’s people" (Johnson 1992:186). Also, Dollar says, "There is no episode any more central in Luke’s presentation of the story of Christianity than the section in which he recounts the conversion of Cornelius. On the events of this section Luke places the full weight of his historical and theological argument for the universality of the gospel message" (cf. 15:8-11, 13ff.) (1996:80). Also, he describes the conversion of Cornelius as "the paradigmatic conversion account of Gentile conversions" without the traditional requirement for Gentiles to become a part of God’s people—meaning circumcision and the offering of sacrifices (1993:176). Lesslie Newbigin notes, "The story of Peter and Cornelius is the preface to the much wider and more costly struggle
which had to be fought out concerning the conditions on which Gentile converts should be admitted to the church” (1978:66).

Luke Timothy Johnson describes the setting of the scene as follows:

After the interlude devoted to the call of Saul who would be the elect vessel for carrying the name to the Gentiles (9:1-30), Luke again showed the work of Peter in Judea, healing the lame, raising the dead, and at the same time moving geographically and ethnically closer to the edge, to the place by the sea in Joppa, where he resided with the ritually impure tanner Simon, ready to hear the call from the Gentile city of Caesarea (9:31-42). Now at last Luke is ready to show how the church made this most fundamental and dangerous step, which would involve the greatest struggle and demand the most fundamental self-reinterpretation for the nascent messianic movement, which in fact would in principle establish its destiny as a universal and not simply ethnic religion. (1992:186)

The Cornelius conversion narrative (Acts 10:1-11:18) is divided into eight scenes following the approach used by Gaventa (1986:96-129). She summarizes the scenes of the Cornelius conversion according to a parallel series as follows:

| Vision Scene  | 1  | Cornelius  | 10:1-8  |
| Journey and Welcome | 2  | Peter      | 10:9-16 |
| Proclamation    | 3  | Cornelius  | 10:17-23a |
|                 | 4  | Peter      | 10:23b-29 |
| Confirmation    | 5  | Cornelius  | 10:30-33 |
|                 | 6  | Peter      | 10:34-43 |
|                 | 7  | Holy Spirit| 10:44-48 |
|                 | 8  | Community  | 11:1-18 |

Source: Gaventa 1986:111-112
As seen in the above literary pattern of Acts 10:1-11:18, Gaventa describes the scenes.

First, Cornelius sees the divine messenger and then Peter experiences his ecstatic vision. Each receives during their visions a command that is largely unexplained. Second, Cornelius’ delegation arrives at Peter’s lodging and is welcomed. Likewise, Peter and his colleagues journey to Caesarea and are welcomed by Cornelius. Third, Cornelius makes a brief speech in which he explains why he summoned Peter. Peter then summarizes the Christian kerygma. Finally, the Holy Spirit confirms the rightness of this event by inspiring Cornelius and his household to speak in tongues. Peter then must defend his actions in Jerusalem where the community also confirms the rightness of the event. (1986:111)

These scenes show God’s dramatic intervention as Peter and Cornelius struggle to make the decision of encountering each other. Regarding this, it “[highlights] the fact that both Cornelius and Peter required conversion, and it [demonstrates] that the abrogation of food laws and the inclusion of Gentiles within the church are inextricably connected” (Gaventa 1986:112).

What are the missiological implications of this story? What are the cultural implications for Jewish Christians of the first century if Gentiles become Christians without the traditional requirements of circumcision and the Jewish food law? In fact, Luke’s missionary paradigm which explicitly describes God’s intention of salvation for all people is seen in Cornelius’ conversion account. In this regard, it is clear that for God “the conversion of
Gentiles was no problem, but the difficulty was in bringing the Jewish Christians to see that Gentiles did not need to become Jews as they became Christians’ (Dollar 1996:87). In Cornelius’ conversion account, Peter’s conversion is perhaps more important than Cornelius’ conversion. In other words, we can see God’s sovereign intervention in that Peter broke the cultural barriers to evangelize the gospel. Cornelius did not need to change his culture to become a Christian. Rather, the conversion of Peter (cf. Hahn 1965; Gaventa 1986; Bevans 1998) made him change his worldview and go to Cornelius. Dollar gives an important missiological implication of this event as follows:

It is the Jews who must drop their historic standards that separate them from Gentiles. It is Peter who is forced to go to the home of Cornelius and to remain there after Cornelius’ conversion, not Cornelius who comes to Peter. Centrifugalism is supplanting centripetalism. Centripetalism assumes acculturation on the part of those who come to the messenger. Centrifugalism assumes “cultural adaptation” on the part of those who go to preach. (1993:185)

The second missiological implication is the issue between gospel and culture. In the first century, Jewish Christians did not distinguish between the gospel and their culture. Therefore, for Gentiles to know God was to adopt Jewish culture such as circumcision and the food laws in order to become Jews. Dollar says that “the reason why the apostles did not rush to
evangelize Gentiles was not because of their disobedience to the Great Commission or spiritual dullness, but because of this misunderstanding of the relationship between the gospel and their historic faith and culture” (1996:88). Comparing Peter’s cross-cultural conversion to Paul’s conversion, Peter faced a difficulty in practicing his own experience with Cornelius that made him address the Jerusalem Council. But after that event he was rebuked by Paul because Peter withdrew from eating with Gentiles and separated himself from the Gentiles (Galatians 2:11-13). In contrast, Paul’s conversion made him instantaneously realize the universal dimension of the gospel. This led him to the Gentile mission as an apostle of the Gentiles.

Third, the gospel must be preached to any people without forcing them to abandon their culture. The introduction to Peter’s speech before the household of Cornelius reflects this principle: “There is no partiality with God” (Acts 10:34). In other words, Peter declared what he realized: Anyone who fears God (Acts 10:2, 22) and behaves accordingly is acceptable without changing culture. Here we can see the principle of contextualization. The gospel is supracultural, but for the gospel to be understood it must be communicated in cultural forms. The crucial task of the early church was the contextualization of the gospel message from culture to culture. In this sense,

As Gaventa says,

The conclusion to which Luke points is unmistakable: God has included the Gentiles, and the church may not resist. The implications of that decision become clearer in the following chapters of Acts. Not only is the decision unmistakable, but it forms the climax of the first half of Acts, with 11:19-15:35 forming the denouement. Immediately following the Cornelius narrative, we read of the formation of a Gentile Christian community in Antioch (11:19-26). With the beginning of the mission of Paul and Barnabas begins also the pattern of rejection by the synagogue and acceptance by Gentiles (13:44-52). Finally in Acts 15 it becomes necessary that the Jerusalem leaders address directly the events that already have occurred. (1986:122)

**The Jerusalem Council**

Central to the story of Peter and Cornelius is the community’s acceptance of Cornelius and Peter’s action that is symbolic or representative for mission to the Gentiles. The central theme of the conversion of Cornelius is brought to the Jerusalem Council. Luke Timothy Johnson, in his book *Decision Making in the Church: A Biblical Model* (1983), describes the stages of one of the most important decisions made in the history of
Christianity. The first decision was made by Cornelius and Peter’s conversion (Acts 10:1-48). The second decision was made by Peter’s defense of the Cornelius event in Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-18). The final decision was made in the Jerusalem Council, which was opposed and affirmed (Acts 15:1-35). In the Lucan missionary paradigm the most important event is the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1-35). Stephen G. Wilson calls the Jerusalem Council “a watershed in the book of Acts” (1973:192). Wilson notes that “it is a turning point of the whole narrative. This event was the opening of mission to the Gentiles through official recognition by the Jerusalem church. It concludes and justifies past events and makes possible all future development” (1973:192-193; cf. Stott 1990:241). Dollar describes the cultural reflection on the Jerusalem Council as the theological high point of Acts, as “a revolutionary cultural adaptation” (1993:229-230). John Stott stresses the importance of the Jerusalem Council in that the decision “liberated the gospel from its Jewish swaddling cloths into being God’s message for all humankind, and gave the Jewish-Gentile church a self-conscious identity as the reconciled people of God, the one body of Christ” (1990:241). Interestingly enough, after the Jerusalem Council Luke moved the emphasis on the church’s mission to the Gentile world from Jerusalem. In
other words, before the Jerusalem Council the Jerusalem mission dominated, but after it attention exclusively focused on Paul’s preaching all the way to Rome.

However, the history of early church mission cannot be separated from its theological base. Romans chapters 9-11 shows why mission shifted to the Gentiles. Paul recognized that “Israel’s rejection of the gospel had provided the opportunity (but not the justification) for the mission to be opened to the Gentiles (Romans 11:11-12)” (Senior and Stuhlmueller 1983:180). Paul concluded that God’s grace through Jesus Christ broke down the cultural boundaries between Jew and Gentile, and that people could “call on the name of the Lord” and experience God’s salvation (Romans 10:12-13).

Preparation for the Jerusalem Council began with the conversion of Cornelius and his household and continued through the first mission of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles (cf. Dollar 1996:93; Stott 1990:240; Johnson 1992:267). In fact, the conversion of Cornelius created a crisis and challenged the church in Jerusalem because he was a Gentile. That is why we can call this event a "paradigm shift" or an "innovation" which demanded of the church clear discernment of this challenge. Was the conversion of the Gentiles legitimate? If so, on what grounds could they be considered part of
God’s people? In the process of decision making, the point was not to ask whether Cornelius was the first Gentile convert but how the church reached the decision for inclusion. There were several issues raised and questions asked in the process of decision-making in Jerusalem: preaching and baptizing to the Gentiles, circumcision, table fellowship, etc. In fact, the Council was the major turning point as to whether “the church decided to recognize and acknowledge actions of God which go beyond its present understanding, or it demand that God work within its categories” (Johnson 1983:69).

In the text, the fact that God intended the salvation of the Gentiles is beyond human doubt and debate. After the confrontation between Peter and the Jerusalem leadership (Acts 11:1-18) and before the Jerusalem Council, Luke’s readers can see how Greeks were evangelized in Antioch (Acts 11:19-26) and how the missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas became a mission to the Gentiles led by the Holy Spirit in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13). In fact, Acts 13-14 function to drive the conclusion of Peter’s mission to Cornelius. The preaching to the Gentiles did not result from a private decision but from God’s direct involvement through circumstances. Luke shows that the Gentile mission was certified by the Jerusalem church through the sending of
Barnabas to Antioch where Paul joined him latter (Acts 11:22-26). Now the Gentiles were becoming Christians in many places without following Jewish laws. Dollar says, “Paul and Barnabas’ mission in Asia Minor is the final experiential step in the gospel becoming universal before the church council in Jerusalem” (1996:94).

A conflict regarding circumcision of Gentiles in the church of Antioch (15:1) made the Jerusalem Council necessary. When some men came down to Judea from Antioch and insisted on circumcision for Gentile Christians to be saved, there was sharp dispute and debate between those men and Paul and Barnabas. This not only challenged the mission of Paul and Barnabas but also the integrity of the church in Antioch itself. When this controversy could not be settled at the local level, Paul and Barnabas, along with others, were sent by the church of Antioch to Jerusalem to resolve the issue (15:1-2). When the delegation from Antioch, who were warmly welcomed by the church of Jerusalem, “reported everything that God has done through them” (15:4), they were quickly opposed by some converted Pharisees who demanded that Gentile Christians must be circumcised and be required to obey the law of Moses (15:5). It seems that those converted Pharisees were a minority group in the community. “There is no indication that any of the
leadership in the church of Jerusalem or Antioch opposed the inclusion of Gentiles" (Dollar 1996:96), but the community needed to clarify the issue and make final decisions on the level of the whole church.

After much discussion (15:7), Peter addressed the Council (15:7-11). His entire presentation before the apostles and elders was the story of both his and Cornelius' experience. It is one story and is Luke's third mention of the narrative. Peter "no longer elaborates the puzzlement and confusion, but speaks confidently of the story as one told by God" (Johnson 1983:81).

There are several verbs in Peter's speech. The subject of the verbs is God. First, God chose Peter to open the door of mission to the Gentiles. Peter verified that the idea of Gentile mission—preaching, baptism, and table fellowship—did not belong to Peter and the apostles, but belonged to God himself. Second, God accepted the Gentiles by giving the Holy Spirit. Gentile evangelism was the work of the Holy Spirit. Third, God made no distinction between us and them. God purified their hearts by faith, not by any rituals. Then Peter concluded that we are saved in the same way as they are. Dollar says, "Peter moves beyond the primary question of the conference and concludes that circumcision not only has nothing to do with the salvation of Gentiles, but it also has nothing to do with the salvation of the
Paul later gave a solid theological argument for the salvation of Gentiles on the basis of Abraham, prior to Moses, by faith, not by works (Romans 4:1-25).

Peter's testimony made clear the way for Paul and Barnabas (15:12). They told about all the signs and wonders that God had worked through them among the Gentiles. ""Signs and wonders' are the consistent Lukan signal for the way God validates human ministry from Moses to Paul" (Johnson 1983:82). "The manifestation of signs and wonders demonstrates God's approval of the mission to the Gentiles" (Dollar 1996:97).

In the Council the entire discussion was summarized and brought to conclusion by James. He affirmed the fundamental freedom of the Gentile Christians through the confirmation of what Peter had addressed (11:1-18; 15:7-11). With the citation of Amos 9:11-12, he "argues that the salvation of the Gentiles is not a new idea thought up by Peter or any other human being but is part of God's predetermined plan" (Dollar 1993:98). Amos 9:11-12, indicating God's promise to include the Gentiles, does not seem to abrogate the requirement of circumcision. But James interpreted the passage that "we should not make it difficult for the Gentiles" (15:19). Luke T. Johnson indicates an implication of the text (Amos 9:11-12).
The text is confirmed by the narrative, not the narrative by the Scripture. As Peter had come to a new understanding of Jesus’ words because of the gift of the Spirit, so here the Old Testament is illuminated and interpreted by the narrative of God’s activity in the present. On the basis of the narrative and of the Scripture, therefore, James decides for God rather than for precedent. (1983:84)

James made a final statement (15:20) that Gentiles should “abstain from food polluted by idols, from sexual immorality, from the meat of the strangled animals and from blood.” The decree of four prohibitions was imposed by the Council on Gentile Christians. What does it mean in relation to the decision made by the council that Gentiles do not have to be circumcised to be saved? Dollar insists that “Gentiles are bound to observe the relevant parts of the Mosaic Law. The relevant parts have to do with guidelines for table-fellowship between Jews and Gentiles” (1996:101).

Luke T. Johnson insists,

The logic of James’ position is either a) that these primordial commands would be known to all nations, or b) that those frequenting the synagogues would already know them. In either case, no burden would be put on the Gentiles by demanding their observance.... The point would seem to be to provide the basis for table-fellowship and full communion between Jew and Gentile Messianists. (1992:273)

Dollar points out an implication of the decree imposed on the Gentile Christians as follows:

While the past Gentiles could become a part of God’s people only by
losing their own cultural identity, now they can hold to their cultural identity with only minor alterations. Further, Gentiles do not form their own fellowship groups when they become Christians but are brought into a relationship with another group, the Jewish believers, who are also allowed to maintain their own cultural identity, with only minor alternations. The Christian movement is made up of both Jews and Gentiles. (1996:107)

The decision of the Jerusalem Council marks both theological and cultural high points of Acts. In other words, from the missiological viewpoint the Jerusalem Council represents “a revolutionary adaptation” in the history of Christianity. It is an articulation of faith of the church seeking understanding. The early church understood God who calls it as a people through the decision which was the result of a long process. Theologically, recognition of the decision is a long process, but in mission work, practice of cross-cultural adaptation is immediate.

The council made two practical decisions: sending the Jerusalem delegation to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, and sending a letter to Antioch (15:22-25). They were greeted by the whole congregation of the Antioch church. The Jerusalem community fulfilled its great mission by exhorting and strengthening the brothers in Antioch. Also, the Antioch community fully recognized that they were in communion with the Jerusalem church. Before and after the council Luke focused on Paul’s mission to the Gentiles. In
Paul’s mission work we can see how God’s preparation and intervention through the work of the Holy Spirit were at work to fulfill the Great Commission and Acts 1:8.

Without doubt the missional context of the Jerusalem Council would bring the urgent need for Paul to train or disciple missionaries. In other words, the contexts for mission to the Gentiles determined discipling, and training people for cross-cultural mission work (cf. Acts 16).

Summary

In this chapter, I have tried to deal with biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training through the examination of two conversion narratives and the account of the Jerusalem Council in the book of Acts. Those events help us understand why cross-cultural witnesses need to adjust to kingdom values and to have biblical perspectives before going to the people whom they will serve. This means that cross-cultural witnesses need two kinds of conversion, conversion to Christ and cross-cultural conversion. In fact, the conversion models mentioned above enable us to explain the nature of cross-cultural missionary training which is the process in which worldview is radically changed through the work of the
Holy Spirit.

Paul’s conversion and call remind us of some important principles for training missionaries. To be a cross-cultural witness one must give up his/her preconceived or ethnocentric attitudes toward people of other cultures. The Holy Spirit helps us overcome our ethnocentric attitudes. Also the cross-cultural missionary must grow holistically in order to adapt to another culture for effective cross-cultural ministry.

In the New Testament missionary training or discipleship was the corporate eventful process whereby Paul and his missionary band intentionally crossed barriers in discipling the nations. They lived out their covenant love in God’s kingdom under the lordship of Jesus, mobilized by the Holy Spirit, and stimulated by other disciples to action in response to what God was doing in their midst and in the context of their mission in the world. First century Christians were urgently involved in the task of taking the gospel to the nations in the power of the Holy Spirit. As Paul gave himself to witnessing about the risen Christ, establishing communities of believers, and training missionaries, God blessed his mission to the world.

Both Acts 10-11 and Acts 15 contain the essence of Luke’s theological understanding that Gentiles are accepted by faith in Jesus Christ without the
traditional requirement of circumcision, and they have table-fellowship with the Jews. This is referred to as a conversion model. Biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural training cannot be separated from God's special involvement in human history, the incarnation of Jesus Christ.

In this conversion model God's incarnational nature breaks down the cultural barriers between Jews and Gentiles. In fact, incarnational ministry requires a radical conversion in the messengers of the gospel (cf. Kraft 1994:150-153). The conversion of Peter (Acts 10-11) shows that missionaries must not bring their cultural baggage and force the local people to accept it in the name of Christian conversion. Rather, missionaries must adapt to the local culture to proclaim the universal gospel message effectively. This means that Korean missionaries must not insist that their converts to Christ also adopt Korean ways of worship, church organization, and spirituality. Korean missionaries must learn to apply the lessons of Acts 15 to their own cross-cultural ministry. From the perspective of cross-cultural missionary training these biblical principles must be a key factor for training Korean missionaries.

In the next chapter, I examine Korean cultural values and worldview as anthropological foundations for cross-cultural missionary training, and their
influence on Korean missionary work.
Notes

1. See Chapter 1 pages 65-66 about “Incarnational Ministry.”


7. Luke’s intention to show God’s plan for the salvation of the Gentiles is indicated in several places in Luke. The salvation brought by Jesus to Israel is a “light for revelation to the Gentiles” (Luke 2:32). “All flesh shall see the salvation of God” (Luke 3:6; Isaiah 40:5). After his resurrection, Jesus tells his witness that “forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem” (Luke 24:47).

8. “Christian Pharisees” are described as “false brothers” by Paul (Galatians 2:4). Paul considered them as “counterfeit Christians.”


10. In Paul’s case, his conversion experience included both conversion to Christ and cross-cultural conversion as he realized that Jesus is the Lord of the universe and of the church. This means that Paul’s conversion experience made him commit to the lordship of Jesus Christ and participate in a universal community of faith where there is no difference between Jew and Gentile (cf. Senior and Stuhlmueller 1983:191-208).
CHAPTER 4

Understanding the Korean Worldview and Its Influence on Korean Mission Work

Robert Taylor, an American anthropologist, argues that "no missionary can be really successful unless he/[she] knows his/[her] people and their culture" (1954:43). In this sense, missiological anthropology is the most valuable approach to understanding cultural behavior and forms. This can be done through a very sensitive approach to examining one's own culture.

Table 5
Importance of Understanding Korean Culture in Understanding Other Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validation of Korean Culture</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid virtually not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a fair amount</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a considerable amount</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the questionnaire to Korean missionaries (item 3.18), as seen in Table 5, 106 missionaries out of 125 respondents, 84.8 percent response, say that understanding Korean culture is important to understanding other
cultures. In this regard, examining the Korean worldview\(^1\) is a foundation for understanding other cultures. This is the first step in culture training.

Without doubt missionary training must be based on the trainees’ strong calling and spirituality. Nevertheless, lack of understanding of the trainee’s own culture causes more problems than any other because living and working in another culture is a totally different experience. For this reason understanding one’s worldview is one of the most decisive factors in cross-cultural missionary training.

Non-mission training organizations have developed various cross-cultural training programs like culture learning skills for those who want to live and work in cultures other than their own. In their training programs the basis of cultural learning includes a critical and objective examination of one’s own worldview in comparison and contrast with others (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck 1961; Hall 1976; Hofstede 1980, 1991; Stewart and Bennett 1991; Trompenaars 1993).

As seen in my research, most missionary training centers in Korea do not provide a course on “Understanding the Korean Worldview” at a theoretical and practical level. In my research with eight missionary training centers, only one, Global Missionary Training Center, provides the course,
"Understanding Korean Culture." Most of their emphasis on training is on how to plant churches and evangelize people. Surely leading people to Christ is the ultimate task in our missionary enterprise, but without appropriate cross-cultural preparation it can hardly be accomplished. For missionary training centers in Korea it is one of the most neglected areas or tools for cross-cultural training. If missionaries ignore the depth of their cultural formation, they are bound to be frustrated and, finally, the victims of culture shock. If missionaries understand how their culture molded them, they are much better prepared to be competent cross-cultural witnesses (Atkins 1990:269). In this regard, understanding the Korean worldview helps Korean missionaries to establish relationships with people they serve. Korean missionaries tend to be exclusive toward people of other cultures. Because of their monocultural background they are blind to their cultural biases in general and they lack value-oriented cultural training in particular.

In Table 6, 106 Korean missionaries out of 125 respondents, with 84.8 percent responding, say that their Korean monocultural background affects their adjustment to other cultures negatively (item 3.6). This means that Korean missionaries have difficulty relating with local people. This result indicates that missionary training programs in Korea need to focus their
emphasis on cross-cultural adjustment skills through the examination of Korean cultural values and worldview. Jae-Un Kim insists, “To understand oneself is no easy task. And yet, self-understanding happens to be essential to the behavioral and social sciences, for research in these fields are ultimately aimed at improving the welfare of ourselves” (1991:v).

Table 6

Effect of Korean Monocultural Background on Cross-Cultural Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very negatively</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat negatively</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no effect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat positively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very positively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the Korean worldview on the basis of Confucian values. In order to do this, I employ Hofstede’s model of five dimensions of cultural value differences. Prior to discussing Confucian values of the Korean people, I will briefly deal with the formation of Korean culture based on traditional religions of Korea. Finally, I will discuss how the Korean worldview influences Korean mission work.
**Formation of Korean Culture**

Korea has an ancient history and a highly developed culture. Korea is well-known as a monocultural and monolingual society. It is said that Korea was founded in 2333 B.C. by Tangun.² Subsequently the Three Kingdom—Koguryeo, Shilla and Bakje—were established. Shilla absorbed the other two and unified the Korean peninsula in the seventh century A.D. With the decline of Shilla, a new kingdom of Koryo was founded in 935 A.D. It was followed in 1392 A.D. by the Chosun Dynasty, so-called “Yi Dynasty.” In 1910, Japan annexed Korea. Korea was liberated in 1945. Throughout the history of Korea, she was invaded by China and Japan from 57 B.C. to 1910, about 931 times (T. R. Yoon 1994:16).

Historically, Korean people have held deep religious belief. According to Pong Bae Park, the Korean culture is a mixture of three cultural elements; Shamanism, Confucianism, and Buddhism.³ Among them Shamanism was the original cultural soil into which the other two foreign cultures came to Korea around the third and fourth century A.D. respectively. It should be remembered that Shamanism is the key element for understanding the religious mentality of the Korean people (Pong Bae Park 1972:33). Today, in Korea “four major religions coexist in a state of complex intermixture. On
the surface, Buddhism and Christianity flourish, but looming underneath are Confucianism and Shamanism affecting the ways of life among the mass” (Jae Un Kim 1991:69). It means that “the adoption of new beliefs does not mean displacement of the old” (Alford 1999:3).

Formation of Shamanistic Culture

Korea’s ancient religion is Shamanism which prevailed in Northeast Asia. Shamanism is regarded as the foundation of Korean culture because it is an indigenous religion which deeply penetrates the ethos and life of the Korean people. Other religions such as Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, and Christianity were introduced to Korea from outside and became part of the Korean cultural tradition.

The primitive ethos of the Korean people influenced by Korean Shamanism is polytheistic. Boo Woong Yoo points out, although the religious force of Confucianism and Buddhism permeated the social and political life of the people, the people have been retaining shamanistic worldview as the most powerful religious influence upon the population as a whole. However, because shamanism stems from pre-literate societies, and lacks a systematically expressed doctrine, it is difficult not only to comprehend, but also to distinguish from other religions. Moreover, because of its very nature, it has easily borrowed from others and has tended to vary in its expression in different times and places. In this regard, shamanism postulates a universe in which not only human beings but also lower animals
and inanimate things have souls or spirits. (1992:172)

Shamanism was often regarded as inferior to these world religions, which have criticized and resisted shamanistic influences. For instance, in spite of the fact that many Christians visit fortune tellers, most churches deny that they are syncretized with shamanistic faith. But shamanistic influences are shown in the external forms of Korean Christianity such as the emphasis on healing, charismatic appeals in preaching and prayers, material blessings through spiritual power, and the experience of ecstatic trance during worship.

Shamanism may seem to have vanished in the technological and industrial society of Korea today but it still lives in the hearts of the Korean people and is expressed in their lifestyle. For example, the core values emphasized in Shamanism are this-worldly prosperity, material welfare, and life itself. The main concern of Korean Shamanism is earthly blessings in the selfish attainment of wealth, health, and longevity, and personal protection from the curse of evil spirits through shamanistic rituals, gut, performed by mostly female shamans, so-called mudang. Jun Sik Choi says that foreign religions in Korea have been shamanized in order to survive. He insists that every day shamanistic rituals, kutpan, are performed in Korea. He also estimates the number of mudang to be approximately 300,000 (1997:263-
Jung Young Lee insists that “Shamanism as an internal character of the Korean ethos will never disappear, but will continue to reappear in different forms in contemporary life, for it is the native religion of the Korean people” (1997:31). Most Koreans do not regard Shamanism as their religion. Rather, they perceive Shamanism as a religion of a pre-literate society. However, the influence of Shamanism cannot be overlooked.

Considering the influences of Shamanism on Korean Christianity, many Christian practices and patterns tend to be shamanistic or syncretistic in ways that some Korean Christians, including ministers, fail to distinguish the difference between Korean forms and Christian meanings, and so do not realize that Korean “shamanistic” forms could be used to convey Christian meanings. Messages of some Korean revivalists contain shamanistic meanings with Western Christian forms as they usually emphasize offering as a mean of receiving earthly blessings. Younsik Noh argues that “some specific practices or patterns found in prayer meetings in prayer mountain centers and revival meetings are not syncretistic but indigenous” (1998:130). The problem of Korean Christianity is that many Christians seem to “hold dual allegiance both to Jesus Christ and to shamanistic spirits” (1998:130).
Noh insists that “religious patterns of Korean churches are not necessarily syncretistic, but have great potential of being indigenous” (1998:202).

Formation of Buddhist Culture

Buddhism came to Korea in 372 A.D. and was the official state religion until Confucianism was adopted during the Chosun Dynasty in the fourteenth century. Korean Buddhism has its root in Mahayana Buddhism which originated from the teaching of Asoka Kaniska, the greatest exponent of early Buddhism in 270-233 B.C. (Sung Tae Kim 1991:309-310). Along with Shamanism, Buddhism became part of the tradition which nurtured the Korean way of life. Under Buddhism a brilliant civilization arose in Korea during the Three Kingdoms period, the Unified Silla era, and the Koryo Dynasties (935-1392). Jung Young Lee writes,

Korea prospered under Buddhism for more than a thousand years. Many beautiful paintings, sculptures, buildings, ceramics, and literary works which bear the characteristics of Korean Buddhism can still be found throughout Korean society. If Shamanism was the basic building block of Korean civilization, then Buddhism refined that civilization. (1997:32)

However, because the influence of Buddhism was suppressed and rejected under the rule of Confucianism during the 500 years of the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910) in spite of the longest history and the most brilliant
culture in Korea, Buddhism easily incorporated the phenomenon of religious syncretism with its tolerant nature of differences. In this sense it has ruled over the people in a profound combination with Shamanism, which is the conventional popular faith in Korea. John T. Kim says, “The Koryo Dynasty had Buddhism as its national religion, but its kings had a great zeal for Shamanism” (1996:37). In this regard, Korean Buddhism is “shamanized Buddhism.” Sung Tae Kim asserts that “when we observe the present status of Buddhism in Korea, we can say with conviction, that it has been shamanized, although Buddhists may deny this” (1991:309). Mahayana Buddhism has been mixed with Korean Shamanism and became a syncretistic religion. Sung Tae Kim describes the characteristics of syncretized Korean Buddhism as follows: (1) salvation through Boddhisattvas, the Buddhas of second grade; (2) salvation through divine spirits; (3) prayer to Boddhisattvas for blessings; (4) Buddha’s power in scriptures, incantation, or amulets; (5) divine spirits’ power in divination, magic spells, or prayer; and (6) the concept of Western Paradise (1991:211). In addition to these, the experience of suffering, mindfulness, and the idea of Mirukbul, the future Buddha, have shaped Korean values and beliefs. These features of Korean Buddhism still influence Korean people’s life. They also provides a pre-understanding of the
Christian gospel such as "the concept of judgement, life after death, salvation through the help of a deity, and heaven and hell" (Hyun Mo Lee 1992:31-32).

Particularly, the idea of the achievement of the state of Buddha (Nirvana) in this world by accumulating good deeds and virtues contributes to Korean people's behavior patterns, especially in doing good things for others.

**Formation of Confucian Culture**

While Shamanism has mainly influenced Koreans' religious minds, Confucianism has influenced the socio-political characteristics of the Korean people. Many scholars in the area of Koreanology argue that the major cultural influence to shape the Korean worldview came from Confucianism. Koreans attempted to carry their Confucian ideals into practice with a fervor that was almost pathetic during the Chosun Dynasty (1392-1910).

Confucianism as a political norm ruled Korea for 500 years. Confucian values in the family and political systems were almost absolute. Confucianism is still the main current of Korean thought. Fred Alford confirms this when he notes that "Korea is a country still more dedicated to the teachings of Confucius than any other" (1999:x).

In the Chosun Dynasty, the first king, Yi Sung-gae, declared Confucianism the national religion in 1392. It became the norm of the socio-
political system. Koreans took Confucianism so seriously that it became not only a philosophy or a religion but also the dominant political, social, and moral instrument. It seems that Confucianism is closer to ethical and political principles than religious teachings. The heart of Confucianism that has sustained the Korean people is its focus on ancestor worship. Since Confucianism is deeply entrenched in the life of Korea, ancestor worship is still one of the most sacred rites in the minds of the Korean people. It is the soul of the Confucian culture and tradition with which most Korean people identify themselves.

Hofstede insists that “Confucius’ teachings are lessons in practical ethics without any religious content. Confucianism is not a religion but a set of pragmatic rules for daily life derived from what Confucius saw as the lessons of Chinese history” (1991:165). According to Confucius, human relationships should be regulated by the five codes of ethics which are based on the five basic relationships: ruler/subject, father/son, husband/wife, older brother/younger brother, and between friends. “These relationships are based on mutual and complementary obligation as unequal relationships. The junior partner owes the senior respect and obedience. The senior partner owes the junior partner protection and consideration” (Hofstede 1991:165).
Through reviewing various observations and existing studies on the Korean people, Jae Un Kim finds the core elements of the Korean character or personality: filial piety, authoritarianism, family-centered individualism as a kind of collectivism, this-worldly success through education based on the five relationships of Confucianism. He points out twelve basic factors of Korean values and social character: self-centeredness, authoritarianism, order-conscious behavior, endurance, politeness, laxity, defensive self-abasement, superstition, self-centered showing off, warm personality, closedness, traditionalism, and face consciousness and formalism (1991:213-222). He argues that Confucian values are still valid today in the Korean national character because the thought and the behavior patterns of the Koreans do not seem to have undergone any fundamental change in spite of a strong influence of Western cultures (1991:217).

While Confucianism has had influence on Korean people’s behavior and attitudes, Korean Shamanism has formed Korean people’s religious faith at a deep level such as material blessings, healing and exorcism, ecstasy and mystical experiences, spiritual power, and so on. In this respect, when we see that the main problems of Korean mission work are related to the relational area and leadership style, Confucianism has had more influence on
Korean mission work than has Shamanism.

Understanding the Korean Worldview

In this section, the Korean worldview and values such as the temperament, personality, structure of mind, and patterns of behavior of the Korean people is discussed from the perspective of Confucian cultural traits. To do this, Hofstede's model of five dimensions of national cultures\textsuperscript{7} is adopted. This can be regarded as a grand model for it provides a broad range of cultural traits. The purpose of this model is to promote cooperation among nations through comparing and contrasting different national cultures (Hofstede 1991:12). The goal of this discussion is to identify the specific values, attitudes, and behaviors of the Koreans that missionary trainers and trainees can learn in order to develop effective cross-cultural ministry. It is also to discover how much the Korean worldview affects Korean mission work.

Power Distance: Authoritarian Character of the Koreans

Hofstede defines power distance as:

the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. Institutions are the basic elements of society like the family, school, and the community; organizations are the places where people work. Power distance is thus explained from the value of
the less powerful members. The way power is distributed is usually explained from the behavior of the more powerful members, the leaders rather than those led. (1991:28)

One of the most prominent characteristics of Korean culture is authoritarianism. Condon and Yousef (1975) distinguish among three cultural patterns: democratic, authority-centered, and authoritarian. High power distance is correlated with authoritarianism. In other words, cultures with high power distance usually foster and encourage emotions that present status differences and hierarchical role relationships. In Hofstede’s Power Distance Index (PDI), among fifty-three countries the most high power distance countries are found in South Asian, South American, Caribbean, and African countries (1991:26). South Korea ranks twenty-seventh out of fifty-three countries, with a score of sixty. Among those countries that I visited for my field research, the Philippines ranks fourth, Indonesia eighth/ninth, Singapore thirteenth, and Thailand twenty-first/twenty-third.

I expected that Korea would rank much higher than this. What does this mean? Jun Sik Choi, professor at Ewha Women’s University in Seoul, Korea, argues that though Koreans have the fixed sense of order as they are very authoritarian and hierarchical in general, they are eager to pursue human equality. In other words, as much as authority forces people to obey, they
tend to struggle against authority in order to pursue equality (1997:188).

According to Hofstede (1991), there are many dimensions of the power distance continuum classified by family, school, work place, politics, and ideas. In large power distance countries there are two basic norms (Hofstede 1991:3). First, inequality among people is both expected and desired. Second, less powerful people should depend on the more powerful; in practice, less powerful people are polarized between dependence and counter-dependence. Hofstede states the ideas of the large power distance situation as follows: (1) Might prevails over right: whoever holds the power is right and good; (2) Skills, wealth, power, and status should go together; (3) The middle class is small; (4) The powerful have privileges; (5) Powerful people try to look as impressive as possible; and (6) Power is based on family or friends, charisma, and ability to use force (1991:43). These ideas are easily seen in Korean society as influences of Confucianism. Jae Un Kim delineates this trait of social relations of Korean society as follows:

The dichotomized mode of social relations, the typical Confucian framework of inter-personal relationships, deeply embedded in the mind of the Korean people, has molded all the human relations into a pattern of dominance and subordination. It has bred authoritarianism in the mind of those in the position of power, and the tendencies of submission, servility, flattery, double-play or compliance in the behavior of the powerless. (1991:214-215)
According to Hofstede, the high power distance situation rooted in family systems can be expressed as the following: Parents teach children obedience and children treat parents with respect (1991:32). "The impact of the family on our mental programming is extremely strong, and programs set at this stage are very difficult to change" (Hofstede 1991:33).

Among the five relationships of Confucianism, the relationship between father and son is the key to all relationships in life. The essence of the father-son relationship is filial piety which becomes the cornerstone for familial, social, and political life. Filial piety is the central value extending to all human relations. Jae Un Kim calls this basic relation between father and son "a binary-relative relationship" which is upheld to keep stability and order (1991:58). This binary-relative relationship is typified as relationships between king and subject, husband and wife, and the like. To the ruling class, the yangban, the family was an important pillar of society. The family always overruled other social institutions. In this regard, there is a clear hierarchical order between the older and the younger people. This hierarchical order consists of obedience and respect to the older and nurture for the younger. This relationship is usually expressed in the dependency of less powerful people on more powerful people. Dependency on older or
more powerful people directly connects to other social institutions such as school, company, and politics.

The large power distance can be seen in the Korean educational system. According to Hofstede, tendencies toward large power distance at school is that teachers are expected to take all initiative in class as gurus who transfer their wisdom and knowledge to students, and students treat teachers with honor and respect (1991:37). In a society, people's cultural values, attitudes, and behavior are learned at home and school. The child learns and acquires his/her parents' values, attitudes, and behavior. And those things are further developed at school mostly by teachers and classmates. "Teachers and classmates inculcate additional values, being part of culture that honors these values" (Hofstede 1991:33). Values and behavior in families are often carried out at school. Hofstede says, "In the large power distance situation the parent-child inequality is perpetuated by a teacher-student inequality which caters to the need for dependence well established in the student's mind" (1991:34).

In this respect, as Paulo Freire (1970) points out, in "the banking concept of education" the educational process is teacher-centered as the teacher transfers his/her knowledge to students. In the classroom there is
supposed to be a strict order with the teacher initiating all communication. Students must respect and obey the teacher and teachers are not criticized nor contradicted by students. For instance, students must stand up when the teacher enters the classroom, and the students must give a respectful salutation to the teacher led by the class leader. In the classroom nobody is allowed to ask a question without permission from the teacher. Also, there can seldom be free discussion about issues, only taking notes that the teacher teaches and writes on the blackboard.

In this sense, education is meant to nurture Confucian virtues and thus is a means of succeeding in life. Koreans are almost fanatical about education and academic degrees. Education today remains an important value to the Korean people. The real purpose of education is to attain high status and fame. Most Koreans want to attend the best schools and attain the highest academic degrees, and Korean parents want their children to attend the best schools to become government officials in particular. This means that they bring honor to their family through attaining high status, fame, wealth, and power.

The role pairs parent-child and teacher-student are complemented with the role pair boss-subordinate. Their attitudes toward parents, especially
father, and toward teachers are easily transferred toward bosses at work places (Hofstede 1991:35). According to Hofstede, the characteristics of the large power distance situation in work places are as follows: (1) Hierarchy in organizations reflects the existential inequality between higher-up and lower-down; (2) Centralization is popular; (3) Wide salary range between top and bottom of organization; (4) Subordinates expect to be told what to do; (5) The ideal boss is a benevolent autocrat or good father; and (6) Privileges and status symbols for managers are both expected and popular (1991:37).

Hofstede points out, “Relationships between subordinates and superiors in a large power distance organizations are frequently loaded with emotions” (1991:36). Jun Sik Choi says that the Korean people regard the ideal boss as a father-like figure in spite of lack of managing ability rather than a time and achievement-oriented figure (1997:192). Patterns of these relationships can easily be seen in the Korean churches between the senior pastor and the assistant pastors. Also, it can be assumed that Korean missionaries have learned this value relating to the leadership pattern in Korean society. This top-down leadership pattern has affected Korean missionaries to conflict with fellow missionaries and local ministers.

Finally, features of Hofstede’s large power distance in politics are as
follows: (1) The way to change a political system is by changing the people at the top (revolution); (2) Domestic political conflicts frequently lead to violence; (3) Autocratic or oligarchic government is based on cooperation; (4) The political spectrum, if allowed to be manifested, shows weak center and strong wings; and (5) Prevailing political ideologies stress and practice power struggle (1991:43).

The characteristics of the large power distance situation mentioned above are enough to explain Korean values and attitudes in terms of political culture. Confucianism offers practical ethics for maintaining the political system, which is based on family-centered values. Kyung Il Kim, professor at Kookmin University in Korea, criticizes Confucianism by saying that Confucian ethics exist only for politics, the superior, the male, and the elderly, not for common people. Confucian culture came into peoples' lives as the political ideology of the Chosun Dynasty in 1392 A.D., and it still rules over every sphere of Korean people's life (1999:7). The political structure of the Chosun Dynasty, based on Confucian principles, possessed the ultimate power of physical coercion within the society. In order to preserve the system, it was necessary to have not only a political organization to support it and a value system to legitimize it, but it also required a social structure,
especially the family, which incessantly furnished various forms of obedience
(Jae Un Kim 1991:59).

Some salient characteristics of Korean political culture originated
mostly from Confucian tradition (Jae Un Kim 1991:59-61; Kyung Dong Kim
1992:492-516). The most persistent behavior pattern in Korean political
culture is bureaucratic tradition which originated from the political system of
the Chosun Dynasty. It was reinforced by the Japanese colonial militaristic
bureaucracy during the Japanese occupation (1910-1945) and still persists in
the present bureaucracy.

Another feature is strong collectivism in which power centers on a
leader. One could say that parochialism is another feature, for it is rooted in
the exclusive obsession on the nation as an extension of the family. In this
sense, similarly obsession on the church, denomination, or mission
organization is an extension of the family. Factionalism and localism stem
from parochialism. For example, regional conflict between Kyeongsang
province and Cheolla province in Korea shows a good case of collectivism
(cf. Min and Kim 1991). In relation to politics, those two provinces
inevitably manifest themselves in a serious conflicting relationship because
these have been the two big political forces in Korean society. Also there
should be added some other features of Korean political culture such as political distrust, apathy and alienation, popular insurgencies, and protest.

It can be assumed that a political structure of small constitutions such as companies, civil organizations, and religious denominations usually accord with a national political structure. In this sense, the mission structure of the Korean church and values of Korean missionaries can never be separated from the main social structure. For instance, denominationalism in mission structure can be understood from the perspective of the exclusive obsession on the family.

Collectivism: We-ness (Uri Consciousness) of the Koreans

In their article, “We-ness: A Korean Discourse of Collectivism” (1994), Sang-Chin Choi and Soo-Hyang Choi argue that the Western individualist perspective of collectivism can hardly explain the collectivistic characteristics of Korean society. They write that “the current Western notion of group is hardly expected to take even the slightest grasp of the indigenous notion of Korean collectivism” (1994:58). Collectivism is associated with group-based disposition and functioning. The term “we-ness” proposes an indigenous discourse of Korean collectivism. But unlike the Western concept of group discourse that persons are individuated
elements of the whole, the Korean individual parts are not "glued" to the whole. Choi and Choi assert that "individual persons in a Korean context of collectivism are invisible concepts. They are physically present, but not psychosocially recognizable" (1994:78). In this sense, we can find a discourse of Korean collectivism in a family-centered social structure.

The most dominant value in the Korean society is related to the family. As mentioned above, the family is the basic social structure extending to all other social structures and human relations. This is called "familistic collectivism." The archetype of Korean collectivism is familism. It seems that collectivism is the most appropriate term to describe Korean values and worldview (cf. Jun Sik Choi 1997:25).

According to Hofstede, the dimension of individualism and collectivism are defined as follows:

Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. (1991:51)

In Hofstede's individualism index (IDV), South Korea ranks forty-third out of fifty-three countries, with a score of eighteen (1991:53). This means that
Korea is a strong collectivist society. The most individualistic society is the United States as it ranks first. In IDV, the Philippines ranks thirty first, both Singapore and Thailand thirty-ninth/forty-first, and Indonesia forty-seventh/forty-eighth. That means Korea is more collectivistic than the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, and less collectivistic than Indonesia.

Harry C. Triandis, in his book *Individualism and Collectivism* (1995), identifies the cultural syndromes of collectivism and individualism in four dimensions of the constructs as follows: (1) the definition of self is interdependent in collectivism and independent in individualism; (2) personal and communal goals are closely aligned in collectivism and not at all aligned in individualism; (3) cognitions that focus on norms, obligations, and duties guide much of social behavior in collectivist cultures, and that focus on attitudes, personal needs, rights, and contracts guide social behavior in individualistic cultures; and (4) whereas an emphasis on relationships is common in collectivist cultures, in individualist cultures the emphasis is on rational analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of maintaining a relationship (1995:43-44).

Triandis writes,

There are four kinds of self: independent or interdependent and same or
different. The combinations of these four types can be categorized as horizontal individualism (independent/same) and horizontal collectivism (interdependent/same), vertical individualism (independent/different) and vertical collectivism (interdependent/different). In collectivist cultures, horizontal includes a sense of social cohesion and of oneness with members of the ingroup. Vertical includes a sense of serving the ingroup and sacrificing for the benefit of the ingroup and doing one’s duty. In both individualist and collectivist cultures, the vertical dimension accepts inequality, and rank has its privileges. This is reflective of “different self.” In contrast, the horizontal dimension emphasizes that people should be similar on most attributes, especially status. This reflects the “same self,” which does not want to stand out. (1995:44)

According to Hofstede’s survey on the relationship between the power distance index and the individualism index (1991:54), collectivism is correlated with the high power distance. In other words, large power distance countries tend to be more collectivist, and small power distance countries to be more individualistic. According to Hofstede’s research, Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and Singapore are classified as both high power distance and collectivistic countries (1991:54). Hofstede says, “In view of the correlation between power distance and collectivism one could consider them as two manifestations of one single dimension of cultural differences” (1991:56).

Some distinctive features of collectivism appear in Korean society. Whereas individualism is associated with a nuclear family structure,
collectivism is associated with an extended family structure. Also, collectivism leads to the distinction between ingroup and outgroups. Today, Korean society, under the influence of Western culture, especially American individualism, continues to change its family structure from the traditional extended family structure to a nuclear family system. Thus the Korean family structure is a form of nuclear family externally, but is essentially different from the American nuclear family structure. Though Korean people separate from their parents or grandparents after marriage, they often depend on their parents for decisions on important family matters.

What is the root of this vertical collectivism that emphasizes interdependency and hierarchy or high power distance? As mentioned above, the core of the five relationships of Confucianism is filial piety. In other words, Confucian principles start from a teaching of father-and-son relationship, not mother-and-daughter relationship. Here we can see the root of Korean familism that clearly divides between ingroup and outgroups. As I mentioned, Koreans prefer “we” (Uri) to “I,” Uri means a house or a fence. If a Korean says uri, it indicates a very close relationship. Traditional Korean houses were usually built to protect the family members from natural disasters and outside attacks. Regarding this housing structure, if the inside of the
house is community and a safe place, the outside is enemy and a dangerous place. The sense of duty and responsibility as an ingroup member to make harmony may be strong inside the home but may be diluted and concealed out of the home.

In language usage Koreans prefer "we" to "I" when we designate individual selves. For instance, Korean husbands say "our wife" when they actually mean "my wife." This is never found in a culture outside Korea. In Korea, the use of words "I" and "you" is restricted. "I" as an individual has to be concealed behind the cause of family, clan, and some collective obligations. Koreans do not use the word "you" or people's first name. Using these words is offense and means disrespect to others, especially elderly people. Instead, they use an honorary suffix, nim, that can follow after a person's family name according to his or her status. In fact, "we" comes to be used not as an expression of "I" into some collective identity, but rather as an escape of self into some collective identity. Alford says, "The heavy presence of we-words in Korean society demonstrates that 'we-ness' is a value" (1999:36). Regarding this, Confucianism determines the collectivistic tendency of Korean society in every arena of people's life.

In Korean society the most intimate social structure is the family. The
family is the central structure extending into other social structures (Jun Sik Choi 1997:38). Every social norm is attributed to the family norm. In other words, the family is the basic unit for governing a nation, so filial piety to one’s father may be extended to a king. In this sense, obeying father at home is the same as obeying a king, an expression of filial piety.

In his book, Character of Korean Culture (1997), Bong Young Choi, professor at Hangkong University in Seoul, Korea, states the principles and practices of Confucian familism. The core of the Confucian value system is the family. According to relationships between people, the family structure is divided into two kinds of social systems. One is the family, based on the relationship between father and son, which represents blood relationship. In the family one’s life is inherited from parents and ancestors, so it exists in relationships with ancestors and their descendants. One’s individual life is preserved and inherited in the family as a part of family life. Therefore one’s duty is to preserve the collective family life by maintaining family honor and fame.

The other social system is the nation based on the principle of governing and caring for people. One’s duty to the nation is to carry out one’s social responsibility for the public so that the nation’s history proceeds
and culture is preserved. In Confucianism the relationship between ruler and ruled is seen as an expression of filial piety. Usually blood relationship makes people exclusive to outgroups. In contrast, in relationship with the nation people include others. In a Korean context, an ideal social system is where these two norms, the relationship between father and son and between ruler and ruled, complement each other. But when loyalty to the family overrules other social responsibilities, family-centered exclusivism dominates people's social values. So people are not interested in public affairs for social good but only care about their family matters (1997:92-95). In this sense, people are willing to die for the sake of their family honor and name, but not for the public. Choi and Choi write,

The Korean individual parts are not independently flexible agents of which aggregate could render an instant configuration of group as circumstances demand. They are immovable parts of a fixed whole; taken out of the particular whole, they cannot renew immediately their membership in another whole. Their part is not transferable to another whole as a single element. Evidently, despite the alleged group-oriented tendency of the Koreans, public or common solidarity at the levels of community or nation is a largely absent concept in Korean society. (1994:64-65)

Several examples of familistic collectivism appear in Korea. We can see the extreme collectivism in the political leader of North Korea, Il Sung Kim. The North Korean people called him father. Also in South Korea Sun
Myung Mun, founder of the Muni Church, is called father by the church members.

In this respect, filial piety still tops all other virtues and when it comes in conflict with other social virtues it overrides them. In Confucian principles filial piety can only sustain family ties and solidarity. Furthermore, it is the foundation for sustaining the political structure as well as other social systems. The most important expression of filial piety is ancestor worship. According to Confucian ethics, not only must people exhibit filial piety, but they also ought to carry their duty to take care of their deceased parents through ancestor worship. Jun Sik Choi argues that ancestor worship is a Confucian way to strengthen familial collectivism and remember one’s ancestors (1997:78-81). In this sense, “Death is not the end. It is the exchange of existence in which the person moves from the world of the living to become a part of the world of the ancestors” (Burnett 1990:61).

Many examples reveal how Koreans cling to their own family and clan. One of the most well-known cases is the genealogical table. In Korea genealogy is more highly developed than any place in the world. Most kinship groups organize a clan association, chongchinhoe, the main purpose of which is to publish a genealogical table, worship ancestors, and hold
meetings to strengthen kinship ties and unity. A negative aspect of *chongchinhoe* is that members of a clan or kin group would form strong exclusive attitudes toward outgroups. Also, they seldom think about the public good for society or the nation even though they have strong solidarity with the ingroup members (Jun Sik Choi 1997:82-85).

Also, Koreans show a collectivistic character when they get married. In traditional society, marriage was not a individual matter but a family matter. An individual could never intervene in his/her marriage. Today, under the influence of Western individualism, it is not difficult for young people to choose their spouses for marriage. But without parents’ permission it would be hard for them to get married. In Korea marriage means making a connection between two families.

Koreans usually send a gift to special birthday parties of an employee’s parents or parents-in-law. Also they send condolences to employees whose parents and grandparents died. They congratulate employees when their children get married. Even the school admission of an employee’s child is cause for congratulation.

Regarding the above tendencies, Hofstede states,

In the collectivist family children learn to take their bearings from
others when it comes to opinions. "Personal opinions" do not exist: they are predetermined by the group.... The loyalty to the group which is an essential element of the collectivist family also means that resources are shared.... Obligations to the family in a collectivist society are not only financial but also ritual. Family celebrations like baptisms, marriages, and especially funerals are extremely important and should not be missed. (1991:59)

In this respect, an ingroup-oriented character is the most salient characteristic of Korean collectivism. In Korean society ingroup-based social networks are the highly sophisticated genealogical system and people's general concern with it, various connections of collective origins such as family, region, school, work place, religious, political party, and so on.

Collectivist societies are shame cultures whereas individual societies are guilt cultures (Dodd 1995:106). In collectivist cultures it is important for people to save face. If one loses face, the whole group to which he/she belongs is ashamed. It is regarded as losing one's group identity (cf. Hofstede 1991:60-61). "Shame cultures have a way of looking inwardly for collective obligation and responsibility. If duty is overlooked, it could cause shame to someone else, which in turn would cause you to be ashamed" (Dodd 1995:106). In his article "The Koreans, Their Cultures and Personality" (1994), Tae-Rim Yoon sees the root of shame culture in relation to saving face in Confucian moralism. He says that under the influence of the
Confucian concept of morality, in Korean society there is a tendency to value external forms which make people’s behavior fall into formalism and mannerism (1994:21). In a collectivist society, a person’s behavior depends on what others might think of him/her. In this regard, what others would think about me is a real matter of concern. This attitude or behavior pattern is called nunchi. Nunchi may be translated as the tendency to try to read others’ mind and to probe others’ motives (Jae Un Kim 1991:114-115).

We can see the group-oriented attitude and behavior pattern at school in the collectivist society. Hofstede writes,

In the collectivist classroom the virtues of harmony and the maintenance of “face” reign supreme. Confrontations and conflicts should be avoided, or at least formulated so as not to hurt anyone; even students should not lose face if this can be avoided. Shaming, that is invoking the group’s honor, is an effective way of correcting offenders; they will be put in order by their ingroup members. At all times the teacher is dealing with the students as part of an ingroup, never as an isolated individual. (1991:62)

In the Korean society these tendencies in the educational system hinder students from self-reflection and self-consciousness. In the classroom even if one knows that one is right, one tends to refrain from pushing an opinion too hard in order to save one’s own face and not offend others. Also, Korean students are expected to be modest and deferent nonverbally in the presence
of their instructors. In the collectivist society the purpose of education is learning how to maintain harmony with others, and the diplomas or certificates which result from successful completion of study provide entry into higher status groups (Hofstede 1991:63). In this regard, the higher degree one gets, the better job or marriage partner one can choose. Also, with an acknowledged diploma or certificate one can honor one's family and ingroup. In other words, "The social acceptance that comes with the diploma is more important than the individual self-respect that comes with mastering a subject" (Hofstede 1991:63).

In the Korean society under the influence of a strong hierarchical social system and an emphasis on bureaucratic tradition, the motivation to elevate status through education is unusually strong. "This status-achievement-orientation so pervasive during the Chosun Dynasty has been transmitted to the contemporary 'diploma disease' and the system of education which puts too much emphasis on book learning and blind memorizing" (Jae Un Kim 1991:118). Fred Alford (1999:32-33) points out that Koreans tend to be individualistic and competitive in consideration of the system of competitive exams for university admission. Their future depends on this exam so that family members are willing to spend 30 to 40 percent of their income to
provide their children with private tutoring. According to Alford, the individualistic and competitive tendencies of Koreans are explained in a way that "Koreans are not separate individuals to begin with, so the individualistic competition you see is not really competition among individuals at all, but among families, the individual always representing more than him or herself" (1999:33).

When we see the collectivist tendency in the workplace, "an employer never hires just an individual, but a person who belongs to an ingroup. The employee will act according to the interest of this ingroup, which may not always coincide with his or her individual interest" (Hofstede 1991:63). In this sense, the workplace itself is an ingroup. Hofstede points out, "The relationship between employer and employee is seen in moral terms. It resembles a family relationship with mutual obligations of protections in exchange for loyalty" (1991:64). In the collectivist society business can not be done without building a personal relationship and establishing trust. The personal relationship prevails over the task and should be established first. In order to make a successful deal one must be recognized as an ingroup member. In Korean society the people connection plays a crucial role in running business and politics. When one applies to a company or institution,
it is more important to have a close connection with those in high position in a company or institution than to have a strong ability to accomplish a given task. For instance, the "school connection factionalism" is prevalent in Korean society. Among the faculties of Seoul National University more than 90 percent are the graduates of the same school. Another example is that International Monetary Fund diagnosed the biggest problem of Korean economy as nepotism of a few big companies, so-called chaebol. Korean economy has been run by a few chaebol (conglomerates). The top five chaebol own so many diverse businesses that together they produce almost 50 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In a sense, close government-business relationships have made the rapid economic development possible under the governments of military government. Confronting the IMF crisis, the Korean government is trying to work out the chaebol-centered economic system in order to revive the Korean economy.

This "connectionism" can be applied to politics. The political system of a nation is rooted in people's values. As seen in characteristics of the high power distance society, the relationship between a nation and its people resembles the relationships between parents and child, teacher and student, and boss and subordinate. Hofstede states that in the collectivist society the
state controls the economic system and political power is exercised by
interest groups (1991:73). Kyung Dong Kim points out that one of main
characteristics of the Korean political structure is "connection-centered
collectivistic factionalism" (1992:505). The core of the political connection is
the blood connection, but according to the political interest of an ingroup its
scope may be extended to regional, educational, religious, or work place
connections. It is like a connection net. Through sustaining the political
connection a political boss can continue to hold power. This political,
factional connectionism centered on political bosses is related to "regional
conflict" as mentioned above.

Collectivistic ideas and attitudes in Korean mission work hamper the
cross-cultural ministry effectiveness. One of distinct features of collectivism
is connectionism. This tendency is connected to local church-centered
missions. Many missionaries sent and supported by local churches are not
administered by mission agencies so that they work as lone rangers. For
those missionaries local churches are more cohesive ingroups. In this case,
cooperation between sending churches and mission agencies is difficult.
Also, collectivistic ideas and attitudes are connected to competition which
hampers partnership with other mission agencies, other missionaries, and
local churches. This will be further discussed later in this chapter.

**Korean Culture: Its Masculine and Feminine Tendency**

Hofstede defines masculinity and femininity as follows:

Masculinity pertains to societies in which social gender roles are clearly distinct (i.e., men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life); femininity pertains to society in which social gender roles overlap (i.e., both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life). (1991:82-83)

In this definition, characteristics of masculine society fit with Korean society. However, according to Hofstede’s masculinity index (MAS), Korea ranks forty-first out of fifty-three countries with the score of thirty-nine. This means that Korea is a feminine society. Japan, with similar cultural values to Korea’s, ranks first. This means that Japan is the most masculine society. How can this be explained? Hofstede writes that the terms, masculinity and femininity, as indicating socio-cultural role distinction “are relative, not absolute: a man can behave in a ‘feminine’ way and a woman in a ‘masculine’ way; this only means they deviate from certain conventions in their society” (1991:80). But I think that Hofstede’s survey shows only one side of the Korean cultural pattern. The other side of the Korean cultural values relates to the Confucian view of women’s social status and role.
As seen above, Confucianism supports the idea that men are superior to women. Korean women were born to be inferior to men. To be sure, Korea is a patriarchal society. Nevertheless, a woman keeps her own family name without taking her husband’s family name after marriage. But Korean women’s names are not recorded on the genealogical table. Performance of their duty was limited to the home and they had no right to inherit the family property or participate in ancestor worship. As seen above, the five relationships of Confucianism are hierarchical. They indicate respect and obedience to the powerful member. In Korean traditional society the father’s authority was almost absolute. Relatively, the mother’s role was limited to the home as a housewife, and the mother submitted to the father (cf. Hofstede 1991:87). In this case, in the extended family role models are clear. Also, in the family gender-related values and behaviors are taught by parents in subtle ways. Among the characteristics of both masculine and feminine societies (cf. Hofstede 1991:96, 103), Korean social values are mostly related to the masculine tendencies.

In the *Analects of Confucius* only one phrase mentions women’s status. That is, it is hard to control women and the grassroots because if they are not acknowledged or focused they feel ignored, and if they are recognized they
are arrogant (Jun Sik Choi 1997:201). This reveals Confucius' view of women and that Confucius and his followers were not concerned about women. So it can be easily assumed that under the strong influence of Confucianism (later it was strengthened by Neo-Confucianism during the Chosun Dynasty), discrimination against women existed and still exists in Korean society today.

In a Confucian society such as Korea, patriarchy, distorting the image of humanity, has oppressed, exploited, maimed, and killed women. A wife should obey her husband's commandments. Korean women have suffered under the Confucian social structure for many years. In the teaching of Confucianism, women are seen as inferior to men. Because Shamanism had been forbidden in Confucian society, Korean Shamanism is called "a religion of women" and is a strong advocate of women. Traditionally, in Confucianism the role of women was to stay at home, bear children, serve their husbands, affine and husbands' ancestors, and avoid interference in their husbands' outside affairs. Man Ja Choi describes the double oppression of Korean women:

Confucian ethical norms on women is rigidly institutionalized, and it is markedly male-based. There was a thought of namjonyobi, male high female low. This was rationalized as the
"way of Heaven." Among the ideas with namjonyobi property are the following: samjongjido, which means a woman must follow three things, her father, husband, and son; bulgyongibu, which means women must not remarry; and yopiljongbu, which means women must obey their husbands. (1992:23)

In this context, the lives of Korean women were often exceedingly difficult and expressed in the experience of severe physical and mental dysfunction. Patriarchy produces women's Han, the deep wound of the heart and the soul. This aspect of women's status has contributed to the rapid growth of the Korean church. In other words, the gospel has been accepted by women more than by men. Korean women are more receptive than Korean men to the Christian gospel because the gospel contains the good news of liberation for women from gender discrimination as well as from sin.

The outcome of Hofstede's survey on the part of masculinity and femininity which suggests Korea is classified as a feminine society can be explained. Jun Sik Choi insists that after the middle of the seventeenth century the Chosun Dynasty strengthened the Neo-Confucian principles, especially patriarchy. Before the Chosun Dynasty adopted Confucianism as a national religion, in Korean society women's status was higher than in the Chosun Dynasty and their roles were more varied. For instance, there were three queens during the Silla Dynasty. Also, the traditional marriage custom
was that not only did the groom get married and stayed in the bride’s house for several years as a worker, but also he should bring a bride price when he went to the bride’s house. In fact, under the influence of Confucianism the era of the Chosun Dynasty was the period during which women’s social status became lower and their role was diminished. Today Korean society still keeps the masculine tendencies as a man-centered society. But the other dimension, the feminine character, coexists at a subconscious level in people’s mind (1997:203-208).

In cross-cultural missionary training, the training system must not be hierarchical and man-centered. Rather, it must emphasize equality between men and women to facilitate woman’s roles and to create a learning community in mutual respect and help. Cross-cultural missionary training centers in Korea need to develop curricula for single woman missionaries and missionary spouses. This may help to facilitate woman missionaries’ roles in Korean mission work.

**Intolerance of Differences: Strong Uncertainty Avoidance Tendency of the Koreans**

As a cultural dimension, feelings of uncertainty or ambiguity are acquired or learned in a society. Also these are shared with other members of
one's society. Hofstede says that every human society has developed ways to alleviate anxiety which is created by extreme uncertainty and ambiguity. These ways include religion, law, and technology. Technology helps people avoid uncertainties caused by nature. The main purpose of laws and rules is to prevent uncertainties in the behavior of other people. Religions provide people with the chance to avoid uncertainties through the ultimate certainty of life or by providing power to control a human's personal future (1991:110-111).

Hofstede defines uncertainty avoidance as "the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations. This feeling is, among other things, expressed through nervous stress and in a need for predictability: a need for written and unwritten rules" (1991:113). In relation to cross-cultural adjustment this dimension has some important insights. We can discuss racism, colonialism, imperialism, and ethnocentrism in terms of this dimension. Especially, monocultural and monolingual societies like Korea tend to avoid uncertainties and ambiguities. In Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance index (UAI), Korea ranks sixteenth/seventeenth with the score of eighty-five out of fifty-three countries. Among countries where I interviewed Korean missionaries and local
ministers, Thailand ranks thirtieth, Indonesia forty-first/forty-second, the Philippines forty-fourth, and Singapore fifty-third. Whereas Korea is a strong uncertainty avoidance society, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Singapore are classified as weak uncertainty avoidance societies. Especially, Singapore ranks last, which means the weakest uncertainty avoidance society. The tendency of Korean missionaries in those countries to pursue visible results quickly can be explained by the characteristics of the strong uncertainty avoidance. This often creates conflicts with local ministers in those countries because they do not show aggression and emotion for obtaining visible results. The different attitudes and values between Korean missionaries and ministers in those countries cause cross-cultural conflicts.

Hofstede states that a country’s neuroticism or anxiety scores are strongly correlated with uncertainty avoidance. Strong uncertainty avoidance is negatively correlated with risk taking and positively correlated with fear of failure. He delineates the characteristics of anxiety in relation to uncertainty avoidance (1991:114-116). Possible outcomes of anxiety are high suicide rate, high death rate caused by alcoholism, high accident rate, high rate of prisoners. Tendencies of anxious cultures are intuitive, expressive, emotional, busy, aggressive, active, and fidgety which relate to people’s
strong nonverbal expression in conversation. These actions are socially acceptable in those cultures. Men in those cultures often use alcohol for a way of releasing anxiety. Also, people in those cultures drive vehicles very fast which means more fatal accidents, thus more risk.

The characteristics of the strong uncertainty avoidance mentioned above fit the Koreans. It is well known that suicide rates and accident rates are high in South Korea. South Korea has the highest car accident rates and second highest industrial disaster rate in the world. Korean taxi drivers are notorious for driving very fast. Also, South Korea is one of the main consumers in the world wine market. Many foreign people agree that Korean people always hurry, so that they often try to finish things on time without considering quality. Korean people are regarded as “the busiest people” in the world (Jun Sik Choi 1997:217-219). To some extent, the rapid growth of the Korean economy can be explained by this tendency. In other words, Korean people desire to see a visible outcome in a short period of time. Some tragic accidents in the 1990s may be related to this tendency. For instance, in 1995 the Sampoong department store completely collapsed and killed over 500 people. In the same year the Grand Sungsu bridge collapsed and killed thirty-seven people, including young students. To a large extent,
these accidents and other small accidents were attributed to the "visible outcome-centered attitude" of the Koreans.

Historically, the tendency of the strong uncertainty avoidance is attributed to the fact that Korea has been invaded almost 1,000 times by surrounding countries due to geopolitical reasons. In the last 100 years Korea has experienced socio-political turmoil: the Japanese annexation (1910-1945), the Korean war (1950-1953), and military regimes (1961-1992). Throughout Korea's modern history the cold war brought an unresolved tragic situation to the Korean peninsula, the division between North and South for fifty-two years. People's anxiety increased due to the military encounter with North Korea.

According to Hofstede, in strong uncertainty avoidance cultures parents teach their children what is dirty and dangerous. These classifications of "do and do not" are tight and absolute. There is a tendency toward xenophobia\(^1\): "what is different, is dangerous" (1991:118-119). This tendency correlates with the strong collectivistic tendency that an ingroup regards outgroups as different and dangerous people. This attitude is also connected to ethnocentrism.\(^2\)

Confucian principles show tendencies of strong uncertainty avoidance.
The five relationships of Confucianism indicate it. Confucian norms are so tight and absolute in a way that the distinction of “do and do not” is clear. When one did not follow the rules and norms, he or she was dislocated from society. Such was the life of people in the Chosun Dynasty. In this regard, the influences of Confucianism is so strong that Korean people tend to exclude foreigners. For instance, today discrimination against foreign laborers who come mostly from South Asian countries is a big issue in Korean society. Some factory owners exploit them with hard work and a low monthly wage, which are illegal according to Korean industrial law.

In education “students from strong uncertainty avoidance countries expect their teachers to be the experts who have all the answers. Teachers who use cryptic academic language are respected” (Hofstede 1991:119). These tendencies can be easily seen in classes in Korean schools. Korean students tend not to conflict with their teachers by suggesting different opinions from the teachings of the teachers. This must be understood with the dimension of the high power distance. The educational system in Korea does not aim for students to learn how to learn and think creatively but to memorize an amount of knowledge from what teachers teach. The real purpose of education is to successfully get through the university entrance
exam and finally to get a better job.

As mentioned above, in strong uncertainty avoidance cultures laws and rules function to prevent uncertainties in the behavior of people. According to Hofstede, “The emotional need for laws and rules in a strong uncertainty avoidance society often leads to the establishing of rules or rule-oriented behaviors which are clearly nonsensical, inconsistent, or dysfunctional” (1991:121). These laws and rules often prevent people from thinking up innovative or creative ideas. In politics a conservative party often takes the majority and resists innovative ideas and thoughts. In Korea there is much red tape in government offices. Government officials rigidly follow the laws and rules. Also, in a strong uncertainty avoidance society nationalism, extremism, fundamentalism, and repression of minority groups prevail in people’s attitudes.

In relation to the Korean Protestant church, to some extent the rapid growth of the Korean church is caused by the conservative and fundamental Presbyterian church mission. The Presbyterian church has been divided into more than 100 denominations. The reason is because of dogmatic differences and power struggles. The early church mission provided the people, who underwent severe sufferings with socio-political turmoil, a strong certain hope
that people could overcome the uncertain situations only with the Christian gospel. The other group that holds the tendency of the strong uncertainty avoidance is the North Korean communist regime. In fact, Marxism contains strong uncertainty avoidance; when Marxism was planted in the soil of Korea, the world’s most exclusive country was born.

The characteristics of the strong uncertainty avoidance can be seen in Korean mission work. To a large extent, Korean missionaries are emotionally busy and work hard in order to satisfy their sending churches’ needs, maintain their ingroup honor, and save their faces. These tendencies usually bring a strong competitive attitude toward others and consequently lack of cooperation. Also, in order to bring visible results and quick achievement, they competitively employ local ministers with material resources. This idea breaks the relationship between Korean missionaries and local ministers because their relationships are based on material resources, not on mutual respect and love.

Short-Term and Long-Term Orientation

The fifth dimension of Hofstede’s model of national cultures is called “Confucian dynamism.” It refers to a comparison between a long-term and a short-term orientation in life. It is composed of the following Confucian
values: Values on long-term orientation are persistence (perseverance), ordering relationships by status and observing this order, thrift, and feeling a sense of shame. And values on short-term orientation are personal steadiness and stability, protecting face, respect for tradition, expecting quick results, and reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts (Hofstede 1991:165-166, 173). This dimension shows the correlation between certain Confucian values and economic growth. In Hofstede’s survey, South Korea ranks fifth out of twenty-three countries with the score of seventy-five. This means South Korea is a country of long-term orientation. Because this result is closely related to economic growth of certain Asian countries such as Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore, this dimension is not enough to explain values of a certain group. The Korean value system contains both long-term and short-term orientations which are all Confucian values.

In contrast to Hofstede’s research sample, Korean missionary work reveals tendencies of a short-term orientation rather than those of a long-term orientation. That is, Korean missionaries usually expect quick visible results through hard work and show collectivistic tendencies and face saving. This does not mean that Korean missionaries do not have values of a long-term
In this section I seek to discover how Korean values characterized by certain traits stated above tend to affect Korean mission work. Without doubt Korean values mentioned above influence Korean mission work both in a positive and negative sense. Christian missions include many areas: missionary candidate selection or screening, pre-field training, sending, field work with on-field training, and reentry. How do Korean values affect these areas? In Rudolfo “Rudy” Giron’s missionary training model, “Lifelong Process of Missionary Formation: The Building of Training,” the foundational level includes cultural, social, family, and educational background (1997:29-36). In this regard, careful examination of the relationship between one’s cultural values and their influences on his/her lifelong involvement in mission is a critical issue in cross-cultural missionary training and adjustment for effective mission work.

Influences of Korean Missionaries’ Authoritarian Values and Attitudes

In my field research, including interviews with Korean missionaries and local ministers plus participant observation, I found that some problems
of Korean missionaries are caused by the certain traits of Korean values. In my informal interview with Melville Szto (1999), director of Asia Cross-Cultural Training Institute in Singapore, he asserts that the most important skill for trainees to learn is conflict management skills theoretically and practically. In Steve Moon’s research, “problems with peer missionaries” ranks first out of seven major causes of Korean missionary attrition (1997:136). To a large extent, this problem is related to Korean traditional values such as an authoritarian and autocratic leadership style, a factionalistic tendency based on a strong ingroup and outgroup distinction, and a hierarchical social system.

Table 7

Effect of Korean Cultural Values on Relationships with Fellow Missionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very negatively</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat negatively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no effect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat positively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very positively</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals that for ninety-four Korean missionaries out of 125 respondents with 75.2 percent responding Korean cultural values have negative effects in relationships with fellow Korean missionaries (item 3.14).
In my interview with twenty Korean missionaries they indicated that Korean values such as authoritarian and top-down leadership style often causes problems with peer missionaries who are under the same mission agency or denomination.

Along with the characteristics of collectivism, the characteristics of authoritarianism imply that Korean missionaries have conflicts in interpersonal relationships. In high power distance cultures the more powerful members tend to control the less powerful members. The less powerful members are usually forced to obey the direction or command of the leader or boss. For the less powerful member, direct expression of complaint or dissatisfaction to the leader is not allowed. Especially in collectivist cultures, alienation from the ingroup members and conflict with the group leader would be a painful experience. In Korean culture where people usually suppress their emotions, those negative emotions accumulate in people’s mind without proper resolution. Thus accumulated, negative emotions cause various mental problems. In his article, “A Cross-Cultural Study in Clinical Psychology” (1997), Suk Man Kwon, professor at Seoul National University in Korea, insists that people mostly project the accumulated negative emotions through physical symptoms such as headache, stomachache, chest
pain and so on. Mental problems of Korean people usually can be seen through certain physical symptoms, because of certain traits of the Korean culture which are oppressive and dependent (1997:283). In Steve Moon’s research, “health problems” rank second out of seven major causes of Korean missionary attrition (1997:136). This shows that authoritarian and collectivistic cultural values are negatively related to Korean missionaries’ interpersonal relationships.

These tendencies are connected to monocultural and cross-cultural conflicts: conflict with peer missionaries who belong to the same mission agency and with local ministers and foreign missionaries. As seen above, Korean leadership style tends to be authoritarian, hierarchical, and autocratic, which is not congruent with biblical leadership. Also, seniority is an important factor for missionaries to relate to peer missionaries. These factors are embedded in the five relationships of Confucianism. Korean missionaries carry these values in leadership and interpersonal relationships over to the mission field. They have learned the leadership style of their senior pastors in Korea, which is almost the same as the relationship between father and son. In other words, leadership style is essentially a cultural phenomenon that cannot be separated from its cultural context.
In her doctoral dissertation, "Training Korean Missionaries for Team Effectiveness: A Study Based on the Kosin Missionaries in the Philippines" (1996), Kyeong-Sook Park writes that Korean traditional leadership style is usually judged to be negative and tends to hinder both monocultural and cross-cultural team effectiveness through a research study on Korean missionaries who belong to the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Kosin). And those tendencies are seen in Korean mission work (1996:38-78). Also, Myung Hyuk Kim points out that Korean missionaries face difficulties in cooperating with fellow missionaries, one of the most serious problems in Korean mission work (1992:129). As mentioned above, this tendency comes from values of authoritarian and hierarchical social relationships and individualistic familism. To be sure, the high power-oriented leadership style is not congruent with biblical leadership. The following cases show how Korean values affect Korean missionaries' interpersonal relationship and leadership.

Case 1

Two ordained Korean missionaries, B and G, embarked to a Southeast Asian country in late 1989. For the following year, they worked together well. Because missionary B is older than missionary G, B naturally played an important role as a leader. At that time, there was no organized mission field team. During the following eight years, the
mission board of their denomination sent twenty missionaries. Because of this increase in the number of missionaries, the missionaries felt a need to organize an association. So they organized the conference to extend denominational churches, and without doubt missionary B was elected as the first bishop and field director. In time, most missionaries were willing to respect the senior missionary. However, because of B’s authoritarian and top-down style leadership, it was very hard for them to maintain team effectiveness and relationships with each other. As a result, B lost his position as field director in the 1994 annual conference. Furthermore, severe conflict arose between missionaries due to a strong disagreement over establishing a seminary. Communication between the new leadership and other missionaries broke down. The missionaries have not resolved the conflicts. As a result, the missionaries suffered through ineffectiveness of their mission work. The conflicts among the missionaries with various issues were caught by the mission board. In the process the mission board tried to intervene to solve the problem but with little success. In time, due to the economic crisis in Korea which started in late 1997, they faced financial difficulties. The denominational mission board summoned most of missionaries back to Korea, including missionaries B and G.

Kyeong-Sook Park points out that for ordained Korean male missionaries it is extremely hard to submit to the leadership of a younger missionary who is ordained or unordained because leadership is equated with power (1996:60). For Korean pastors ordination is equated with holding leadership, and age is equated with experiences and wisdom and power.

Case 2

Mr. B, a national worker appointed by a Korean missionary, was in charge of a local congregation with responsibility for evangelism, discipleship, visitation, and preaching on Sunday. Since the church was unable to cover his salary, the missionary paid his monthly
compensation. The missionary visited the church twice a month. Whenever the missionary visited the church, B had trouble with the missionary because of his paternalistic attitude. When I went to an Asian country in 1997, I made an appointment to preach on Sunday at Mr. B's church. On that Sunday, while I was preaching I did not see B's family. After the worship service, they had a monthly church meeting. In the meeting, B officially complained about the missionary's paternalistic attitude, authoritarian and autocratic leadership style, and control with money. He immediately lost his job. He was fired by the missionary.

There is no one avenue for using money contributed by the sending churches in Korean mission work. Rather, missionaries raise the funds and use them individually for each one's own project. So if a missionary leaves the field for a sabbatical year, his or her church which is usually taken care of by a paid local minister is closed because of lack of pastoral care and is ignored by fellow missionaries. Jun Vencer forcefully states the problem of the misuse of money:

The sub-Christian use of money as power to control in a relationship is a pernicious evil. Money is neutral by itself, but it has an inherent power to corrupt, resulting in abuse. Money is not only a precise valuation of commodities, it is also a measurement of character. . . . When leadership is bought, loyalty will be in question. When the money supply is gone, there is little commitment to stay. Such a method is costly in cash. One cannot buy self-respect. . . . The ultimate question for these missions is: Will they continue to serve the nationals when they can no longer dominate them? (1994:104-105)

the hindrance of Western missionary affluence to Western mission work.

Today Korean missionaries are facing the same problem as did Western missionaries. In fact, "uncritical use of money" can result in a huge negative impact on Korean mission work. In other words, the consequences of Korean missionary affluence are the sacrifice of valuable communication and strategic effectiveness as well as relationships with local people (cf. Bonk 1991).

Finally, the methods of the Korean missionary training centers are not separated from the educational system of Korea. It is not surprising that Korean missionaries who have been taught in a passive learner system have difficulty trying to apply to the mission field what they have learned. David Lee says,

When one understands the educational system of a country, one understands a great deal about one's own culture and training needs. Korean education can be characterized as teacher centered, dominated by the rote memory, with its main focus on passing the university entrance examination. This can have tremendous repercussions in missionary training. The trainer must not only change the learning method, but also deal with the whole area of life style, relationship, and character development . . . . Korean theological education has borrowed much from the West. It needs to reevaluate to make theological education contextualized and indigenous. Korean missionary training should attempt to give tools to contextualize theological learning in different cultural contexts. (1991a:72)

Two major points regarding the Korean educational system can be
gleaned from Lee's statement. First, the Korean traditional educational system, to a large extent, is not adequate to bring about significant changes in individual character, nor does it develop team effectiveness. Second, Western educational models are also not enough to train Korean missionaries effectively. Thus we need to find a biblically-based contextualized educational model. This I propose to do in this dissertation.

Collectivistic Tendencies in Korean Mission Work

Triandis points out disadvantages of collectivism (1995:175-178). At the private level collectivists have a high level of homesickness and a low level of self-esteem. The results of the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) showed the weakest part for Korean missionaries which is the part of Personal Autonomy (PA). This result indicates that collectivistic values prevail among Korean missionaries. At the public level collectivists support ingroups and in situations of conflict treat outgroups harshly. Also, they do not share information with outgroups. Cooperation in collectivist cultures occurs only within the ingroup; extreme competition is used with outgroups. "In collectivist cultures people have so many obligations toward their ingroups that they do not have the interest" (Triandis 1995:177). For instance, many Korean young people tend to choose their vocational goals
according to their parents’ desire, rather than their own interests and will.

Triandis writes,

When collectivism operates in personal situations, it is generally a very desirable social pattern, but with a major qualification: as long as ingroup members are involved. It becomes undesirable when large collectives are involved, especially when outgroup members are targets of the actions of ingroup members. (1995:178)

Collectivistic ideas and attitudes in Korean mission work may be seen in the process of missionary selection, sending, financial support, and relationships between mission agencies and sending churches. Chang Sam Yang, professor at Han Yang University in Seoul, Korea, points out that the representative feature of the social character of the Korean church is familism. It is recognized that Confucian familism strongly affects the church with the emphasis on connectionism. This tendency is connected to local church-centered missions and denominationalism. To a large degree, the Korean church has grown on the basis of this collectivistic familism which has the functional merit that people tend to be cohesive in the early stages of church growth. But today, familial particularism as a form of exclusivism hinders the ongoing growth of the Korean churches (1997:100).

In doing missions, Korean Protestant churches reveal a strong collectivistic exclusivism in congregational missions or local church-centered
missions. In other words, the inability to cooperate between mission board and sending churches is one of the most difficult problems of the Korean mission. In general, denomination is an ingroup for Korean Christians, but local churches are more cohesive ingroups in selecting and supporting missionaries. Unless one has a strong connection with a local church, he or she has difficulty being recommended as a missionary candidate and supported in prayer and finance. In this regard, mission agencies need to maintain a good relationship with sending churches. In the process of missionary selection, it is hard for a mission board to reject an applicant who is recommended by a large church. Because missionary selection is often done through various connections which are embedded in Korean values, the screening is usually ineffective. Also, some applicants might be accepted without a missionary calling and motivation. Steve Moon’s research indicates that “lack of call” ranks fourth out of seven major causes of Korean missionary attrition (1997:136). This implies that some Korean missionaries have been sent to the mission field with wrong reasons and motivation for missions, such as a wrongly imposed missionary calling, failure of ministry, regarding a missionary as being honored by sending churches, and using missionary experiences as a stepping stone for study in foreign countries, or a
Regarding the relationship between mission agency and sending church, if the relationship is broken, churches seldom send their missionaries through mission agencies. In this case, a missionary sent by a local church, not through a mission agency or denominational mission board, will have inadequate or no training and preparation. Also, if one receives financial support from the sending church, he or she cannot ignore the sending church’s requests for visible results that need to be shown to the sending church as fast as possible. For example, many churches planted by Korean missionaries usually go by the names of the supporting churches. This is attributed to the idea of exclusive “we” consciousness, and also to the idea of ingroup honor. It is hard for missionaries to refuse the request of the sending church because it is directly connected to financial support.

Usually collectivists regard an outgroup as a competitor. As mentioned above, partnership works in an ingroup, not with an outgroup. People do not share information. These ideas are related to some values of masculine societies such as leader’s decisive role, strong competition, and resolution of conflicts by fighting (Hofstede 1991:96). The cultural factors such as competition, conflicts, and the achievement-oriented attitude of Korean
missionaries are attributed to ingroup-oriented collectivistic values. Also, it must be remembered that Korean society has been influenced by Western individualism.

In this respect, partnership is one of the most difficult areas for Korean churches and missionaries. Because partnership includes cooperation, teamwork, networking, joint ventures, and strategic alliances, it shows how much cultural factors exert influence. Partnership is defined as "an association of two or more autonomous bodies who have formed a trusting relationship, and fulfill agreed-upon expectations by sharing complementary strengths and resources, to reach their mutual goal" (L. Bush and L. Lutz 1990:46, cited in W. Taylor 1994:4).

As stated above, Korean mission structure is a local church-centered mission structure. Its weakest area is the lack of a spirit of partnership. Most missionary sending churches are affiliated with mission agencies, but both denominational and non-denominational mission agencies have little relationship with each other. They seldom share information and cooperate with each other. As a result, money for missions is not used effectively. That is, mission agencies, missionaries, and sending churches prefer certain countries where they can see immediate visible result. In other words,
because there is no partnership and cooperation between mission agencies and between missionaries, they have poured their energies, such as a lot of money and human resources, into the same projects in which everyone desires to succeed. This is very ineffective mission work. For instance, the Philippines is a country to which Korean churches have sent more than 500 missionaries and to which Korean missionaries desire to be sent. Many examples of the negative aspects of Korean mission work occurred in the Philippines.

Today one of the most crucial tasks of Korean mission is the effective distribution of money and human resources through partnership between mission agencies and between missionaries. Also, partnership with foreign mission agencies is a critical issue for the Korean church.

**Tendencies of Intolerance and Formalism in Korean Mission Work**

One of the most salient features of strong uncertainty avoidance cultures is that people need to be busy and seek to work hard in order to maintain their ingroup honor and save their faces (cf. Hofstede 1991:125). Also, people hold exclusive attitudes towards people of different cultures. David Augsburger points out three emergency behaviors that accompany competitive confrontations in the process of destructive conflict: acceleration
of anxiety in the urgency for victory, more selective perception, and total and consistent thinking (1992:48).

Jae Un Kim points out that one of negative characteristics of the Koreans is self-centered showing-off (1991:221). This characteristic relates to extreme formalism and face saving. In Korean society people are sensitive to what others might think of them. In this regard, what others think about one's family or church is a matter of real concern. So they have a strong obsession about external forms, numbers, visible results, and quick achievement. These tendencies seen in the patterns of Korean church growth without doubt are prevalent in Korean mission work. These values and attitudes have brought negative results such as lack of cooperation and strong competition among missionaries. Furthermore, sending churches tend to manipulate missionaries to do what the sending churches desire, not what the local church needs, a form of paternalism rooted in Confucian patriarchy.

As mentioned above, due to lack of cooperation their competitive spirit, Korean missionaries have invested money and energy in the same projects. Furthermore, their competitive attitude in employing local ministers often spoils them in the process because the relationship between missionary and local minister is not based on mutual respect and love, but on money.
Some Korean missionaries use material resources in order to bring an immediate visible result. (cf. E. M. Lee 1996:85). The following cases illustrate these tendencies mentioned above.

Case 3

Missionary C was sent to a South Asian country by a Korean church. During the first year of his ministry, he concentrated on learning the local language and adjusting to the target culture. In time, he was asked to write a letter every month to the missions director of the sending church in order to report the results of his ministry. For several months he sent letters to the missions director that he was learning the local language and adjusting to the new environment. The first response of the missions director was that the missionary needed to report on the progress of planting a church and leading people to Christ. Nevertheless, missionary C sent letters with similar content, because he was keenly aware of the fact that without enough language acquisition and cultural adjustment it is very hard to do effective cross-cultural ministry in a highly unfamiliar environment. Finally, the missions director sent him a letter that the missionary’s report must include visible results whether or not it is true. If no visible results are reported, the financial support might be cut or suspended. He said, “I ought to show some visible results to the congregation to raise funds for your mission work. The congregation strongly desires to see results as soon as possible.”

Case 4

A Korean missionary was sent to a collective farm run by Korean immigrants in a central Asian country. He led many Koreans to Christ and finally planted a church. Later another Korean missionary who belongs to a different denomination than the former missionary came to the farm and planted another church. There was tension and conflict between the two churches because they fought one another for church members. There were conflicts and fights between the Koreans caused
by the churches' meaningless competition to get a quick result. As a result, the Koreans requested the two missionaries to leave the farm. (M. Chung 1996:99)

As seen in above case, most Korean missionaries do their mission work with a heavy burden because they must show a visible result as fast as they can, according to the sending church's desire. This becomes a stumbling block so that they often make mistakes. Sometimes this is a cause of missionary attrition (H. W. Yoon 1999:54).

To overcome these negative values and worldview, the Korean church must experience a paradigm shift in understanding of mission. That is, the Korean church should examine kingdom values and biblical perspectives in comparison with Korean cultural values, and cross-cultural missionary training needs to focus its emphasis on examination of the Korean values and worldview in comparison with biblical perspectives and the target cultures (cf. Lingenfelter and Mayers 1986; Menconi 1996). In this regard, David T. Lee writes,

Our goal in the missionary training as in any Christian leadership training must aim for building kingdom values so that the trainees have a healthy biblical worldview. It is neither Western nor non-Western that is our goal. The "change" is the key here. Any missionary training that does not change us to become kingdom persons is inadequate. Both missiology and training of missionaries based in the West and spread to the Two-Thirds World have become victims of
their cultures. As a result we have become too pragmatic at the cost of aiming at biblical maturity of the missionaries themselves; too scholarly at the cost of overlooking some of the most important values, such as sense of community, sacrificial spirit, love, humility and power of prayer. In this regard both the West as well as the Two-Thirds World need to compare their values against biblical values. (1999a:10)

Summary

I have described Korean values and worldview in employing Hofstede’s model of national culture, and the negative influences of some Korean values on Korean mission work. Of course, there are some strengths of Korean mission work in relation to Korean values and worldview. For instance, many young Christians continue to dedicate themselves to missions in spite of the economic crisis in Korea. This may be attributed to the emotional character of the Koreans, probably a strong zeal or enthusiasm for missions and evangelism. Also, the experiences that Korean churches have had in phenomenal growth, which is deeply embedded in Korean values, has motivated Korean Christians to do world mission.

In the last 115 years God has blessed the Korean Protestant church through its enormous growth. Today the Korean church with her overseas missions is facing a crisis in the stagnation of church growth and the economic crisis that directly influences Korean mission work. Korean
mission work cannot be separated from the values and worldview of the
Korean church. In fact, some Korean values and worldview influences on the
Korean mission work have a negative effect, especially on Korean
missionaries' effective cross-cultural adjustment. One of the most important
ways to overcome those weaknesses may be through missiological education
for the sending churches and for effective cross-cultural missionary training
for the missionaries who are sent.

Korean values and worldview which underlie attitudes and behaviors
of Korean missionaries and mission practitioners must be carefully examined
and exposed, biblically and evidentially. In other words, Korean values and
worldview which are inconsistent with biblical perspectives must be changed.
Values and worldview shape training programs. In this regard, the ultimate
goal of cross-cultural missionary training is the growth of the trainee in Christ
through changing his/her worldview in order to do effective cross-cultural
ministry.

In the next chapter, I examine the training programs of eight missionary
training centers in Korea through analyzing interviews with directors of those
training centers and Korean missionaries, and questionnaires from Korean
missionaries.
Notes

1. See the definition of "worldview" in the section, Definition of Terms (pp. 67-69). Also see David Burnett, Clash of Worlds (1992:11-24). I prefer the term "worldview" to "value," because worldview contains assumptions, values, and allegiances (cf. Kraft 1996:11-12; Hiebert 1985:45-49).

2. The Tangun myth is the story of the beginning of Korea. The idea of Hananim (God), which was adopted as a Christian term, is based upon the ancient Tangun myth. In the Tangun myth, Hananim is identified as Hwan-in, the Heavenly Father, and grandfather of Tangun, who reputedly set up Korea's first kingdom in 2333 B.C. (Palmer 1967:8). There are some similar words such as Hananim, Hanunim and Hanulnim in Korean Shamanism. The word Hana means one and Hanul means heaven. And the word nim is a honorary suffix. In this sense, most scholars agree that the above terms express the general idea of the "Heavenly One."

3. Missiological doctoral dissertations dealing with the Korean worldview from the perspectives of the traditional religions in Korea are as follows: Sung-Tae Kim, Contextualization and the Presbyterian Church in Korea (1991:297-317); Hyun Mo Lee, A Missiological Appraisal of the Korean Church in Light of Theological Contextualization (1992:25-39); and Peter Yuntag Im, Toward a Theological Synthesis of Missionary Discipleship: Foundation for a Korean Missiological Paradigm (1992:227-260). These dissertations help us understand the Korean religious worldviews that have influenced the formation of the Korean mind and personality.

4. Taoism was introduced to Korea in the seventh century A.D. It was soon mixed with Shamanism and lost its power. But its major theory, so-called "yin-yang theory," explained in the Book of Change has influenced the Korean worldview. The diagram of the great ultimate is the emblem of the Korean national flag. "The yin-yang symbol is the collective subconsciousness of the Korean people" (Jung Young Lee 1996:24).

5. "The development of the Korean form of ancestor worship occurred through the process of combining the shamanistic forms of worship with the Chinese form of Confucian ancestor worship" (John Kim 1996:49). For descendants, the faithful performance of the ancestor worship as an expression of filial piety is a means of pleasing the deceased souls in order to get reward and blessing.
6. Hofstede overstates when he says Confucianism is not a religion. Confucian principles and ethics contain religious factors such as concept of God, ancestor worship, and so on.

7. Hofstede’s model came out of studying a large body of survey data about the values of people in forty countries around the world. These people worked in the local subsidiaries of one large multinational corporation—IBM. In his book *Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values* (1980), the IBM data represents four dimensions of national cultures: large and small power distance, collectivism and individualism, femininity and masculinity, and weak and strong uncertainty avoidance. In another book, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (1991), Hofstede added more than ten countries and a dimension, long-term and short-term orientation, so-called “Confucian Dynamism,” in the first survey.

8. The following table shows the differences of the main themes of collectivism and individualism in relation to ingroup/outgroup characteristics (Triandis et al., 1985:397-398).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collectivism</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingroup is extension of the self</td>
<td>1. Self is distinct from ingroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ingroup is center of psychological field</td>
<td>2. Person is center of psychological field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subordination of personal goals to goals of ingroup</td>
<td>3. Ingroup and personal goals are unrelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ingroup regulation of behavior</td>
<td>4. Individual regulation of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interdependence between person and group</td>
<td>5. Self-sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ingroup harmony is important</td>
<td>6. Confrontation within ingroup may be good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sense of common fate with ingroup</td>
<td>8. Personal fate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shame control</td>
<td>8. Guilt control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Hofstede’s survey shows that studies dealing with the distribution of power are more correlated with power distance than with individualism and collectivism, while studies dealing with social integration are more correlated with collectivism than with power distance (1991:57).

important dimension of the collectivism of the Korean self. "Koreans frequently point out that a Korean term for humans (the term is gender-neutral), in'gan, is composed of two Chinese characters. One put it this way. In was made to show two people leaning against each other, and implies dependency or mutuality of human relationships. The character gan means between. From this, we can say that Koreans, and maybe Chinese, thought people are people only when they exist between people" (1999:35).

11. Xenophobia is defined as "the feeling that foreign persons or things are dangerous" (Hofstede 1991:263).

12. Ethnocentrism is defined as "applying the standards of one's own society to people outside that society" (Hofstede 1991:261). In their book Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behaviors (1972), Levine and Campbell list twenty-three facets of the syndrome of ethnocentrism through explaining attitudes and behaviors toward ingroup and outgroup (1972:11-21). They are congruent with a distinct feature of collectivism, ingroup/outgroup distinction.

13. The Chinese Value Survey (CVS) sample for the examination of Confucian Dynamism had been collected through 100 students (fifty men and fifty women) in each of twenty-two countries around the world by Michael Bond. After the publication of the results, data for China were added (Hofstede 1991:161).


15. Koreans get hwabyong disease. Hwa means fire, and byong means disease, so hwabyong means literally fire disease, but it is often translated as anger disease. It is a unique Korean folk syndrome, attributed to the suppression of anger. It is caused by accumulated han. Han is the term used by Koreans to characterize the anger that results from living under such constraint. The term evokes not just individual resentment, but the suffering of the Korean people, who have been forced to live, and suffer under the domain of surrounding countries, the ruling class, the yangban, and more recently the military dictators. Also it is caused by taein kongpo (literally anthropophobia). It is a form anxiety takes in cultures that place enormous influence on reading the nonverbal reactions of others, what Koreans call munchi (Alford 1999:76-80).
CHAPTER 5

Evaluation of Korean Missionary Training Programs

Affecting Korean Missionaries’ Cross-Cultural Adjustment

The purpose of this chapter is to evaluate the training programs of eight cross-cultural missionary training centers in Korea in their relation to Korean missionaries’ cultural adjustment. Do eight missionary training centers provide their trainees with adequate knowledge, practical cultural adjustment skills, and experience of cultures?

1. Do the missionary training programs provide training in missiological anthropology, understanding Korean values and worldview, beliefs, customs, cross-cultural communication, and conflict management skills?

2. Do the missionary training programs provide informal training methods to improve character qualities and develop interpersonal relationship skills?

3. Do the missionary training programs provide appropriate culture learning activities and cross-cultural skills through experiential learning?
The data were collected through responses to interviews with directors of the missionary training centers and from the written documents of the training centers as well. This chapter profiles the curricula of the missionary training centers in order to analyze curricula training factors relating to cross-cultural adjustment skills for the trainees.

**General Information about Eight Missionary Training Centers**

Table 8

General Information about Eight Missionary Training Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year of Foundation</th>
<th>Mother Agency</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Average Intake</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap)</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Korean Methodist Church</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of Korea (Kosin)</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Korea Evangelical Holiness Church</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of Korea (Hapdong)</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Global Missionary Fellowship</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Interdenominational</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Operation Mobilization Korea</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The eight training centers can be compared and contrasted by the following criteria: (1) year of foundation; (2) mother agency or denomination; (3) language use; (4) average intake per class; and (5) number of alumni.

Center for World Mission (CFWM)

CFWM was established in 1974 as an affiliated organization of the Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary (Tonghap) in Seoul. The cross-cultural missionary training program in CFWM started in March, 1986. As of March, 1999, CFWM has produced 556 alumni out of 567 missionaries who belong to the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap). Since the opening of the CFWM missionary training program, twenty-five classes have graduated. The average number of trainees in a class is thirty. In the twenty-fifth missionary training session, March to May, 1999, twenty-nine missionary candidates were trained. Korean was the only language used in class and communal living. English is taught in classes.

International Missionary Training Institute (IMTI)

Unlike other denominational missionary training centers, the Korean Methodist Church (KMC) approves people as its missionaries who finish the training program run by the School of World Mission and Evangelism at the Korea Methodist Seminary in Seoul. This training program is a two-year
degree program. Also, the KMC has four one-year non-degree missionary training centers: Korean Mission Strategy Institute, International Missionary Training Institute, Jung Dong Overseas Mission Training School, and Soongeui Global Missionary Training Institute. Among them the Korean Mission Strategy Institute is the KMC affiliated training institute. The other three are local church-based missionary training centers as approved missionary training centers by the KMC. All five training centers serve as missionary training arms of the KMC. For this reason, the overseas missions department of the KMC designs a basic training curriculum for the KMC missionaries, and the four missionary training centers design their own specific curricula on the basis of the curriculum guidelines of the KMC overseas missions department. Among those four training centers, I studied the International Missionary Training Institute (IMTI) which is the first missionary training centers of the KMC. IMTI started its missionary training program in 1990 in Seoul. As of November, 1999, IMTI has produced sixty-eight graduates. The average number of trainees in each session is ten. Korean was the only language used in the classes, but English is taught in the classes. Each training session lasts one year.
Kosin Missionary Training Institute (KMTI)

KMTI was inaugurated in 1987 as the training center of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Kosin). KMTI started its training program in 1988. KMTI is located in Daejun City, Korea. As of March, 1999, KMTI has produced about 200 missionaries out of the 220 Kosin missionaries working in thirty-three nations. The average number of trainees in each session is twenty. During the training session, January to February, 1999, twelve missionary candidates were trained with their children. Korean was the only language used in classes and communal living, but English is taught.

KEHC Missionary Training Center (KMTC)

The Korea Evangelical Holiness Church (KEHC) started its missionary training program for KEHC missionary candidates in 1988 in Seoul. As of January, 1999, 163 missionaries were trained in KMTC. In the tenth training class, March to September, 1999, twelve men and women with their children were trained. The average number of trainees in each class is twenty-five. The trainees use Korean language both in classes and communal living. The training curriculum includes English classes taught by native English speakers. Also, the trainees participate in the English camp, called “Adventures In English” (AlE) for two weeks held at Seoul Theological
University. The instructors of AIE are OMS missionaries in Korea and OMS short-term missionaries.

**Global Missionary Training Institute (GMTI)**

GMTI of the General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in Korea (GAPCK) (Hapdong) was opened in 1983 in Seoul. As of March, 1999, GMTI has produced about 1,000 GAPCK missionaries, and 900 GAPCK missionaries now serve in eighty-four countries. Since the opening of GMTI in 1983, thirty-four classes have graduated. During March to May, 1999, twenty-three trainees were trained in the thirty-fifth training class. The average number of trainees in twenty-five classes is fifty. Classes are mainly taught in Korean. English classes are provided for the trainees to improve their English language proficiency. In communal living, Korean is used.

**Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC)**

GMTC is a missionary training arm of Global Missionary Fellowship (GMF), which embraces several professional mission-related agencies. GMTC was opened in 1986 in Seoul by David Taiwoong Lee, chairman of GMF. Since the opening of the missionary training program, GMTC has produced 430 graduates. The average number of trainees is thirty-five. In the eighteenth missionary training session, January to May, 1999, thirty-five
missionary candidates were trained. Korean was the only language used in the classes and communal living. An English camp is provided for the trainees to improve their cross-cultural adaptability.

**Missionary Training Institute (MTI)**

MTI was originally founded in 1983 as the training center of the General Assembly of Presbyterian Church in Korea (GAPCK) (Hapdong) in Seoul. Until 1993 MTI had been a denominational missionary training center. In 1994 it separated from GAPCK (Hapdong), currently named GMTI. Since then, MTI has been a interdenominational missionary training center and has trained more than 600 missionaries. An additional 1,140 trainees have attended at least one MTI training session as of December, 1998 (Son and Eshenaur 1998:124). In the twenty-eighth training program, September to November, 1999, forty-five trainees were trained. The average number of trainees is forty. Unlike other missionary training centers in Korea, English is the only language used in the classes and in communal living.

**OM Korea Missionary Training Center (OMMTC)**

OMMTC was founded as a training arm of Operation Mobilization Korea in 1997 in Seoul. OMMTC has produced about 120 graduates as of March, 1999. It trains an average of forty missionaries every year through
two training sessions. In the fourteenth training session, nineteen people were trained during October to December, 1999. Korean is the only language used in the classes and in communal living. English classes are provided to improve the trainees’ English proficiency.

Training Factors Influencing Cross-Cultural Adjustment

In a broad sense, curriculum refers to “every item of a training program which contributes either explicitly or implicitly to the accomplishment of purposes, goals and objectives of the training program” in terms of content, skills, and character issues (Clinton 1984:80). In other words, curriculum indicates the content including the written courses and materials, the planned and guided learning experiences, the actual experiences of trainees guided by a trainer (Hoke 1995b:66-67).

Robert Ferris states that the ultimate goal of missionary training is growth of the trainee in Christ-likeness and in ministry effectiveness and the empowerment of the trainee “to take a large view, to appreciate alternative perspectives, customs, and mores” (1995a:13-14). This indicates a worldview change in the trainee through ongoing learning and growth. Examining training goals is important for evaluation of a training program.
As mentioned above, training factors influencing missionaries’ cultural adjustment are seen mainly in three methods: formal, informal, and non-formal training. These methods include factors such as length and type of training, place of training, the trainer, and curriculum. These factors should be considered as facilitating the trainee’s cultural adjustment skills.

**Length and Type of Training**

Length and type of training programs affect missionary candidates’ ability to acquire adequate knowledge and practical skills. Missionary training must focus on the development of the trainees’ competency in performing specific skills and meeting specified training objectives. For this reason, a cross-cultural missionary training needs to require enough length in a residential context.

Regarding length of missionary training, David Lee indicates that for Korean missionaries “longer and more thorough training under competent trainers is needed” (1991a:70). What is the proper length for training Korean missionaries? Directors of the eight training centers whom I interviewed responded to the interview question (item 4.2): What is an ideal length of missionary training in the Korean context? Their answers vary: four to twelve months including overseas field experience. The average length of
missionary training suggested by the directors is seven months and three weeks.

Table 9
Comparison of Training Centers in the Length and Type of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM</td>
<td>Twice a year (Mar/Sept), D: 8 weeks, O: 2 weeks</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI</td>
<td>Twice a year (each 14 weeks), O: 2 weeks (summer)</td>
<td>Non-residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI</td>
<td>Twice a year (Jan/June), D: 8 weeks, O: 2 weeks</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC</td>
<td>Once a year (Jan-July), D: 6 months, O: 4 weeks</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI</td>
<td>Twice a year (Mar/ Sept), D: 10 weeks, O: 4 weeks</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>Twice a year, D: 6 ½ months, Post-field training: D: 3 months for missionaries on furlough</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>Twice a year (Mar/Sept), D: 3 months</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC</td>
<td>Twice a year (Mar/Oct), D: 3 months, O: 4 months</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D: Domestic  O: Overseas

Considering the length of training, each center has a different context, but most training centers do not train their missionary candidates for the ideal length of time due to financial difficulty and insufficient facilities. Interestingly, directors of most denominational missionary training centers responded that it is difficult to train by ideal length because of the pressure from and control by denominational leadership. This reveals one of the weaknesses that characterize denominational training centers. I will discuss
more about this issue later in this chapter.

Korean missionaries showed a similar response with the directors to the question: What is your opinion about the ideal length of a missionary training program in the Korean context?

Table 10

Ideal Length of Missionary Training in the Korean Context According to Missionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Length</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one to three months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three to six months</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to nine months</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than nine months</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 reveals that eighty-four out of 125 missionaries prefer more than a six-month period of missionary training. The three most important reasons they chose the length, more than six months, are as follows: (1) acquiring cross-cultural adjustment skills through field experience; (2) development of spirituality and Christian character through communal living; and (3) acquiring knowledge and various skills through adequate training in order to facilitate ministry effectiveness.

This result indicates that most Korean missionaries prefer non-formal
and informal training to formal training in more than a six-month training period. Cross-cultural adjustment skills are acquired best through informal and non-formal training. A proper and sufficient length of training is necessary to bring about an effective cross-cultural adjustment. As seen above, the importance of developing spirituality and character qualities were pointed out by Korean missionaries both in the questionnaire for 125 Korean missionaries and the twenty-four interviewees. Training courses such as prayer, power encounter and spiritual warfare, and spiritual formation rank in the top ten courses for cross-cultural adjustment (Table 30 on page 344).

This study does not aim to deal with the issues of character qualities and spirituality but of cross-cultural adjustment skills. Nevertheless, as seen in the above data, character building and developing spirituality through informal training are important for cross-cultural adjustment because they play an important role in human relations. In fact, knowledge and skill goals should relate directly to character qualities and spirituality in the training context. In other words, biblically based character and spiritual development are inseparably linked to knowing and doing. Regarding character qualities and spirituality, Robert Ferris writes,

Character qualities represent the most fundamental yet the most
challenging tasks of the missionary trainer. Ultimately, the missionary’s own life is her or his most powerful message to those who need Christ. Perhaps this is the reason the large majority of biblical standards for spiritual leadership are character qualities. Training in Christian character must begin with living models [informal training with communal living]. Trainers may be reluctant to say with Paul, “Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ” (1 Corinthians 11:1), yet it is demonstration of Christian virtues in daily life, relationships, and ministry which trainees need most. (1995a:13)

What type of training is important with the proper length of training?

Usually there are four types of missionary training: (1) seminary-based missionary training; (2) missionary training modules; (3) training institute with communal living; and (4) use of overseas missionary training centers (cf. David Lee 1994:78-81). Whereas the first two types are non-residential training programs, the last two are residential training programs.

Among these four types of training programs, the most effective training in the Korean context is the third type, a training institute with communal living, because through the training environment of communal living the trainees can have more opportunities to develop their character qualities and interpersonal relationship skills than in other formal types of training. But to make communal living effective, the trainers’ role is important and sufficient facilities should be provided. Trainers are required to have cross-cultural experience as professionals and to be role models and
guides. In other words, the trainer must model what the trainees are supposed
to become. In the interview with David Lee, he said about the term,
“communal living,” it is that trainees and their families live in a family unit in
a close-knit community divided into four houses for seven months. Trainees
and their family live in a family unit in one building or a close-knit
community. But they have communal meals every day and manage all the
household affairs in cooperation. In the case of GMTC, “Leadership is given
to one family per month. The leader is responsible for all the household
affairs. By the time the trainees graduate, a permanent relationship has been
formed” (David Lee 1991a:78). Trainees pay for the communal living,
usually for food and training materials, but they manage their own finance.

Missionary training through communal living provides a more effective
learning environment through life experience with other people. Informal
training as socialization is called “the hidden curriculum,” which includes all
the things a trainee learns through the total experience of his or her life during
the training program, especially outside the classroom (Ferris and Fuller
1995:57). Stephen Hoke writes,

The more closely missionary training centres can produce a family
environment—a learning community—the more powerful will be the
teaching-learning impact on trainees. A learning community provides
for loving acceptance and trust of each member, nurtures the growth and development process, and creates frequent natural settings in which people can share needs, reflect on their experience, talk about what they are discovering, and be vulnerable in admitting what is difficult to apply to themselves and changes about themselves. (1995:88)

In this regard, the IMTI training program of the Korea Methodist Church shows a weakness compared with other centers as they use the module type, non-residential training program. As mentioned above, there are four training centers in the Korean Methodist Church. These four centers adopted a non-residential, module-type program, the length of which is one year. The programs consist of fourteen weeks in two semesters. Each training session runs about five to six hours on weekends. Even though those training centers offer on average a one-month summer training camp, this does not seem long enough to develop the trainees’ interpersonal skills, character qualities, and spirituality through communal living. In my interviews with four KMC missionaries, all of them indicated that adopting the residential training program like other training centers is an urgent task for the KMC training centers in order to facilitate the trainees’ interpersonal relationships and cross-cultural adjustment skills.

The OMMTC training program combines the third type with the fourth
type, residential with overseas training through the OM International program. Six other centers adopt the third type of training, missionary training institute with communal living and long-term intensive training for three to seven months. In the Korean context, an appropriate cross-cultural missionary training system would be long-term, more than six months, coupled with communal living in order to develop the trainees’ adjustment, ministry skills, and character qualities.

**Missionary Trainers**

Korean education is characterized as teacher-centered as the teacher just transfers his/her knowledge to students. The educational system of Korea cannot be separated from its hierarchical social structure, and the authoritarian and top-down leadership style. Traditionally, in Korea the teacher initiates all communication in the classroom. Students must respect and obey the teacher, and the teacher is neither criticized nor contradicted by students in the classroom. In short, the educational system of Korea focuses on formal learning methods of education such as acquiring knowledge, theory, and information. Also, students are forced to memorize what they have learned (cf. Hofstede 1991:33-37). The Korean terms, sunsaeng (teacher), haksaeng (student), hulryun (training), hulryun-ja (trainer), and
hunryun-saeng (trainee) cannot be separated from the traditional meaning of teaching and learning as indicated above. In Korean language usage, the titles of missionary trainers who are mostly ordained ministers go by their status as pastor, missionary, professor, or staff member along with the honorary suffix nim. In this respect, there is no Korean term equivalent for the English term trainer which implies a less hierarchical and more equal relationship between the trainer and trainees which enables a trainer to create more effective training.

David Lee argues that these teacher-centered traditional educational systems of Korea “have tremendous repercussions in missionary training. The trainer must not only change the learning methods, but also deal with the whole area of lifestyle, relationships, and character development” (1991a:72). Missionaries who are trained under circumstances that do not create equality between the trainer and trainees and instigate two-way communication cannot learn by doing and experiencing. In this situation, the trainer’s role is limited to knowledge transfer. The formal training methods and the traditional role of the trainer cannot bring about significant changes in trainees’ character and attitude, nor do they develop spirituality and interpersonal skills. In this regard, the trainer’s role must be defined by the biblical concept of
leadership, the so-called “servant leadership.” Many roles of a missionary trainer can be listed: staff, facilitator, counselor, mentor, supervisor, lecturer, caregiver, teacher, instructor, and so on. In fact, a trainer’s knowledge, attitude, values, and integrity as a Christian leader can determine an effective cross-cultural missionary training program and method.

In a training context which is not multicultural or cross-cultural, missionary training centers need experienced and spiritually mature trainers in order to facilitate the candidates’ interpersonal relationship skills and character qualities. The importance of trainers must not be underestimated because having good trainers is directly connected to the success of cross-cultural training programs. Cross-cultural adjustment involves an attitude toward people to whom we are sent. In a cross-cultural training setting, trainers are the most important persons from whom trainees learn how to communicate with people. Through communal living with trainers, the trainees can learn how to interact with people and how to develop cross-cultural skills, spirituality, and character qualities as well as to acquire cross-cultural knowledge and information.

At the World Evangelical Fellowship Missions Commission-sponsored Missionary Training Seminar in 1994, a composite profile of attributes of a
missionary trainer's life and ministry was proposed in four areas: Christian maturity, ministry skills and experience, teaching and equipping skills, and interdisciplinary knowledge. These key essentials should lead to a successful training program (Ferris, ed. 1995:167-169).

I. Christian Maturity: A missionary trainer ...

1. Maintains spiritual disciplines in personal relationship with God
2. Is building an ample knowledge of the Word of God
3. Is growing in obedience to God’s Word
4. Is characterised by the fruit of the Spirit
5. Practises an effective prayer life
6. Promotes a biblical relationship with the church
7. Exercises good stewardship
8. Gives priority to a balanced family life
9. Lives a sacrificial and simple lifestyle
10. Has vision and a passion for mission
11. Builds accountability relationships
12. Is respectful of spiritual authority
13. Possesses a teachable spirit

II. Ministry Skills and Experience: A missionary trainer ...

1. Has successful cross-cultural experience in ministry
2. Develops effective disciple and mentor relationships
3. Is able to manage people and projects with sensitivity and wisdom
4. Interacts well with others in cross-cultural and diverse situations
5. Has personal maturity to sustain open and honest relationships
6. Enters into cooperative relationships with diverse peoples
7. Demonstrates cultural sensitivity and respect

III. Teaching and Equipping Skills: A missionary trainer ...

1. Is a good listener and effective communicator
2. Focuses on practical and relevant course work
3. Is able to teach using various techniques and resources
4. Brings a wealth of practical and personal experience
5. Can foster good interpersonal and team dynamics
6. Accurately evaluates people and guides them to effectiveness
7. Models by lifestyle what is being taught
8. Motivates people to want to learn

IV. Interdisciplinary Knowledge: A missionary trainer...

1. Relates theological knowledge to missiological practice, especially regarding socio-political, economic, and ethical realities
2. Is familiar with local, political, and social situations and organisations
3. Has prior training and experience appropriate to the institution’s goal
4. Keeps abreast of other missionaries and mission activities worldwide
5. Has a biblical and historical grasp of the local and global church

Michael Paige (1993:190) suggests twelve personal attributes of an intercultural trainer as follows:

1. Tolerance of ambiguity
2. Cognitive and behavioral flexibility
3. Personal self-awareness, strong personal identity
4. Cultural self-awareness
5. Patience
6. Enthusiasm and commitment
7. Interpersonal sensitivity
8. Tolerance of differences
9. Openness to new experiences and to people who are different
10. Empathy
11. Sense of humility
12. Sense of humor

One of the weaknesses of missionary training programs in Korea is
lack of qualified trainers. Due to the short history of overseas missions, the Korean church has not produced enough qualified missionary trainers fitting the above trainer profile. There are distinctive features in relation to the trainer issue in the following.

Table 11
Comparison of Training Centers by the Number of Training Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Foreign Training Staff</th>
<th>Trainee-Trainer Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>about 40</td>
<td>1 for English</td>
<td>7.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI</td>
<td>1 (Director)</td>
<td>about 20</td>
<td>some for English</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>about 30-40</td>
<td>1 part time</td>
<td>7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC</td>
<td>1 (Director)</td>
<td>about 30</td>
<td>3 part time for English</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>about 40</td>
<td>1 part time</td>
<td>11.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>7 and 4 MK trainers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 full time</td>
<td>4.7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 full time</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM MTC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 Missionaries</td>
<td>1 full time</td>
<td>7:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, most training centers that I researched have not enough full-time trainers for the trainees to model after. Most training centers heavily depend on part-time lecturers. The ratio of trainees to trainers needs to be low for effective modeling and mentoring (Ferris and Fuller 1995:59). As seen in Table 11, GMTC has the lowest trainee-trainer ratio, 4.7:1. Among training
centers, KMTC has the highest trainee-trainer ratio with only one full-time trainer, 25:1. Like KMTC, IMTI has one full-time trainer, but shows a lower ratio, 10:1, because of a lower number of average trainees than KMTC.

CFWM, GMTI, and MTI have four full-time trainers. The trainee-trainer ratio of CWFM is 7.5:1, GMTI 11.5:1, and MTI 10:1. KMTI and OMMTC have three full-time trainers. Their trainee-trainer ratio is 7:1, which is closer to the ratio of CWFM.

Acquiring qualified trainers is one of the most urgent needs of most training centers. Most directors of the missionary training centers acknowledge the importance of having more full-time trainers for effective training, but it is not easy to find well-qualified trainers with career missionary experience, with adequate knowledge or a degree in missiology, and cross-cultural sensitivity in particular, due to the short mission history of the Korean church. Also, lack of concern by denominational leadership for missionary training may contribute to hindering the recruitment of qualified trainers. Probably there is a financial reason for this issue.

David Harley evaluates a striking feature of GMTC in relation to the trainer:

The staff [of GMTC] are involved in the life of the community and live
in close proximity to the students. They adopt a simple lifestyle and raise their own support. As trainees and trainers live together during the training course, there is ample opportunity for the teachers to demonstrate what they teach by their own lives and personalities. There is also time to deal in depth with problems that may surface within the context of a close-knit community. (1995:21)

David Lee, director of GMTC, points out, “Communal life can have a detrimental effect if appropriate care is not given” (1991a:78). A Korean missionary in the Philippines said,

Because of a lack of care during the training period, communal living was not effective, nor was it helpful for developing skills and interpersonal relationships. Rather, there were interpersonal conflicts between the families and individuals. The conflicts were not resolved even after finishing the training program. What I learned in communal living was just how to be patient when a conflict occurs.

In this regard, enough full-time trainers are needed to mentor and supervise the trainees not only as trainers but also as care-givers. If there is appropriate care in communal living, “trainees train each other and teachers can give attention to in-depth problems that may be hidden” (David Lee 1991a:78). Ferris and Fuller state, “It is important for all staff, both administrative and teaching, to participate with students in outreaches, field trips, visits during internship, prayer, and field experience. Constant staff contact with the mission field is vital if teaching and curriculum are to be kept relevant” (1995:59).
Second, it was not easy to find full-time foreign trainers who can facilitate the trainees with cultural adjustment skills and develop skills for interpersonal relationship through communal living. Most foreign trainers function just as part-time English instructors, especially in the case of MTI which has four full-time English instructors. Communal living with foreign trainers should be administer by helping trainees to develop their ability to interact with people in other cultures.

Third, most training centers seldom offer training programs for missionary kids (MKs) or third culture kids (TCKs), except GMTC. Regarding this, GMTC shows an example of how to train MKs. It has enough facilities with four full-time volunteers as parents with cross-cultural ministry experience for training MKs. Most training centers provide a childcare program or a lecture for MK education in adult classes.

Some training centers do not allow the trainees’ children to join their parents during the residential training period due to lack of facilities. This might hinder the effective cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries. Today the importance of MK education is increasing. Unless we train our children to adjust to another culture, we seldom avoid severe culture shock because cultural adjustment is a family matter, not just an individual one.
Directors of most training centers recognize the importance of MK education in a pre-field setting. Bertil Ekstrom points out, “The training should include the entire missionary family. The reason is that the missionary unit is not individual, but the family as a whole” (1997:189). Training for the children should be included in the program.

**Place of Missionary Training**

To some extent, the place of training is an important factor to improve the trainees’ cultural adjustment skills. Unlike formal education, cross-cultural missionary training must take place in various places because cross-cultural training must be experiential and competency-based in order to achieve effective goals and objectives. In this sense, the most effective cross-cultural training is done through informal and non-formal methods. As mentioned above, an informal training method can be effective in a residential setting with qualified trainers.

Unlike formal training, the main purpose of non-formal training is to bring about specific change or transformation of trainees’ attitude toward people in other cultures. Non-formal training is the most effective method for the trainee to change his/her attitude. Through non-formal training the trainee acquires information and skills. “In missionary training, most cross-cultural
communication, and ministry skills will be learned best through non-formal education” (Ferris and Fuller 1995:54). Ferris and Fuller state the crucial aspects of non-formal training:

Missionary training centres should take full advantage of the strengths of nonformal education. To do this, they should focus on recruiting trainers and planning curricula which will equip trainees with the character qualities and practical skill competencies needed for cross-cultural ministry. Because of the power of training by example, missionary training centres should provide many opportunities for trainees to observe trainers in ministry situations. Whenever possible, trainers also should take trainees into “field” situations to practise cross-cultural and ministry skills. (1995:56)

Table 12

Comparison of Training Centers by Training Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Center</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM</td>
<td>yes (seminary campus)</td>
<td>Field experience &amp; evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI</td>
<td>yes (local church)</td>
<td>Summer camp (2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI</td>
<td>yes (inner city)</td>
<td>Field experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC</td>
<td>yes (inner city)</td>
<td>Mission, evangelism and English camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI</td>
<td>yes (headquarters building)</td>
<td>Evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>yes (inner city)</td>
<td>English camp, evangelism &amp; leadership seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>yes (inner city)</td>
<td>Evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM-MTC</td>
<td>yes (using a church’s retreat center)</td>
<td>Evangelism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fact, cross-cultural adjustment and ministry skills can best be acquired by nonformal training, especially in overseas field trips or research. In my questionnaire to Korean missionaries, they listed the most helpful course for cross-cultural adjustment (item 2.1-2.32) as an "overseas field experience." Also, to my question: If you were a missionary trainer, which courses definitely would be necessary for the Korean missionary training program? (item 2.34), overseas field trips rank first. Because the context in Korea is monocultural, well-planned and prepared overseas and domestic field trips are the most effective way for trainees to acquire appropriate ministry and cross-cultural adjustment skills. Non-formal training methods can function as trainees act, reflect, and respond for their own growth in facilitating competencies in a cross-cultural context, namely action-reflection-response learning⁴ (cf. Hess 1994:21-22).

Table 12 reveals that most centers train both in Korea and overseas. Three types of training relate to place. All eight centers provide formal, classroom-based training. First, two centers, GMTC and MTI, do not provide overseas field trips, but each center has a different reason why they do not do so. In my interview, David Lee said that as of January, 1995, the length of the training program has shortened from nine months to six and a
half months. The reason for shortening the length was to produce two different training programs. One is for missionary candidates, the other is post-field training for missionaries, a continuation program for missionaries on furlough. The post-field training program lasts three months. This means that GMTC does not provide overseas field trips because most candidates have had some type of overseas field experience prior to admission. In the process of selection, the GMTC selection committee considers candidates who have both domestic and overseas experience. Such overseas field trips would not be for sightseeing, but for participation in a missionary's ministry, experiencing culture shock, and evaluating the outcome. In this sense, overseas field experience must be in the training curriculum.

Young Jun Son, Director of MTI, gave a different reason why MTI does not provide overseas field trips. He recognizes the importance and effectiveness of them but it is not easy for MTI to do that because overseas field trips often are more expensive than formal training.

Second, OM as an international mission organization usually trains short-term missionaries. They often decide whether he/she commits as a career missionary after serving two years of short-term ministry. OMMTC provides the longest field-based training through the training channel of OM
International—three to five months. This overseas field training highlights
the OMMTC program as a strength.

Third, other centers provide two to four weeks for an overseas field
trip in the end of the training. In the case of CWFM, the twenty-nine trainees
in the twenty-fifth training class were ministers who graduated from the
Presbyterian Seminary and College with M.Div. or Th.M. degrees. In my
interview with Dr. Kwang Soon Lee, director of CFWM, she indicated that
most missionary candidates have one year, short-term field experience in the
M. Div. program, but after the eight-week pre-field training program, the
trainees who have no overseas field trip are encouraged to spend two weeks
on an overseas field trip individually. But this training program is an elective
course due to the high cost.

In this regard, due to the lack of experienced trainers who supervise
and mentor trainees in the field, overseas field experience may not be
effective. Rather, they are the same as ordinary mission trips. Unless the
field experience is planned by experienced trainers or field leaders, it is not
easy to produce a satisfactory result that gives trainees appropriate
experiential culture learning.
Analysis of the Curriculum of Eight Missionary Training Centers Influencing Cross-Cultural Adjustment: Their Weaknesses and Strengths

In this section, I will analyze the curricular activities of the eight missionary training centers according to the three training methods—formal, informal, and non-formal—in their relation to cross-cultural adjustment. Also, weaknesses and strengths of each training program will be discussed according to the research question: Do the eight training centers provide their trainees with adequate knowledge, practical cultural adjustment skills, and experience of diverse cultures? The findings for this research were based on content analysis from the catalogs or written reports from the training centers and from interviews with directors and Korean missionaries.

Analysis of CFWM Training Curriculum (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Tonghap)

The CFWM training program was presented in the twenty-fifth CFWM training curriculum (March 23-May 13, 1999) which is based on written documents and an interview with the director, Dr. Kwang Soon Lee. To the question: What are the strengths and weaknesses or developing areas of the missionary training program you have received? (item 2.38), the missionaries who received their training in CFWM pointed out weaknesses and strengths.
| I. Formal Training Courses | | II. Informal Training Courses |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **Core Subjects on Mission** | **Cross-Cultural Ministry** | **Language Learning** |
| 1. Theology of Mission: 9 hr | 1. Evangelism and Discipleship: 9 hr | 1. Language Acquisition: 2 hr |
| 5. Contemporary Mission Theology: 9 hr | 5. Church Planting and Growth: 12 hr. | 1. Religion and Society: 6 hr |
| **Missionary Life and Work** | | 3. Introduction to the Korea Bible Association: 3 hr |
| 1. Mission Administration: 6 hr | | 4. Videos and Games |
| 2. Cultural Adaptation & Language Training: 9 hr | | |
| 3. Missionary Life and Work: 6 hr | | |
| 4. Spirituality of Missionary: 6 hr | | |
| 5. Community Life Training: 6 hr | | |
| 6. Cross-Cultural Counseling: 3 hr | | |
| 7. Preventive Health Care: 3 hr | | |
| 8. Practical Skills (Computer, Camera, Acupuncture Skills) | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Mission Field Study (every weekend: 6 weeks), Overseas Field Trip (2 weeks, elective), Mission Seminar and Area Study by Trainees (Study on 15 areas), Fellowship with the International Mission Leaders (2 hr), Fellowship with Missionaries (5 hr), Visiting Churches (every Sunday)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weaknesses are: (1) the training program is so theoretical that it is hard to apply knowledge to real life situations, and is not helpful for cultural adjustment; (2) the training program excludes trainees' children; and (3)
communal living is not effective for character development. The strength is that there are case studies led by denominational missionaries on furlough in both formal and informal settings.

Also, I interviewed four Korean missionaries trained in CFWM. They were asked the question (item 4.1): how effective has the missionary training that you received been to your cultural adjustment and cross-cultural ministry? They responded that the training program was too theoretical and too short to acquire appropriate knowledge and practical skills for cultural adjustment and effective ministry.

**Weaknesses of CFWM.** As pointed out by the missionaries, CFWM shortened the length of its program from twelve weeks to eight weeks because the missions department of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Tonghap) reduced the program to create more intensive training. Because of this, the training program tends to become more theoretical than practical and experiential. This means that the trainees have lost an opportunity to acquire practical skills for cross-cultural adjustment, a weakness of most denominational missionary training programs. In other words, in curriculum development the role of training director and staff members is usually limited to following the direction of the missions department. One of the
missionaries interviewed suggested that the length of the training program must be longer than eight weeks in order for trainees to acquire adequate knowledge and skills.

One of the interviewees pointed out that one of the weaknesses of the program is that it does not provide training for their children. CFWM does not allow trainees to bring their children. This may cause a problem with the children’s cross-cultural adjustment to the new environment which can create difficulties for a whole family. This is very shortsighted. What CFWM saves on money may lose missionary effectiveness and longevity of their families.

CFWM has a plan to train MKs with their parents but lacks MK trainers and facilities. Also, it has only two trainers out of four full-time people who have cross-cultural ministry experiences. One of the interviewees suggested that CFWM needs more experienced full-time trainers.

There is a two-week overseas field trip in the training program but this is an elective course. According to the director, most trainees do not take overseas field trips after finishing training in Korea. It should be in the program but overseas field experience is difficult due to high cost and to limits on the length of training. Also, the missions department does not want to include an overseas field trip in the training program for the same reasons.
All of the interviewees, however, emphasized the importance of overseas field experience.

Even though the director recognizes that the mono-cultural background of Korean missionaries decisively affects their cultural adjustment to other cultures, CFWM has no course on understanding Korean culture. Instead, they provide videos as culture learning tools that compare and contrast cultures. One of the distinctive features in my interviews with twenty-four Korean missionaries is that all of them emphasized that understanding Korean culture is a very important way to understand other cultures. Unfortunately, except GMTC no training centers offer the course “Understanding Korean Values and Worldview.”

**Strengths of CFWM.** One of the strengths of CFWM is that it provides communal living with foreign students that can help trainees facilitate cross-cultural communication skills. Each trainee’s family adopts a foreign student studying in the Presbyterian Seminary and College. For the trainees, non-formal activities such as visiting mission organizations and local churches every weekend may be helpful for cultural adjustment. Especially visiting foreign seamen and laborers is a good opportunity for the trainees to do experiential learning through interacting with people from other cultures.
Also, through visiting local churches the trainees can maintain an intimate relationship with church members in prayer and financial support. In the area of spiritual life, CFWM provides solid informal training methods such as Scripture readings and various prayer meetings for developing the trainees' spirituality and character qualities; this also can contribute to the trainees' cross-cultural adjustment.

**Analysis of IMTI Training Curriculum (Korean Methodist Church)**

The IMTI training curriculum was presented in the Spring and Fall semesters of the 1999 program of IMTI. In my questionnaire to the KMC missionaries (item 2.38), they pointed out only weaknesses of the training program. Weaknesses are as follows: (1) the training program is too theoretical to acquire practical ministry and adjustment skills. It needs to focus on case studies, area studies, and effective overseas field experience; (2) the training program is not balanced or integrated in formal, informal, and non-formal training; and (3) the training program is not residential. A missionary suggested that the four missionary training centers of the Korea Methodist Church should merge into one denominational missionary training center like the others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
<th>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theology of Mission: 6 hr</td>
<td>1. Mission to Unreached People: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. History of Mission: 3 hr</td>
<td>2. Cross-Cultural Counseling: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultural Anthropology: 3 hr</td>
<td>3. Tentmaker Mission: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 21st Century Mission Trends: 1½ hr</td>
<td>4. Discipleship: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. World Religions: 9 hr</td>
<td>5. Mission Practice: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Mission Mobilization: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>* Missionary Life and Work</th>
<th>* Additional Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Missionary Life &amp; Work: 6 hr</td>
<td>1. Church &amp; Mission: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission Administration: 3 hr</td>
<td>2. Urban Mission: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Missionary Task: 1½ hr</td>
<td>3. Literature Mission: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Learning</strong></td>
<td>4. Mission &amp; Ecumenism: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Language Acquisition: 1½ hr</td>
<td>5. Partnership in Mission: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English Training: 28 hr</td>
<td>6. Mission to Central Asia: 1½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. KMC Mission Policy: 3 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Informal Training Courses</th>
<th>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Meeting (9 hr), Communal Meal and Conversation (28 hr), Psychological Test (2 hr)</td>
<td>Case Study (1½ hr), Overseas Field Trip (2 weeks: Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my interviews with four Korean Methodist missionaries (item 4.1-4.3), they pointed out that the training they received was not effective for their ministry. Also, they claimed that the program did not meet their needs for cultural adjustment and effective cross-cultural ministry. They pointed out that the missionary training programs of the KMC, including the IMTI program, need to be more focused on four areas: adequate overseas field...
experience trips, effective communal living, enough area studies, and more practical culture learning. A Korean missionary in the Philippines said about the program.

Some missionaries should not have been sent to the mission field. Particularly, missionaries who lack character qualities and have immature spirituality and poor relationship skills cause many other problems. In this respect, the training center should train missionary candidates in a residential setting in order to be effective, because missionary candidates can recognize their personality, and develop their character and interpersonal relationship skills through living with others. Also, the curriculum should include overseas field experience for missionary candidates to develop cross-cultural adjustment skills.

**Weaknesses of IMTI.** Four missionaries whom I interviewed, and my questionnaire data, pointed out that the weakest area of the training program is lack of informal training. IMTI does not provide communal living and an intensive long-term training program but is a weekend program running for a year. The overseas missions department of the Korea Methodist Church plans to merge all four centers into a denominational training center which will be residential with appropriate training facilities. The program heavily depends on formal lectures done by part-time lecturers. Only the director is a full-time trainer.

In formal training, cultural adjustment-related classes are not provided except for cultural anthropology (three hours) and case study (one and a half
hours). In this sense, the IMTI program does not increase trainees' cross-cultural adaptability in the areas of formal and informal training.

There is only one non-formal training program, an overseas field trip for two weeks led by the director. But like other programs, the overseas field trip would not be effective if it lacks experienced staff and field leadership. The KMC missionary training programs need to be redesigned in various areas for effective cross-cultural missionary training.

**Analysis of KMTI Training Curriculum (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Kosin)**

Until 1998 the KMTI training programs were offered twice a year with each session running two weeks. According to Kyeong-Sook Park, professor at Moody Bible Institute, missionary candidates of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Kosin) were supposedly required to attend four sessions of these programs to be accepted as Kosin missionaries. Nevertheless, this was not strictly enforced. Four sessions of these programs were not considered as a package and were not necessarily repeated consecutively every two years. Each session varied, and its content and structure depended largely on what part-time trainers were available at that given period of time (1996:158).

Since 1997, KMTI has offered no language learning program.
Table 15
Training Curriculum of KMTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Theory of Mission: 30 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bible Exposition: 15 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Informal Training Courses</th>
<th>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Studies &amp; Prayer Meetings (10 hr), Fellowship and Testimony (5 hr), Practical Skills Training (computer, carpentry, motor mechanics, etc) (30 hr)</td>
<td>Overseas Research Trip (4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curriculum shown in Table 15 was presented by KMTI as a training program used until 1998 from the opening of KMTI in 1988. KMTI designed a new program in 1999. The following is an overall design of the new KMTI training program which runs twice a year (January-March, June-August) as the residential program in six stages of domestic training and three stages of overseas field experience:

I. Domestic Training (six weeks)

1. First Stage: Biblical Understanding of Mission
2. Second Stage: Historical Understanding of Mission
3. Third Stage: Cultural Understanding of Mission
4. Fourth Stage: Strategic Understanding of Mission
5. Fifth Stage: Cross-Cultural Church Planting and Church Growth
6. Sixth Stage: Domestic Field Experience
II. Overseas Training (four weeks)

1. First Stage: Research Method and Domestic Practice (first week)
2. Second Stage: Overseas Field experience and Field Adjustment Training (second and third week)
3. Post-Field Report and Discussion (last week)

**Weaknesses of KMTI.** In the questionnaire (item 2.38), nine missionaries pointed out some weaknesses of their training programs. Like most other training centers, they insisted that the program lacks practical aspects. In other words, it does not provide enough cross-cultural training such as effective field experiences. As mentioned above, three out of nine missionaries pointed out a lack of English learning. Also, I interviewed three Kosin missionaries who were not satisfied with the training they received. The missionary training program does not meet their needs for cultural adjustment. They pointed out that KMTI should emphasize more effective communal living, overseas field trips and culture learning, and spiritual warfare in order to make the training effective and help missionary candidates grow.

A missionary in an Asian country said,

I have had a conflict with a fellow missionary since my arrival in this country. This conflict is not resolved yet. It has caused many problems physically, mentally, and spiritually. This conflict was caused by difference of values and philosophy of ministry. Before
coming to Bangladesh, I thought that I would have no problems in relationships with others. But my weakness in relationships with others was revealed on the field. So cross-cultural missionary training needs to focus on developing interpersonal relationship skills through living in a community.

As seen in Table 15, training programs are geared toward cognitive learning that relies heavily on lectures. Regarding culture learning, there are not enough courses such as cultural anthropology and cross-cultural adjustment to help trainees learn adjustment skills. Also, the program is too short to allow the trainee to gain appropriate interpersonal skills and develop character qualities.

The training programs are offered twice a year with each session running two weeks. These programs run in winter and summer as intensive courses. For this reason, it is difficult to run effective informal training programs. Since the training programs are separated from each other, the effect of communal living might be minimized.

**Strengths of KMTI.** In the KMTI training program, the overseas field experience is one of the most important programs. As stated above, a four-week project for overseas field experience is effective in helping trainees to acquire appropriate knowledge like research methods (one week), field adjustment experience (two weeks), and post-field discussion and evaluation
This program started in 1999. However, without qualified trainers and field leadership who can lead the field experience trips, its main purpose, that the trainees learn how to interact with people in other cultures for effective cultural adjustment, might not be achieved.

Analysis of KMTC Training Curriculum (Korea Evangelical Holiness Church)

The KMTC curriculum was presented in the eleventh training program of KMTC which ran from March to September, 1999. In my questionnaire (item 2.38), the missionaries pointed out the following weaknesses in the program: (1) theoretical courses are unnecessarily repeated; (2) there is a lack of practical courses such as area studies and case studies related to problems in the mission field; (3) although the length of the training is longer than in other centers, the curriculum is not effective in developing trainees’ ministry and cross-cultural adjustment skills.

A strength of the training program is communal living, but a lack of trainers and facilities makes the communal living ineffective. Also, I interviewed four Korean missionaries trained in KMTC (item 4.1-4.3), who reported that the KMTC program did little to influence their cultural
adjustment. It barely met their needs for cultural adjustment and ministry.

They pointed out that KMTC needs to focus their training on two areas: planned and organized overseas field experience and area studies with missionaries on furlough.

Table 16

Training Curriculum of KMTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
<th>* Core Subjects on Mission</th>
<th>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Theology of Mission: 6 hr</td>
<td>1. Cross-cultural Church Planting: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. History of Mission: 6 hr</td>
<td>2. Cross-cultural Team Ministry: 9 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cultural Anthropology: 10 hr</td>
<td>3. Cross-cultural Discipleship: 27 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cross-cultural Leadership: 6 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td>1. Spiritual Warfare: 9 hr</td>
<td>* Language Learning (English): 69 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Missionary Health: 2 hr</td>
<td>* Additional Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Missionary Life and Work: 18 hr</td>
<td>1. Inductive Bible Study: 5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Mission Philosophy: 9 hr</td>
<td>2. Orientation to KEHC: 22 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mission Administration: 6 hr</td>
<td>3. Spiritual Formation: 2 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Informal Training Courses</td>
<td>Prayer Meetings (Early Morning, Night, Wednesday ), Scripture Reading, Quiet Time, Writing Reports, Community Time (Exercise, Cleaning), Tests</td>
<td>Overseas Field experience: two weeks, Domestic Field Trip for Spiritual Formation, Seminar in Area Study, Family and Marriage Seminar, Discipleship Seminar, Evangelism Explosion Seminar, English Camp (one week), Evangelism Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses of KMTC. KMTC has the longest program among the eight missionary training centers, which is seven months. But in spite of the longest length, only the director is full time. Thus, communal living has not been effective because appropriate care and supervision has not been given to the trainees and their children. One interviewee pointed out that due to the lack of facilities and care, conflicts arose among families, especially among wives. Recently, a new KMTC building is built which can facilitate the effectiveness of the training program. Also, the two-week overseas field experience seldom produces good results due to the lack of experienced trainers and field leadership. Another weakness of the program is a lack of MK care and education like other training centers.

Strengths of KMTC. One of the strengths of the KMTC training program is that residential English summer camp with OMS missionaries helps increase the trainees’ adaptability to another culture. Compared with other training programs, cultural anthropology (ten hours), cross-cultural discipleship (twenty-seven hours), and ethnographic research methods (twenty hours) are strongly emphasized. Also, one of its emphases is on spiritual formation. The trainees of KMTC have a week-long retreat for spiritual formation.
Analysis of GMTI Training Curriculum (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Hapdong)

The GMTI training curriculum was presented in the thirty-fifth session (March 22 to May 29, 1999). GMTI redesigned its own missionary training program in 1994 since Dr. Young Jun Son, MTI director, resigned the position and wanted to run MTI as an interdenominational training center.

The respondents to the questionnaire (item 2.38) who received their training in GMTI pointed out some weaknesses as follows: (1) the training program is not practical and field-oriented. It needs to provide courses such as area studies, case studies discussed with missionaries, and various field-oriented workshops; (2) it urgently needs qualified foreign trainers to develop trainees’ cultural adjustment skills as well as their English. Although communal living is effective for developing integrity of character and interpersonal relationship, a lack of facilities prohibits this.

In my interview (item 4.1-4.3), the four missionaries trained in GMTI after 1994 were sent to mission fields from late 1994. They argued that the GMTI training program failed to meet their needs for cross-cultural ministry and cultural adjustment. They said that the training contributed little to their cultural adjustment. To meet the trainees’ needs, the program, they insist,
should emphasize the following areas: overseas field experience, communal living for character development, area studies, and a more practical skills-based training.

Table 17
Training Curriculum of GMTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
<th>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Core Subjects on Mission</td>
<td>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Theology of Mission: 5 hr</td>
<td>1. Cross-cultural Christian Education: 8 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. History of Mission: 5 hr</td>
<td>2. Principles of Team Ministry: 2 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Worldview and World Religion: 5 hr</td>
<td>3. Cross-cultural Communication: 5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Current Mission Trend: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td>5. Cross-cultural Church Planting: 2 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Cross-cultural Leadership: 2 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Mission Strategy: 2 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Area Studies: 7 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spiritual Warfare: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Missionary Health: 5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MK Education: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Field Research Method: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mission Policy/Administration: 24 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practical Skills: 25 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spiritual Formation: 2 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Settlement on the Field: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spiritual Warfare: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Missionary Health: 5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MK Education: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Field Research Method: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mission Policy/Administration: 24 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practical Skills: 25 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spiritual Formation: 2 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Settlement on the Field: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Informal Training Courses</td>
<td>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Meetings, Daily Chapel, Self Studies, Evaluation, Orientation, Informal Meetings, Family Devotion, Cleaning and Physical Exercise, Tutorial System (every Saturday: advisory), T-JTA Test, Spiritual Gifts Test</td>
<td>Overseas Field Trip (2 weeks), Evangelism Practicum (weekend), Weekend Services in Local Churches, Membership Training (1 day) Area Studies with Furloughing Missionaries (weekend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* English Practice: 45 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Principles of Linguistics: 10 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Additional Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Missionary Ethics: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eastern Europe Missions: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextualization: 5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Islamic Studies: 5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creative Access Areas: 2 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adoption to the Unreached: 5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses of GMTI. Gap-Chul Shin, director of GMTI, points out weaknesses in the training program in two areas. It is not designed as a holistic training program which is well-balanced between formal, informal, and non-formal training methods. Also, it is not easy for the training staff to design and develop the training program because of the paternalistic attitudes of denominational leadership, as is true for other missionary training centers that belong to the denominations.

GMTI lacks full-time training staff for the trainees to model after. As mentioned above, the number of full-time staff is four while the average number of trainees is fifty in each session. Also, inadequate space and facilities hinder the effectiveness of communal living. A further weakness is the tendency to overemphasize formal and theoretical courses. But due to the short length for the training program, ten weeks, not enough time is allotted to the courses for cultural adjustment. There are no cultural anthropology and Korean culture courses. Rather, the program emphasizes practical skills, English, ministry skills, and denominational mission policy and administration, as seen in Table 17. Gap-Chul Shin said,

Korean missionaries’ monocultural background profoundly affects their cross-cultural adjustment and ministry. However, they seldom recognize its influences. It is not easy to overcome its negative
aspects. Unfortunately, we do not offer "Korean Culture" or "Korean Values and Worldview." I hope to add the course in the training program soon.

**Strengths of GMTI.** The Presbyterian Church of Korea (Hapdong) is the largest missionary sending denomination in Korea. In this regard, most full-time and part-time training staffs have overseas ministry experiences and degrees in missiology. Also, there is strong field leadership who are able to train missionary candidates and supervise new missionaries. In this regard, GMTI has access to various areas for overseas field trips, and access to good field trainers due to the large number of senior missionaries who have worked in many countries. The trainees visit the mission field where they will serve during the period of the field experience (four weeks). This period is for the trainees to be evaluated by the senior missionaries, especially in cross-cultural ministry and adaptability to the target culture.

Approximately 200 out of 900 career missionaries are on furlough each year. GMTI can use those missionaries as part-time training staff in area studies and mentoring for the trainees. GMTI has an area studies (four weeks) program with furloughing missionaries and overseas field experience (four weeks). It is important for the trainees to experience other cultures and acquire related knowledge, but in order to be effective these programs must
have good facilitators. In other words, there must be follow-up processes such as evaluation of the field trip, self reflection, and response to the experiences.

**Analysis of GMTC Training Curriculum (Global Missionary Fellowship)**

The GMTC curriculum seen in Table 18 was presented in the schedule of the eighteenth training session, January to May, 1999. GMTC emerged as one of the leading missionary training centers in Korea. In my interviews with three Korean missionaries who received their training in GMTC, all of them responded that the program contributed to their ministry and adjustment to the target culture.

In my questionnaire (item 2.38), missionaries trained in GMTC pointed out that a developing area in the program is in-depth case studies and area studies facilitated by missionaries that offer trainees indirect field experiences. Twelve respondents out of nineteen missionaries evaluated the training program (item 4.1-4.3) as balanced and holistic. They were satisfied with the trainer’s commitment and character, curriculum, and communal living. One of them asserted that training programs must relate to the Korean context and be conducted by Korean trainers in their language. Three GMTC alumni whom I interviewed pointed out that GMTC needs to add overseas
field trip to facilitate the trainees' cross-cultural adjustment skills.

Table 18

Training Curriculum of GMTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
<th>II. Informal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction to Mission: 11 ½ hr</td>
<td>Marriage Seminar (13 hr), Evangelism Practicum, Leadership Seminar (4 days), Mission Practice (25 ½ hr), Cross-cultural Discipleship Seminar (4 days), Life Formation (28 hr), Case Studies (18 hr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Theology of Mission: 8 ½ hr</td>
<td>* Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History of Mission: 12 ½ hr</td>
<td>1. Phonetics: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History of Mission of the Korean Church: 7 hr</td>
<td>2. Language Acquisition: 8 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Christian Religions: 7 hr</td>
<td>3. English: 33 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cultural Anthropology: 11 hr</td>
<td>* Additional Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Church Growth: 10 hr</td>
<td>1. Korean Culture: 9 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</td>
<td>2. Two-Thirds World Mission: 7 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cross-cultural Exegesis &amp; Homiletics: 4 days</td>
<td>3. Urban Mission: 8 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cross-cultural Communication: 5 hr</td>
<td>4. Islamic Study: 5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cross-cultural Church Planting: 5 hr</td>
<td>5. Animism: 7 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research Method: 3 ½ hr</td>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td>1. Philosophy of Ministry: 3 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cross-cultural Exegesis &amp; Homiletics: 4 days</td>
<td>2. MK Education: 11 ½ hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cross-cultural Communication: 5 hr</td>
<td>3. Spiritual Warfare: 8 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cross-cultural Church Planting: 5 hr</td>
<td>4. Practical Skills: 6 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research Method: 3 ½ hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weaknesses of GMTC. As of January, 1995, the length of the GMTC training program was nine months including the overseas field trip, but was changed to six and a half months without the overseas field trip and domestic
field trips. David Lee, director of GMTC, says that the overseas field trip was removed from the training program because most candidates have had some type of overseas field experience prior to admission. But he recognizes the importance of the overseas field trip. This tendency has made the GMTC training program more theoretical than practical and experiential in comparison with the former program prior to 1995. In fact, GMF, mother agency of GMTC, has a training center in the Philippines, so GMTC can use that center to increase missionary candidates’ cross-cultural adaptability. The GMTC program, however, does not contain the overseas field training conducted in the GMF center in the Philippines.

**Strengths of GMTC.** First of all, regarding the training methods of the GMTC program, informal methods through communal living allow the trainees to develop their character qualities and interpersonal relationships. This informal training method is referred to as the “implicit curriculum.” David Lee indicates the advantages of this method: (1) through worship services, prayer meetings, and personal devotion, trainees can experience personal and spiritual growth; (2) through a house parent system in which families take turns giving leadership to the whole community, trainees can learn about leadership; and (3) through emphasizing family life trainees can
prepare for cross-cultural living (1991a:75).

As stated above, GMTC has an adequate number of full-time staff members. In relation to communal living, MK education makes the training program much stronger. David Lee, in my interview, insisted that trainers being sensitive to other cultures is more important than having cross-cultural experiences. Also he says that training staffs must function as role models and facilitators to change the trainees’ character and worldview.

One distinctive feature is that unlike other training centers GMTC provides the course “Understanding Korean Culture.” Also, it allots enough time for cross-cultural studies such as cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and case studies. David Lee said that without understanding Korean values and worldview it is difficult for Korean missionaries to adjust to another culture. Through understanding the strengths and weaknesses of Korean culture, Korean missionaries can adjust to other cultures without losing their cultural identity and being ethnocentric. He also insisted that training by nationals and “heart language” is most effective in achieving many holistic ends because national trainers best understand the trainee’s worldview and values and using Korean language is the most effective way to develop the trainee’s character and understanding of family life, emotional
health, and spiritual maturity (1998:2-3). Also, GMTC provides a cross-cultural adaptability test along with the psychological test, T-JTA (Taylor Johnson Temperament Analysis). Especially, T-JTA test is “often used for in-depth interviews” (David Lee 1998:2).

Analysis of MTI Training Curriculum (Interdenominational)

The MTI training curriculum was presented in the MTI catalogue along with the schedule of the twenty-seventh training session, March 2 to May 28, 1999. Nine missionaries trained in MTI pointed out weaknesses of the program in my questionnaire (item 2.38). The weaknesses are as follows: (1) a balanced and integrated training program is needed for training effectiveness; (2) training for cultural adjustment and ministry effectiveness is needed; and (3) the training program should not imitate a Western model of missionary training. A strength is that the training program in English helped trainees develop English language proficiency, but training in English hinders effectiveness in that trainees hardly understand the lectures and conversations in communal living. This causes stress.

I also interviewed two missionaries trained in MTI (item 4.1-4.3). They pointed out that the program offered little influence on their adjustment to the target cultures. The training they received has not met their needs on
the fields. They insist that MTI should train missionary candidates in Korean
and schedule overseas field adjustment trips into the program. One of them
said, “The training did not significantly affect his ministry; rather, it was no
more than a mere process for him to be sent to the mission field. Especially,
the training in English is not effective because those who do not speak
English seldom understand the lectures. It can cause a lot of stresses.”

Table 19

Training Curriculum of MTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Informal Training Courses</th>
<th>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Devotions, Daily Chapel, Prayer Meetings, Physical Exercise, Living &amp; Learning in English</td>
<td>Practicum (9 hr), Mission Field Survey (9 hr), Game and Video (9 hr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weaknesses of MTI.** Young Jun Son, director and founder of MTI, and Ruth Eshenaur state that “learning English helps to broaden the outlook of Koreans so that they can relate effectively to both the nationals and missionaries of other cultures” (1998:24), but the MTI training program has its own weakness. There may be a risk of losing both the language and the
training. The trainees’ limitation in English would compound the problem. Although the extreme emphasis on English competence is practical for those who go to countries where English is commonly used, for others who expect to go to countries where English is not used, the English emphasis would compound the problem.

A further weakness is a lack of courses related to cross-cultural adjustment and ministry. Almost all courses are designed for improving trainees’ English competency. The MTI training program is not designed for cross-cultural missionary training.

Unlike GMTC, MTI has a different reason why the training program does not include the overseas field trip: that is because of high cost and trainees’ complaints. Also, because of a lack of full-time training staff almost all courses are taught by foreign staff. For this reason, there is a problem of communication. Also, the communal living is limited to four days a week, Tuesday to Friday. Unlike other training centers, there are no weekend informal and non-formal training programs.

**Strengths of MTI.** There are some strengths of the MTI training program. Living and learning in English facilitates the trainees’ cross-cultural communication skills through interacting with foreign trainers. Also, they can
gain cross-cultural experience through living with foreign trainers, but unless they acquire appropriate anthropological knowledge and cross-cultural adjustment skills, it might have a detrimental effect.

Analysis of OMMTC Training Curriculum (Operation Mobilization Korea)

The OMMTC training curriculum was presented in the OMMTC catalogue and the schedule of the fourteenth training session running from October, 1999 to July, 2000. In my questionnaire to missionaries trained in OMMTC (item 2.38), they pointed out weaknesses of the training program as follows: lack of care of trainees, ineffective communal training, lack of cross-cultural studies such as cultural anthropology, Korean culture compared with other cultures, and cross-cultural communication. A distinctive strength of the program is that trainees live communally with foreign trainers and trainees for cross-cultural adjustment and language acquisition.

Young Hee Chung, director of OMMTC, indicated that the OMMTC training program is mainly for laymen, not ordained ministers. The ratio of laymen to ordained ministers is 7:3. He pointed out that OMMTC needs more professional full-time trainers and needs its own building for more effective training. Because OMMTC does not own a building for training, it emphasizes non-residential training (three days a week for five months) along
with one month of residential training since the opening of the program in 1997. But the type and length of the training depends on the place and situation.

Table 20
Training Curriculum of OMMTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Formal Training Courses</th>
<th>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Core Subjects on Mission</td>
<td>* Cross-Cultural Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Theology of Mission: 3 hr</td>
<td>1. Cross-Cultural Evangelism: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td>4. Cross-Cultural Discipleship: 8 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Missionary Life and Work (Knowing God, Knowing Myself, Knowing the Mission): 12 hr</td>
<td>5. Cross-Cultural Church Planting: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spiritual Warfare: 3 hr</td>
<td>6. Team Work: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Missionary Life and Work</td>
<td>English: 18 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Missionary Life and Work (Knowing God, Knowing Myself, Knowing the Mission): 12 hr</td>
<td>* Additional Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spiritual Warfare: 3 hr</td>
<td>1. Precept Bible Study: 6 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Psychology: 2 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Orthodox Church: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. OM Mission Policy: 4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Informal Training Courses</td>
<td>III. Non-Formal Training Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Devotions, Team Devotions, Counseling, MBTI Test, Self-Study, Team Meetings, Worship Services, Fellowship Evaluation, Prayer Meetings, Workshop</td>
<td>Overseas Field Trip for Language Learning and Evangelism Practicum (4 months), Domestic Evangelism Field Trip (10 days), OMK Orientation Camp (1 week), Love Korea Evangelism Campaign, Family Seminar, Group Discussion, Team Meetings, Mission Field Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourteenth OMMTC session in Korea was residential for nine weeks which included six weeks of residential training, ten days of
evangelism travel, and one week of OM Korea orientation. After finishing those programs, the trainees take a four-month overseas field trip for language training and evangelism. This program is conducted by the OM International staff.

**Weaknesses of OMMTC.** Lack of full-time trainers is a basic weakness of the OMMTC training program, which may hinder its effectiveness. Also, it does not have its own building. A further weakness of the program is a lack of courses for culture learning and cross-cultural adjustment. A small amount of time is allotted for cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and cross-cultural studies. There are no courses on Korean culture, MK education, or conflict management. To the question "How do you weigh the importance of learning both Korean culture and other cultures in designing your training curriculum (item 4.4)?" Young Hee Chung, director of OMMTC, said, "It is very important. Unfortunately we do not offer the course. But, it must be in the training curriculum for helping trainees understand themselves and people of other cultures."

**Strengths of OMMTC.** OM Korea belongs to OM International. Unlike other training centers, the strongest area of the OMMTC training program is the overseas field trip. The trainees are sent overseas for language
learning, cross-cultural adjustment, and evangelism practice after finishing the
training in Korea. The length of the overseas field trip is four months which
is the longest period among the eight training programs. Also, they are
trained by experienced foreign trainers. This is a great opportunity for the
trainees to improve their skills in interpersonal relationships, cross-cultural
adjustment, and language competency. During the training, English is the
language used in learning and living.

Summary and Discussion

I evaluated the eight missionary training programs in Korea through an
analysis of data collected from written documents and catalogues, from
interviews with directors of the eight missionary training centers, from
interviews with Korean missionaries, and a questionnaire given to Korean
missionaries. I also described the general information of the training centers
for preliminary understanding. This evaluation focused on the effectiveness
of the training programs in relation to Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural
adjustment. To do this, I evaluated important training factors influencing the
trainees’ cross-cultural adjustment in the length and type of the training, the
training staff, and the training place. I analyzed curricular activities according
to the research question: Do the missionary training centers provide the missionaries with adequate knowledge, practical adjustment skills, and experience of diverse cultures?

Some other factors influence Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment such as family, education, theological background, personality, ordination, working career, and experience. However, cross-cultural training is the most important factor because it enables the trainees to see themselves, develop interpersonal relationship skills, and grow in Christian character and spirituality to successfully adjust to the new culture for the sake of proclaiming the gospel message.

In my questionnaire to 125 Korean missionaries (item 2-38), eighty-six missionaries responded to the question about weaknesses of the missionary training programs they received. They pointed out that common weaknesses of their training programs are as follows: (1) too theoretical to achieve effective ministry and cross-cultural adjustment skills, and lack of a balanced curriculum (fifty-six missionaries); (2) lack of experienced and qualified full-time trainers and facilities for communal living (forty-nine); (3) ineffective overseas field experience (thirty-five); (4) lack of learning English and language acquisition skills (twenty-five); and (5) lack of practical MK training
Also, twenty-four Korean missionaries whom I interviewed overseas indicated that the most important factors for cross-cultural adjustment are overseas field experience, communal living, and culture learning like area studies and case studies facilitated by missionaries. Also, all of them argued that understanding Korean culture is crucial for knowing and relating to other cultures. This tendency indicates that informal and non-formal training methods on the basis of appropriate cross-cultural knowledge are the decisive factors for helping missionaries adjust to other cultures.

In this respect, some training programs have more strength in these areas than others. These factors relate to length, type, place, trainer, and training facilities. Considering these training factors, GMTC provided the most effective training program among the eight missionary training centers. The length of training of GMTC, OMMTC, and KMTC is more than six months in communal living; others average three months. In the trainer issues, seven full-time training staff serve in GMTC. Though GMTI has a lot of staff that can serve to train missionary candidates, it has only four full-time trainers. There are not enough trainers in other centers which may cause problems in effective cross-cultural training. But OMMTC is not included in
this category because it is connected to the OM International training program in which many experienced foreign trainers are available when the trainees are trained overseas. Though OMMTC suffers a weakness in their training curriculum in that it does not offer enough cross-cultural studies, its overseas field training may compensate for that weakness.

Another issue that should be pointed out is the relationship between training centers and denominational leadership. One of the weaknesses of denominational missionary training centers is the hindrance in developing training curriculum. Though staff recognizes the effectiveness of informal and non-formal education in cross-cultural missionary training, if denominational leadership does not understand it, it is hard for them to put those methods into the curriculum design. In fact, denominations of the Korean Protestant church are dominated by a strong authoritarian and hierarchical structure. David Lee said about the training goal of GMTC (item 1.6), "The main purpose of GMTC is to train mission leaders. One of the advantages of GMTC as an interdenominational missionary training center is that no control and hierarchical leadership are involved in running the training center and designing and developing the training curriculum."

As mentioned above, the educational system of the Korean churches
resembles the nation's social structure, which is ruled by traditional formal education. The weakest point of the formal education system is that it is inflexible to respond to pressures from new paradigms because it is not based on real life experiences but on cognitive knowledge. In this sense, the role of the trainer is decisive in developing training programs and building communities of faith to enhance the spiritual and character qualities of both trainers and trainees.

All eight training centers emphasize learning English. In the case of MTI, English is the only language used in the classes and in communal living. Some Korean missionaries pointed out that one of weaknesses of their training program is lack of emphasis on English competence. The reasons why training centers emphasize English is that it is more of a global language than ever. Unless missionaries speak English, it is hard for them to cooperate with foreign missionaries in many mission fields. In this sense, MTI has a strength in English acquisition. But, extreme emphasis on English without adequate missionary training curriculum should compound the problem of cross-cultural mission work. A possible solution is that all training centers in Korea cooperate to establish an English language acquisition program for Korean missionary candidates with the help of English-speaking foreign
missionaries in Korea.

The cross-cultural adjustment issue in missionary training is vital for the traditionally monocultural and monolingual Korean missionary to be effective in cross-cultural settings. Thus, though this issue needs to be addressed in depth, present missionary training programs tend to be weak. Particularly, most training centers seldom offer courses that can help trainees acquire intercultural knowledge such as cultural anthropology, understanding culture shock, cross-cultural communication, conflict management skills, and Korean culture. Most training centers have overseas field trips to help trainees acquire appropriate coping skills in unfamiliar cultural circumstances. However, due to the lack of understanding of culture, experienced trainers, and field leadership, it seems difficult to get good results. In this regard, to make field training effective, it needs competency based training that integrates the cognitive domain of cross-cultural training into experiential learning. In other words, overseas field experience to facilitate trainees' coping skills in other cultures needs to be balanced between the two domains of cross-cultural education, and knowing and doing. Also, post-field evaluation is important to allow trainees to reflect on what they experienced in other cultures.
Another issue needs to be pointed out in relation to training issues. In my interviews with directors of the training centers (item 2.3.4), no training center offers a training program for missionary trainers. Unless trainers develop their training skills, knowledge, character, spirituality, and cultural sensitivity, they cannot produce good missionaries and develop good missionary training programs. It is an important task for missionary training centers in Korea.

Through the evaluation of the curriculum factors of the training programs in their relation to cross-cultural adjustment, GMTC and OMMTC, which are interdenominational missionary training centers run more effective programs contributing to the missionary's cross-cultural adjustment than denominational training centers both in quality and quantity. Of five denominational training centers, KMTC (KEHC) and CFWM (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Tonghap) run relatively better programs than others. IMTI, GMTI, MTI, and KMTI programs need to be strengthened through redesigning the curriculum. These four training programs were much less effective compared to the GMTC program.

In the next chapter, I evaluate Korean missionaries' cultural adjustment by using various research tools. I also seek to determine to what extent the
cross-cultural missionary training programs discussed in this chapter are related to Korean missionaries' cultural adjustment. For this, I adopted the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) for Korean missionaries and the Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries (QFKM) to measure and evaluate their adaptability.
Notes

1. There are approximately twenty missionary training centers in Korea. In this dissertation research I select eight missionary training centers, five denominational and three interdenominational missionary training centers. The denominational missionary training centers are the missionary training arm of main missionary sending denominations of the Korean Protestant church. I excluded World Missions Training Center (WMTC) which is a training arm of the Korea Baptist Convention because WMTC established in 1994 has produced only sixteen graduates as of March, 1999. This was not enough number for gathering the research data. Before the establishment of WMTC, most Korean Baptist missionary candidates were trained at Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC). I also excluded the missionary training center of the Korea Assemblies of God because they refused to be a part of my dissertation research.

2. As a non-formal training method, experiential learning involves "the trainees emotionally and physically as well as intellectually; the trainees learn through actual experience" (Grove and Torbiorn 1993:89).

3. See Kohls and Brussow (1995:5-6; 66-67) about discussion on characteristics of an experiential trainer and a good trainer.

4. Action-reflection-response learning is exemplified by liberation theology. In contrast with "the theory-application learning," action-reflection-response learning fits cross-cultural settings. Action indicates praxis, field experience, practicum, learning on the job. Reflection indicates the process of attaining greater knowledge of something as a result of thinking through the action, a process made possible through gaining more information about, assimilating, and accepting ownership of the experience. Response indicates a corresponding attitudinal or behavioral modification (Hess 1994:21-22).
CHAPTER 6

Evaluation of Korean Missionaries’ Cross-Cultural Adjustment
and Its Relationship to Their Training Programs

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the findings of the survey on Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment in light of the problem of the study: “How is missionary preparation through cross-cultural training related to Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment?”

This research employed a relational design in exploring interaction between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment based the hypothesis that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training is related to a missionary’s poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry. Consequently, inadequate cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment predict a high rate of missionary attrition.

This chapter includes a description of measures, samples, and research procedures administered to Korean missionaries. The relevant findings and statistical report from the CCAI (the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory, See Appendix E) and the QFKM (Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries, See
Appendix A) are also presented. This chapter interprets results and discusses relationships between training programs and missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. Regarding missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment, interviews with missionaries and nationals that were conducted in selected mission fields are presented in this chapter.

Methodology

Sample Description

The sample consisted of 125 Korean missionaries who were trained in eight missionary training centers in Korea: Center for World Mission (CFWM) (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Tonghap, n=14); Global Missionary Training Center (GMTC) (interdenominational, n=19), Global Missionary Training Institute (GMTI) (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Hapdong, n=11), International Missionary Training Institute (IMTI) (Korean Methodist Church, n=32), KEHC Missionary Training Center (KMTC) (Korea Evangelical Holiness Church, n=13), Kosin Missionary Training Institute (KMTI) (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Kosin, n=11), Missionary Training Institute (MTI) (interdenominational, n=14), and OM Missionary Training Center (OMMTC) (interdenominational, n=11). The samples were randomly
selected from the missionary list obtained through the eight training centers. The total number of samples that were randomly selected and contacted by mail was 250 individuals. One hundred twenty-five individuals who responded to the survey were used for the sample of this study. Samples were grouped into eight comparison groups by the training centers in which the missionaries were trained.

Table 21 presents demographic information of the samples of the eight training centers regarding gender, age distribution, and marriage status. The majority of respondents at each training center were male because most female spouses declined to answer the survey. Of the 125 subjects, 112 (89 percent) were male and thirteen (10.4 percent) were female. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents were married and 9.6 percent unmarried, with 2.4 percent of respondents registering no response regarding marriage.

Missionaries ranged in age from twenty-six to fifty-eight, with 46.4 percent of the total respondents between thirty to thirty-nine years of age and 42.4 percent between forty to forty-nine years of age. The mean age for this sample was 39.5. The distribution of samples between the training centers consisted of equivalent percentages in gender, age, and marriage except OMMTC. OMMTC had more females and younger age samples. Forty-five
percent of samples in OMMTC was unmarried. This tendency may be attributed to the fact that OMMTC as a parachurch organization attracts young people, especially female missionaries, who do not like denominational interference because most of them are not ordained ministers, but lay persons.

Table 21

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample I (N=125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>CFWM (Tonghap) n (%)</th>
<th>GMTC (Hapdong) n (%)</th>
<th>GMTI (KMC) n (%)</th>
<th>IMTI (KEHC) n (%)</th>
<th>KMTI (Kosin) n (%)</th>
<th>KMTI n (%)</th>
<th>MTI n (%)</th>
<th>OM MTC n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>17 (89.5)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>27 (84.4)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>10 (90.9)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>5 (15.6)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
<td>6 (31.6)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>2 (65.6)</td>
<td>9 (69.2)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>8 (57.1)</td>
<td>12 (63.2)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>10 (31.3)</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>10 (71.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2 (14.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (5.3)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>2 (18.1)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>13 (92.9)</td>
<td>18 (94.7)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>27 (84.4)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>13 (92.9)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (5.3)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>3 (9.4)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 presents other demographic information on the sample regarding education, ordination, terms of missionary experience, serving countries, and kind of ministry. Approximately 90 percent of all missionaries surveyed were seminary graduates and 88 percent were ordained. The majority of the missionaries have first or second-term career missionary
experience. Fifty-four percent of total respondents were first-term missionaries (one to five years), 32 percent second-term (six to ten years) and 10 percent third-term (eleven to fifteen years).

Table 22

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample II (N=125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFWM (Tonghap) n (%)</th>
<th>GMTC (Hapdong) n (%)</th>
<th>GMTI (KMT) n (%)</th>
<th>IMTI (KEHC) n (%)</th>
<th>KMTI (Kosin) n (%)</th>
<th>OM MTC n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>16 (84.2)</td>
<td>32 (100)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordination</strong></td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>14 (84.2)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>10 (90.9)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Term</td>
<td>6 (42.9)</td>
<td>9 (47.4)</td>
<td>23 (71.9)</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Term</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
<td>5 (26.3)</td>
<td>6 (18.8)</td>
<td>2 (6.3)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Term</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
<td>5 (26.3)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9 (64.9)</td>
<td>14 (73.7)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>28 (87.5)</td>
<td>12 (92.3)</td>
<td>7 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>2 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>4 (28.6)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM**</td>
<td>13 (92.8)</td>
<td>18 (94.7)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>28 (87.5)</td>
<td>12 (92.3)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM and KM***</td>
<td>1 (7.2)</td>
<td>1 (6.3)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross-Cultural Ministry

*** Cross-Cultural Ministry and Korean Ministry

The number of countries of service represented by the missionaries was forty, scattered in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, and Oceania.
OMMTC had fewer samples who were ordained and seminary graduates than other training centers. All respondents of GMTI consisted of first-term career missionaries because of its late foundation in 1994. Of the 125 subjects, 116 had cross-cultural ministry experience and the remaining nine ministered in Korean congregations along with cross-cultural mission work.

**Instruments for Collecting Data**

The data for this study came from three surveys: (1) the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI); (2) the self-administered research questionnaire: Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries (QFKM); (3) interviews with Korean missionaries and nationals.

**The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI).** The CCAI, a fifty-question self-report form, is one of the most frequently used research instruments for quantifying cross-cultural adaptability. The CCAI is not targeted to one particular culture; it is designed to be culture-general (Kelley and Meyers 1995). The CCAI was designed to respond to the following needs: (1) to understand the factors and qualities that facilitate cross-cultural effectiveness focusing on four skill areas; (2) to increase self-awareness regarding the factors and qualities that influence cross-cultural effectiveness; (3) to improve skills in interacting with people from other cultures when an
individual is already in a new culture or a multicultural setting; (4) to decide whether to work in a culturally diverse or multinational company, whether to live abroad, and so on; and (5) to prepare to enter another culture through preparatory training customized to the individual (Kelly and Meyers 1995:2).

The CCAI consists of fifty items distributed across four scales as seen in Table 23, page 299. The CCAI items were based on a thorough literature review and on expert opinion. The four scales of the CCAI are as follows: Emotional Resilience, Flexibility/Openness, Perceptual Acuity, and Personal Autonomy. First, the Emotional Resilience (ER, eighteen items) focuses on: (1) coping, especially with stress and ambiguity; (2) accepting and rebounding from imperfections and mistakes; (3) trying new things and experiences; and (4) interacting with people in new or unfamiliar situations.

Second, the Flexibility/Openness (FO, fifteen items) focuses on: (1) liking for, openness toward, interest in, and desire to learn from unfamiliar people and ideas; and (2) tolerance, non-judgementalness, and understanding toward others who are different from oneself.

Third, the Perceptual Acuity (PAC, ten items) is associated with confidence in one's ability to accurately perceive the feelings of others, and valuing other cultures and being willing to suspend judgement of others.
Also, it focuses on communication cues and skills and accurate interpretation of those cues across cultures.

Lastly, the Personal Autonomy (PA, seven items) is associated with one's strong sense of self as a separate and unique entity. Personally autonomous people have a strong sense of who they are, clear personal values, and respect for themselves and others. It means that persons with a sense of self as a group do not lose their identities when entering a new culture (Kelley and Meyers 1995:13-17).

The CCAI scores the sum of the value of the individual's responses to the items. Statistically, the total score is the most reliable of the CCAI scores as an indicator of cross-cultural adaptability. An individual with a high total score has the most critical skills needed for interacting effectively with people of other cultures. The CCAI scales show high internal consistency and have more than sufficient reliability and validity (Kelley and Meyers 1995:26-27).

Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries (QFKM). This self-administered questionnaire (See Appendix A) designed by the researcher consists of three sections: (1) personal information; (2) cross-cultural missionary training; and (3) cross-cultural adjustment. The first section of personal information contains ten items which ask about the respondent's
personal background and ministry affiliation. The second section, cross-cultural missionary training, contains forty items that focus on the respondent’s missionary training. The last section, cross-cultural adjustment, contains twenty-five items that focus on the respondent’s cultural adjustment to the host culture in the dimensions of language, relationships, and health. Also, this section includes questions about missionary attrition and ways of preventing it. The QFKM is used to determine Korean missionaries’ competency for cross-cultural ministry.

The response to the QFKM questions consists of two types: a descriptive response and a selective response from provided options. Options ranged from “low” to “high” and other similar types of options. For each option scores from one to five were given. The QFKM section three, cultural adjustment, is scored by four dimensions: (1) expectation and satisfaction; (2) language; (3) health; and (4) relationships.

Procedure

In order to test Korean missionaries with the CCAI, it was translated into the Korean language by permission from the owner of the copyright, National Computer Systems (NCS). The CCAI, translated into Korean, was tested on thirteen Koreans at Asbury Theological Seminary in Wilmore,
Kentucky in the United States. The translation was modified after the pilot test. The QFKM was developed to extend research investigation.

The missionaries were selected from the eight leading missionary training centers in Korea to supply the population for this study. Survey packets that included a cover letter, the CCAI, and the Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries with instruction and an addressed return envelope were mailed to each individual. Most IMTI missionaries' questionnaires were collected while they were at the Korean Methodist Church Mission Conference held in Seoul, Korea, June, 1999.

A follow-up letter was sent to the missionaries who had not returned the survey approximately ten weeks later after the original distribution. One hundred twenty-five missionaries out of 250 mail contacts returned the survey. Another twenty-five packets were returned because of incorrect addresses. Among 125 survey responses three responses for the CCAI were not valid because of too many missing answers. Among the training centers, GMTC missionaries returned the survey at a higher rate than other centers. GMTC missionaries also tended to respond more carefully and thoroughly than missionaries of other training centers.

To extend this survey, twenty-four missionaries who responded to the
survey and their twelve local ministers were contacted by the researcher in the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and Bangladesh. Individual interviews for missionaries (See Appendix C) were administered in approximately one to two hours. For interviewing local ministers (See Appendix D), interpreters participated.

All the data collected from surveys and interviews were organized and consolidated by Excel, a database program. The CCAI was scored according to the method provided by the authors (Kelley and Meyers 1995). The findings from the CCAI and the QFKM were compared among the eight training centers.

**Research Findings**

The hypothesis of this study was that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training is related to missionaries' poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry. In comparing the eight training centers in Korea through the interviews and examination of the training programs, GMTC provided the most effective cross-cultural training program among the eight training centers. OMMTC was less effective than GMTC but was better than any other training centers regarding the quality of
program. For quality of program, KMTC and CFWM provided programs comparable to each other but KMTC provided more lengthy training.

Comparing the quantity of programs, GMTC, OMMTC and KMTC offered a comparable amount of training in length and number of courses. Ranking of the top four training centers in overall effectiveness is as follows: (1) GMTC; (2) OMMTC; (3) KMTC; and (4) CFWM. The programs of the rest of the training centers (GMTI, IMTI, KMTI, MTI) were much less effective compared to GMTC. Among these four less effective training centers, GMTI and KMTI were more effective than MTI and IMTI.

Regarding the hypothesis of this study mentioned above, "missionaries who received better cross-cultural training will have better adjustment in cross-cultural ministry," the results of the CCAI scores should be significantly different between the more effective training centers and the less effective training centers since the eight training centers were evaluated as notably different in providing programs. If the hypothesis of this study is correct, GMTC, which facilitated the most effective programs among other training centers, is predicted to score higher than other training centers, especially in comparison with training centers that were evaluated as less effective. A comparable result of the QFKM (Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries) that
is similar to the result of the CCAI is expected to support the hypothesis of this study.

The consequences of inadequate cross-cultural training and poor cross-cultural adjustment predict a high rate of missionary attrition. The QFKM tries to find the most significant reasons for missionary attrition through surveying missionaries’ opinions. If this was right, a reference related to inadequate cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment should be ranked with high percentages.

The Results of the CCAI

Out of 125, 122 mail respondents completed the CCAI. The CCAI was scored by four scales: (1) Emotional Resilience (ER); (2) Flexibility/Openness (FO); (3) Personal Acuity (PAC); and (4) Personal Autonomy (PA). After the computation of four scales (ER, FO, PAC & PA), the total score was calculated by the sum of four scales. Table 23 presents the CCAI scale means and standard deviations by the eight missionary training centers.

In general GMTC had a higher score than other training centers except on Perceptual Acuity. KMTC and OMMTC had higher scores than the rest of training centers. Table 24 reveals the CCAI scale means from high to low
by the training centers. Comparing mean scores between training centers, not much difference appeared in mean scores on Personal Autonomy (PA).

Table 23

CCAII Scale Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Training Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Center</th>
<th>Mean N SD</th>
<th>Emotional Resilience (ER)</th>
<th>Flexibility/ Openness (FO)</th>
<th>Perceptual Acuity (PAC)</th>
<th>Personal Autonomy (PA)</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM (Tonghap)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.7857</td>
<td>63.7857</td>
<td>44.3571</td>
<td>27.3571</td>
<td>211.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.8386</td>
<td>5.3948</td>
<td>4.6675</td>
<td>3.3651</td>
<td>14.4298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>77.6316</td>
<td>65.3158</td>
<td>45.3158</td>
<td>29.7895</td>
<td>218.0526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.7187</td>
<td>4.7147</td>
<td>4.4479</td>
<td>2.4626</td>
<td>15.3387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI (Hapdong)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>70.1818</td>
<td>61.2727</td>
<td>41.8182</td>
<td>28.5455</td>
<td>201.2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.2740</td>
<td>3.9010</td>
<td>3.9196</td>
<td>3.5879</td>
<td>13.1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI (KMT)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>73.2667</td>
<td>62.2000</td>
<td>44.5667</td>
<td>27.8000</td>
<td>207.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9.1007</td>
<td>5.8746</td>
<td>5.1774</td>
<td>3.2842</td>
<td>20.0552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC (KEHC)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>76.5385</td>
<td>62.6923</td>
<td>45.3846</td>
<td>29.1538</td>
<td>213.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.9332</td>
<td>4.6257</td>
<td>3.2542</td>
<td>2.5115</td>
<td>14.4808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI (Kosin)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>73.5455</td>
<td>61.1818</td>
<td>43.4545</td>
<td>26.4545</td>
<td>204.6364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.8884</td>
<td>4.1187</td>
<td>4.1800</td>
<td>3.1738</td>
<td>13.2610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>75.6429</td>
<td>64.0000</td>
<td>44.2857</td>
<td>27.5714</td>
<td>211.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.3867</td>
<td>4.2245</td>
<td>3.7092</td>
<td>3.7358</td>
<td>12.5560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>74.8000</td>
<td>64.5000</td>
<td>47.7000</td>
<td>28.7000</td>
<td>215.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.7431</td>
<td>8.5408</td>
<td>6.0378</td>
<td>3.2677</td>
<td>21.3960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>74.7295</td>
<td>63.1398</td>
<td>44.6230</td>
<td>28.1967</td>
<td>210.6393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                 | SD       | 7.4568                    | 5.3634                    | 4.6307                  | 3.2388                 | 16.7174     

Scale: 1-6 (Low-High)
Score (Low-High): ER (18-108), FO (15-67), PAC (10-60), PA (7-42)
Table 24

CCAI Scale Mean Scores by Training Centers (High to Low)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER (high to low)</th>
<th>FO (high to low)</th>
<th>PAC (high to low)</th>
<th>PA (high to low)</th>
<th>Total Score (high to low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMTC (77.6)</td>
<td>GMTC (65.3)</td>
<td>OMMTC (47.7)</td>
<td>GMTC (29.7)</td>
<td>GMTC (218.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTTC (76.5)</td>
<td>OMMTC (64.5)</td>
<td>KMTTC (45.38)</td>
<td>KMTTC (29.1)</td>
<td>OMMTC (215.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWM (75.7)</td>
<td>MTI (64.0)</td>
<td>GMTC (45.31)</td>
<td>OMMTC (28.7)</td>
<td>KMTTC (213.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI (75.6)</td>
<td>CFWM (63.7)</td>
<td>IMT (44.5)</td>
<td>GMTI (28.5)</td>
<td>MTI (211.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC (74.8)</td>
<td>KMTTC (62.6)</td>
<td>CFWM (44.3)</td>
<td>IMT (27.8)</td>
<td>CFWM (211.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI, (73.5)</td>
<td>IMT (62.2)</td>
<td>MTI (44.2)</td>
<td>MTI (27.5)</td>
<td>IMT (207.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMT (73.2)</td>
<td>GMTI (61.2)</td>
<td>KMTI (43.4)</td>
<td>CFWM (27.3)</td>
<td>KMTI (204.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI (70.1)</td>
<td>KMTI (61.1)</td>
<td>GMTI (41.8)</td>
<td>KMTI (26.4)</td>
<td>GMTI (201.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Significance of Difference Found Between the Training Centers.

Kelley and Meyers say, “Statistically, the Total score is the most reliable of the CCAI scores as an indicator of the cross-cultural adaptability” (1995:19). Figure 3 presents the differences in the CCAI total mean scores and the distributions among the eight training centers. In order to determine if these differences are statistically significant, Student’s t-test, and F-test were used. The test results show statistical differences among the more effective training centers and the less effective training centers that were evaluated in Chapter 5. As seen in Table 25, the computed t-values (Student’s t-Value) are larger than the tabulated t-values (Critical t-Value). Thus, there are statistical differences in mean scores between the training centers. Also, the computed F-values (F-Value) are smaller than the tabulated F-values (Critical F-Value).
Thus, the mean scores are significantly different with no difference in
distribution.

Figure 3. CCAI Total Mean Scores by Training Centers

The significant difference in mean\(^3\) was found between GMTC and GMTI,
GMTC and IMTI, and GMTC and KMTI with no significant differences in
distribution.\(^4\) There was also a significant difference in mean between KMTC
and GMTI, and OMMTC and GMTI with no significant differences in
distribution. Table 25 presents this information with the statistical report.
Table 25

Training Centers with Significant Difference

Computed by Student’s t-Test and F-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMTC / GMTI *</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC / IMTI</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC / KMTI</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC / GMTI</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC / GMTI</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI / GMTI</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWM / GMTI</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant difference at alpha level = .05 except * = .01
p = probability
See Appendix F for an example of graphical explanation of Student’s t-test and F-test.

The rest of the training centers that are not compared in Table 25 did not have statistical differences in means and distributions among them.

However, there were statistically significant differences in distribution with no significant difference in mean between IMTI and GMTI (F=2.33, CF=2.16, p.=15%), IMTI and KMTI (F=2.28, CF=2.16, p=16%), and MTI and IMTI (F=2.55, CF=2.01, p=9%).

Comparing Korean missionaries’ CCAI total mean score to the original study group (N=653) tested by Kelley and Meyers and first presented in May
of 1987 (1995:11), Korean missionaries had much lower mean scores than Kelley and Meyers' study group. As discussed in Chapter 4, this might be attributed to Korean cultural values such as ingroup-centered collectivism, exclusive attitudes toward people of other cultures, and authoritarian leadership pattern. Table 26 reveals this comparison. The subjects (N=653) in Kelley and Meyers' study ranged in age from under twenty to over fifty-year-old males (62.5 percent) and females (37.4 percent). The length of subjects' experience abroad was from none to more than three years. Their educational background ranged from high school graduate to graduate work. Therefore, the subjects between these two groups are equivalent to compare for the CCAI result.

Kelley and Meyers in their research found that subjects with no experience abroad had significantly lower total scores and scored significantly lower than other subjects on all scales except Personal Autonomy, on which they scored significantly higher (1995:24). The Korean missionaries had lower scores than the group of subjects with experience abroad in Kelley and Meyers' study on all scales.

Among the Korean respondents, those with second-term (< five years) and third-term (< ten years) missionary service had higher scores than
respondents with first-term only. However, no difference appeared between respondents with second-term and third-term experience. Third-term respondents were likely to show lower scores than the second-term respondents.

As seen in Table 26, comparing Korean missionaries with more than three years’ mission service to Kelley and Meyers’ respondents with more than three years’ experience abroad, Korean missionaries showed a larger difference on Flexibility/Openness and Emotional Resilience.

Table 26

The Comparison of CCAI Scale Mean Scores

Between Korean Missionaries and Kelley and Meyers’ Study Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Abroad</th>
<th>Emotional Resilience (ER)</th>
<th>Flexibility/Openness (FO)</th>
<th>Perceptual Acuity (PAC)</th>
<th>Personal Autonomy (PA)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelley &amp; Meyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None n=189/Mean</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>220.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-36 months n=124/Mean</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>226.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 years n=122/Mean</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Missionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-36 months n=42/Mean</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>205.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 years n=79/Mean</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>63.79</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>213.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kelly and Meyers 1995:28
Summary of the CCAI Results. There was a significant difference between the more effective training centers (GMTC, OMMTC, and KMTC) and the less effective training centers (GMTI, KMTI, and IMTI) in mean and no significant difference in distribution. GMTC, which provided the most effective training program, had a significant difference in mean and no significant difference in distribution compared with IMTI, GMTI, and KMTI. Comparing Korean missionaries’ CCAI total score means to the original group of Kelley and Meyers, Korean missionaries had much lower mean scores than Kelley and Meyers’ group. Especially, Korean missionaries had much lower scores than Kelley and Meyers’ group on Flexibility and Openness and Emotional Resilience.

In contrast to the respondents of Kelly and Meyers, Korean missionaries showed that respondents with longer service (>three years) had a higher score than respondents with shorter service (one to thirty-six months service) on Personal Autonomy (Table 26 on page 304). According to the results of the CCAI, my hypothesis is supported; missionaries who trained better training (e.g. GMTC) had better cross-cultural adjustment.

The Results of the Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries (QFKM)

One hundred twenty-five subjects completed the QFKM. The total
number of respondents were varied due to missing values, which were not calculated in scores. The QFKM for section three, Cross-Cultural Adjustment, included four scales with sixteen questions: Expectation for Target Country (one question, total score five), Satisfaction in Ministry (one question, total score five), Language (four questions, total score twenty), Health (two questions, total score ten), and Relationships (six questions, total score thirty). Each question offered five options. Reasons for missionary attrition were asked of the respondents in order to find its relation to cultural adjustment and cross-cultural training.

These questions sought to determine respondents’ cross-cultural competence in relationships, management, and communication skill by the training centers. Table 27 and Figure 4 present this information. In general, GMTC had higher scores than other training centers. OMMTC had a higher score than other training centers on Relationship and Expectation while it had lower scores on Health and Language than others. GMTI and KMTI had lower scores on satisfaction in ministry than others. Table 28, page 308, presents the QFKM scale means from high to low by the training centers.
Table 27

QFKM (Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries) Scale Mean

Scores and Standard Deviations by Training Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Center</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expectation in Ministry</th>
<th>Satisfaction in Ministry</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFWM</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>49.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>49.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>49.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
QFKM Scale Mean Scores by Training Centers (High to Low)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Satisfaction in Ministry</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC (3.82)</td>
<td>GMTC (3.74)</td>
<td>GMTC (16.3)</td>
<td>OMMTC</td>
<td>GMTC (7.0)</td>
<td>GMTC (52.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMTI (3.75)</td>
<td>MTI (3.64)</td>
<td>MTI (15.9)</td>
<td>KMTI (7.0)</td>
<td>KMTI (50.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC (3.58)</td>
<td>IMTI (3.53)</td>
<td>GMTC (15.2)</td>
<td>KMTI (6.6)</td>
<td>KMTI (49.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMTI (3.45)</td>
<td>GMTC (3.46)</td>
<td>GMTC (14.4)</td>
<td>GMTC (6.5)</td>
<td>GMTC (49.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMMTC (3.38)</td>
<td>OMMTC</td>
<td>IMTI (14.2)</td>
<td>IMTI (6.5)</td>
<td>OMMTC (49.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMTC (3.27)</td>
<td>KMTI (3.00)</td>
<td>KMTI (14.0)</td>
<td>IMTI (5.9)</td>
<td>GMTC (49.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI (3.21)</td>
<td>GMTC (3.00)</td>
<td>GMTC (13.1)</td>
<td>OMMTC (5.9)</td>
<td>KMTI (47.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWM (3.07)</td>
<td>GMTC (3.00)</td>
<td>OMMTC (5.8)</td>
<td>GMTC (5.5)</td>
<td>CFWM (47.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectation and Satisfaction in Ministry. Respondents were asked two comparing questions about their expectation for target countries and their satisfaction in ministry. These questions (item 3.1 & 3.8) were: (1) What was your expectation of the target country before you entered the new culture?;
and (2) How favorably would you describe your satisfaction with the ministry you actually perform now compared with the ministry you expected to perform? Each question offered five options (scale one to five). These questions tried to determine the level of respondents' achievement on cross-cultural ministry by training centers. Figure 5 shows the differences between expectation and satisfaction.

The group of GMTI, IMTI, KMTI and OMMTC had lower satisfaction than their expectations while the group of CFWM, GMTC, KMTC and MTI had higher satisfaction than their expectations. Within training centers with low satisfaction in ministry, KMTI and GMTI had much lower scores than others. The scores of expectation and satisfaction were similar and higher on GMTC. KMTI showed a larger difference between expectation and satisfaction.
Language. The scale of Language tried to determine the level of competency as a basic cross-cultural communication skill. Subjects were asked by four items (3.2-3.5): (1) the difficulty of language during first year (3.2); (2) the level of language fluency (3.3); (3) the use of interpreters (3.4); and (4) the language in ministry (3.5). Each scale means by training centers is shown in Figure 6.

Question 3.2, "How much difficulty did/does the language difference cause you during the first year of your ministry?" was provided with five options: (a) a great deal, (b) a considerable amount, (c) a fair amount, (d) a little, (e) virtually not at all. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents of KMTC, 64 percent of CFWM, 63 percent of KMTI, 63 percent of OMMTC,
59 percent of IMTI, 45 percent of GMTI, 42 percent of MTI, 31 percent of GMTC reported the language problem as a great deal and a considerable amount. GMTC had the lowest percentage of respondents for the problem of language among the training centers. The problem that was experienced by respondents with high percentage was KMTC.

In the question 3.3, "How well do you speak the local language? Eighty-five percent of the respondents of MTI, 63 percent of GMTC, 63 percent of KMTI, 53 percent of KMTC, 40 percent of IMTI, 34 percent of CFWM, 27 percent of GMTI, 27 percent of OMMTC answered that they spoke local language fluently or very fluently. MTI showed much higher percentage than all other training centers. Forty-nine percent of all respondents reported that they spoke local language fluently or very fluently.

Regarding the use of interpreters (item 3.4), there was no significant difference between respondents of each training center except OMMTC. Eighty-two percent of total respondents reported that they rarely or never used interpreters. For the question 3.5, 73 percent of total respondents used only native language in ministry. Six point four percent of total respondents used native language with English. The use of only native language by the training centers was as follows: 94.7 percent of GMTC, 81.8 percent of
GMTI, 81.8 percent of KMTI, 78.6 percent of MTI, 71.4 percent of CFWM, 69.2 percent of KMTC, 65.6 percent of IMTI, and 45.5 percent of OMMTC. OMMTC showed much lower percentage compared to GMTC.

Both spiritual and physical health were higher on GMTC. Physical health was much lower on MTI and KMTI. MTI also had much lower mean
score on spiritual vitality. Five psychological and emotional symptoms most frequently experienced by all respondents were stress, homesickness, anxiety, helplessness, and anger.

Figure 7. Health by Training Centers

Relationships. Relationships include six questions (3.10-3.13 & 3.19-3.20): (1) relationships with nationals; (2) relationships with fellow missionaries; (3) relationships with family; (4) relationship with sending agency; (5) nationals’ respect and trust toward missionary; and (6) missionary’s respect and trust toward national ministers. These questions tried to evaluate respondents’ interpersonal relationships in relation to the training centers. This information was presented by pairs in Figure 8, 9, and 10.
In general, missionaries’ relationships with nationals were higher than with fellow missionaries. OMMTC and GMTC showed higher scores than other missionary training centers on relationships with nationals. Of OMMTC respondents (n=11) 100 percent of the respondents answered that they had good and very good relationships with nationals. Seventy-eight percent of GMTC respondents reported good and very good. CFWM and KMTI were much lower on relationships with fellow missionaries compared to GMTC and OMMTC. There was no significant difference in relationship with fellow missionaries among the training centers. KMTC had the same degree of closeness in relationships with nationals and fellow missionaries.
Comparing the training centers to each other, MTI (3.1) and CFWM (3.2) were much lower than others on relationships with their families. CFWM does not allow trainees to bring their children. MTI has no training program for children. GMTC (3.7) was the highest score on relationships with their families. This is supported by the fact that GMTC provides effective MK training programs with four full-time MK trainers (See Chapter 5). Comparing responses between MTI and GMTC, 38 percent of MTI respondents answered that their relationships with their families were poor and 31 percent were good and very good while 16 percent of GMTC respondents were poor and 72 percent were good and very good. The relationships with the agencies were higher on OMMTC (63 percent for good
and very good) and MTI (78 percent for good and very good) than others. Twenty-seven percent of KMTI respondents reported that they had good relationships with their agencies and 63 percent were satisfactory.

Figure 10. Respect and Trust by Training Centers

In general, the level of missionaries' trust and respect toward nationals was lower than nationals' respect and trust toward missionaries as assumed by the missionaries. Respondents were provided with two comparing questions: 1) On what level do you think that nationals respect and trust you (item 3.19)?; and 2) On what level do you respect and trust national fellow workers (item 3.20)?

MTI (71 percent) and GMTC (63 percent) reported with a considerable amount and a great deal of respect and trust shown them by nationals in
response to question 3.19. GMTI had much lower scores compared to MTI and GMTC on both questions. This can be related to the length of service or less effective training program. This result supports the results of the CCAI. Twenty-seven percent of GMTI respondents believed that nationals would respect and trust them with a considerable and a great deal amount. Also, 18.2 percent of GMTI answered that they trust and respect their national fellow workers with a considerable and a great deal amount of trust and respect.

Korean Missionary Attrition. In asking the question about the reasons for and ways of preventing Korean missionary attrition, respondents answered with twenty-two reasons for attrition and nineteen ways of preventing it. This question tried to determine if cross-cultural adjustment is related to missionary attrition in the light of the hypothesis of this research.

Table 29 reveals the reasons for and ways of preventing missionary attrition (See Appendix A, item 3.23.2 and 3.23.3). It indicates that poor cultural adaptation ranks second among the twenty-two reasons for missionary attrition. And the second most important way to prevent missionary attrition out of nineteen ways is adequate cross-cultural training with the emphasis on informal and non-formal training methods. This result
shows that adequate cross-cultural missionary training is closely related to effective cross-cultural adjustment.

Table 29

Reasons for and Ways of Preventing Korean Missionary Attrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Attrition</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ways of Preventing Attrition</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children’s Education</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1. Adequate Supervision and Care</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poor Cultural Adaptation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2. Adequate/Effective Training</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of Call</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5. Good Relationships with Sending Churches and Agencies</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Problems with Local Leaders</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7. Support Children’s Education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Immature Spiritual Life</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10. Continuing Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lack of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11. Appropriate Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conflict with Mission Agency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12. Language Acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Language Problems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13. Effective Field Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lack of Fruit in Ministry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15. Missionary Welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Unexpected Happenings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17. No Excessive Paternalism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Personal Problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18. Maintaining Healthy Family</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Anxious about the Future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19. Appropriate Mission Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Problems of Selection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Inadequate Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inadequate Choice of Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=125

Summary of the QFKM Results. First, there was significant difference between GMTC/MTI and GMTC/KMTI in mean on satisfaction in cross-cultural ministry. Second, GMTC, MTI, and GMTI had much higher mean
scores than OMMTC, KMTI, KMTC, and IMTI on language. The reason why MTI had a higher score on language may be explained from its training program running in English and focusing on language studies. There were unexpected results that while KMTI had a high score, OMMTC had the lowest score on language. This may be explained by the fact that OMMTC missionaries were younger than other missionary groups and had shorter services than other missionary groups (Table 22 on page 290).

Third, GMTC had a higher mean score on both spiritual and physical health than other training centers. MTI and KMTI had much lower mean scores on physical health as well as on spiritual vitality.

Fourth, GMTC and OMMTC had much higher mean scores than KMTI, GMTI, and CFWM on relationships. Relationships can be considered as the most important factors for cross-cultural ministry and cross-cultural adjustment. In this sense, the fact that GMTC and OMMTC had higher scores than others verified the hypothesis and confirms the relationship between cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that GMTC and OMMTC as parachurch organizations had no denominational interference or control in training missionaries and developing training programs.
Behind the Facts of Statistical Analysis:

Interviews with Korean Missionaries and Nationals

I have statistically analyzed the data collected from the questionnaires and the CCAI which are quantitative research methods. Statistical analysis has its limits in that it often misses some important details. It represents the whole, but depends on a limited numbers of questions and answers. For this reason, qualitative research methods such as informal interview and observation as in-depth and holistic studies are needed for researchers to see the blind spots. In this research, interviews with Korean missionaries (See Appendix C) and national workers (See Appendix D) helped me see more accurately and understand how Korean missionaries view cross-cultural missionary training and their adjustment to the host culture for effective ministry. However, the purpose of this section is not to reveal the relationship between cross-cultural training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment by the eight training centers, but to see the problems they face in relating to adjustment to the host culture.

Regarding interview procedure, I could not interview missionaries who were trained in OMMTC because no missionaries of OMMTC worked in the countries I visited. The number of missionary interviewees by training
centers is as follows: CFWM (n=4), GMTC (n=3), GMTI (4), IMTI (4), KMTC (4), KMTI (n=3), and MTI (n=2). The number of the missionaries by countries where the interview was conducted is as follows: The Philippines (n=6), Thailand (n=7), Indonesia (n=5), Bangladesh (n=6). Among twenty-four missionaries, eleven were in their first term, ten in second term, and three in third term. Their average age was forty-one years old. Four out of twenty-four Korean missionaries did not want me to use a tape recorder for the interview.

Among twelve national interviewees, the number of national workers by training center is as follows: CFWM (n=3), GMTC (n=1), GMTI (n=2), KMTC (n=5), and KMTI (n=1). I could not interview nationals who worked with missionaries trained in IMTI, MTI, and OMMTC. Most national ministers did not want me to use a tape recorder for the interview.

Furthermore, some Korean missionaries trained in IMTI and MTI did not want me to interview national workers who worked with them because they probably wondered if national workers would reveal conflicts with them.

The interviews tried to give an in-depth study through face-to-face contact with missionaries and nationals. The total number of interview subjects was thirty-six. Of the total interviewees, twenty-four were
missionaries and twelve were national workers. Among the missionary interviewees, all were male. Among twelve national interviewees, eleven were male and one female. The purpose of this section is to find the important issues that relate to cross-cultural adjustment by comparing responses between missionaries and nationals in general, not by training centers. The findings in this section are guided by the hypotheses presented in this study that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training is related to a missionary’s poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministries. This section also compares these factors with the results from the QFKM (Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries). The missionary group in this section was indicated by MG and national group by NG.

**Language Competency**

A question rating a missionary’s language proficiency was given to both groups. Of twenty-four respondents, 33 percent of total missionaries (N=8) were beginning (simple greetings), 37 percent (N=9) intermediate (common conversation), and 30 percent (N=7) in advanced level (preaching and teaching). Of twelve respondents, 16 percent of nationals evaluated Korean missionaries as beginning (N=2), 58 percent as intermediate (N=7), 25 percent as in an advanced level (N=3).
MG and NG, the nationals rate Korean missionaries’ language proficiency slightly higher than the missionaries rate themselves. A Korean missionary in Bangladesh whose language proficiency was evaluated as excellent by his co-worker, said that generally Korean missionaries’ level of language proficiency is at the intermediate level. He estimated that among Korean missionaries less than 30 percent can preach and teach in the local language.

A national minister in Bangladesh who taught in a Bible school with nine Korean missionaries said,

Language competency is the first step to understand our people and culture. Without that, it is not possible for missionaries to have a good relationship with our people. Among nine Korean missionaries only two are qualified in language competency for teaching the students. Most students complained that they hardly understand the missionaries’ lectures. Nevertheless, I could not tell this to the missionaries.

Language competency is one of the most important ways to evaluate a missionary’s level of cultural adjustment because it directly relates to cross-cultural communication skills and competency. Four out of six Korean missionaries whom I interviewed in the Philippines barely spoke the local language. Compared with the results of the questionnaire on language competency, the percentage of proficiency in the local language in interviews with Korean missionaries and nationals is lower than in the questionnaire.
According to the results of the QFKM, missionaries with longer service had significantly higher scores in language competency than missionaries with shorter service. Thus, language competency is related to length of service on the field as well as training.

**Health**

In the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (Figure 7 on page 313), the missionaries’ physical health and spiritual vitality were slightly above middle level. As indicated in Table 29 on page 318, among the reasons for Korean missionary attrition, physical health problems ranked fourth while spiritual health problems ranked tenth. These two are not separated from each other. Also, psychological and emotional problems relate to physical and spiritual health. In the interview question (item 3.6.1-2), all interviewees mentioned difficulties of maintaining physical, emotional, and spiritual health. Particularly, lack of member care, which ranked first among the ways of preventing missionary attrition (Table 29 on page 318), causes spiritual vacuum and unsteadiness. Also, physical health problems immediately affect spiritual problems.

The way to at least sustain spiritual vitality is through self-discipline such as early morning prayer, Bible reading, and so on. Korean missionaries
desperately needed supervision, mentoring, and counseling. Missionary member care would be one of the most important issues for effective ministry. It seems that without maintaining good relationships with spouses, fellow missionaries, mission agencies, and nationals, it is difficult for missionaries to maintain or develop their spiritual vitality.

A missionary in Thailand said, "It has been very hard to overcome physical, spiritual, and emotional stress and the feeling of identity crisis accumulated over a long period. Missionaries desperately need to be taken care of by other missionaries or national ministers. But there must be member care programs conducted by mission agency and field leadership."

Relationships

The process of building relationships with the local people is closely related to the cultural adjustment of the missionary. Also, maintaining and developing good relationships with sending agencies, sending churches, family, and fellow missionaries is an important factor to adjust to in the new environment. Without good relationships with these groups of people, it is impossible for the missionary to do effective mission work.

Relationship with Nationals. In Eugene Nida’s model of missionary identification that contains five stages, developing a good relationship with
the local ministers is in the process of knowing others and participating in the lives of people as co-laborers (1960:220). In the result of the CCAI, one of the weakest parts of Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adaptability is that of “Flexibility and Openness” compared with Kelley and Meyers’ group (Table 26 on page 304). In interviews with Korean missionaries responding to the question (item 3.5) “Tell about your relationship with nationals,” four out of twenty-four missionaries said that without involvement with money there would be no conflicts with local ministers. It seemed that most interviewees tried to maintain relationships with local ministers at a superficial level. A missionary in Indonesia said, “I think that I trust the local pastor but I do not know if he trusts me.” Another missionary in Bangladesh said, “Some missionaries have not had any relationship with the nationals because they have a very low view of the local culture and still try to impose a Korean style of faith embedded in the Korean worldview upon the local people.”

A local pastor in Bangladesh said,

I have had little personal relationship with Korean missionaries, but I have a working relationship. I am convinced that without a good and deep personal relationship, it is very hard for missionaries to do effective ministry. Korean missionaries tend to despise, ignore, and overlook the local people. So, average Bengali Christians do not respect Korean missionaries because they are changeable, authoritarian, and paternalistic. My trust in Korean missionaries has
been up and down. I respect Korean missionaries not because they respect my people and appreciate my culture, but because they are God’s servant and show a prayer life. The biggest problem of Korean missionaries is that they seldom try to build deeper interpersonal relationships with the Bengali people.

Also, a Korean missionary in Thailand said about an evaluation by Thai Christians of Korean missionaries: “Why are Korean missionaries so authoritarian, competitive and aggressive? Even though Korean missionaries have strengths for ministry such as strong passion for church planting, establishing schools and many projects, our people do not give good credit to Korean missionaries because they do not have good relationships with us as well as their fellows.” The missionary said that “Korean missionaries’ bad relationships with their own and the local people and ineffective team ministry may be embedded in Korean values. It is difficult for Korean missionaries to do effective team ministry cross-culturally.”

In interviews with Korean missionaries, most evaluated themselves in the following way. Whereas the merits of Korean missionaries are their enthusiasm, passion, and hard work at best, their weaknesses are authoritarian attitudes toward the local people, lack of spirit for team work, excessive competitiveness, failure to understand the host culture, and the lack of interpersonal relationships with both fellow missionaries and nationals.
A majority of missionary interviewees pointed out that the biggest problem for Korean missionaries lies in interpersonal relationships which creates a fatal impact on cultural adjustment and ministry effectiveness. Some of them suggested that before sending missionaries to fields, cross-cultural missionary training is needed that emphasizes culture learning and interpersonal skills through communal living with foreigners. A Korean missionary in Indonesia said, “We must put our priority on our lifestyle and relationships, not mission projects.”

**Relationship with Fellow Missionaries.** In the interview with Korean missionaries (item 3.6.4), it was revealed that Korean missionaries have even more problems in relationships with fellow missionaries than with nationals. While four missionaries out of twenty-four mentioned that they had problems with nationals, nine missionaries had problems with their fellows. Comparing this to the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (Figure 8 on page 314), there are no differences between the QFKM and interviews with Korean missionaries. As seen in Table 29 on page 318, of the reasons for Korean missionary attrition, problems with peer missionaries ranked third while problems with nationals ranked seventh. Most Korean missionaries had more problems with fellow missionaries than nationals. As mentioned above, this
tendency might be embedded in authoritarian and autocratic leadership styles.

A Korean missionary in Bangladesh said,

In my ministry and life, the greatest stumbling block has been the relationship with my Korean colleague. I am still in conflict with him. It seems to me that there is no way to resolve this conflict. Many other Korean missionaries are facing the same problems. Sometimes, missionary wives initiate problems of interpersonal relationships. These conflicts between missionary wives are transmitted to their husbands. In fact, for Korean missionaries having fellowship with fellow missionaries is possible but it is very hard to maintain good relationships if there is a conflicting interest between them for mission projects. So, we should understand ourselves, our cultural values which must be examined and tested by biblical perspectives.

Another Korean missionary in the Philippines said that “some missionaries should not have been sent because they are disqualified especially in their interpersonal relationships. This is because of lack of understanding of our own culture and the host culture, and lack of missionary training.” Needless to say, problems with peers hamper cross-cultural ministry effectiveness as well as effective cultural adjustment. This is directly connected to missionary attrition.

**Relationship with Family.** In the interviews with Korean missionaries (item 3.6.4), sixteen missionaries out of twenty-four said they have experienced family problems, conflicts with spouses, and the problem of children’s education. In fact, as indicated in Table 29 on page 318, of the
reasons for Korean missionary attrition, the problem of children's education ranked first and marriage and family conflicts eighth. Without doubt, maintaining a healthy family and spiritual life is the foremost task for a missionary in an unfamiliar environment.

David Harley writes about causes of missionary family problems: "A growing sense of isolation and antipathy towards the husband's ministry may cause conflict in the marriage and a speedy return home" (1997:2). Also, missionary spouses who have no clear calling may experience severe culture shock and conflicts with family members. Children's education is one of the most important values of Korean society. Korean missionaries struggle with this issue, but no solution is yet suggested. This must be a cooperative task of the Korean church, mission agencies, and missionaries.

As mentioned in Chapter 5, MK training is one of the most crucial issues in missionary training. MKs must be helped to anticipate their new life and be prepared for the adventure that lies ahead. Harley insists, "If children are ignored in the training process, the consequences may be disastrous. They may fail to cope with change and may react either by withdrawing into themselves or by becoming aggressive" (1997:2). Missionary family issues are closely related to cross-cultural adjustment. For this reason, missionary
training must equip the whole family for successful cross-cultural adjustment.

Relationship with Mission Agencies and Sending Churches. Among missionary interviewees, four have had conflicts with their mission agency and two have had conflicts with sending churches. Relationships with mission agencies and sending churches is a less important factor than other relational dimensions for cultural adjustment. This was shown in Table 29 on page 318. Of the reasons for Korean missionaries' attrition, conflict with sending churches ranked ninth and conflict with mission agencies twelfth. Most causes of conflicts with sending churches are related to financial support, mission projects, and the sending church’s request for quick visible results. Causes of conflicts with sending agencies are related to mission agency’s leadership problems, such as unreasonable direction and demands, and a different mission philosophy or vision (See Case 3 on page 212).

Epilogue

Whereas national interviewees in the Philippines hesitated to tell about things related to their Korean fellows and usually responded to my questions with positive answers, Thai and Bengali ministers evaluated their Korean fellows without hesitation.

First, twelve national interviewees’ evaluation of Korean missionaries’
level of living (item 6.2) was as follows: one of low level, five middle level, and six high level. Nationals did not regard Korean missionaries’ lifestyle as simple, but I was impressed by a Korean missionary’s life in Thailand. He was living among Muslims in Bangkok. To the question, “What is the result of your ministry? (item 3.4.4), he said, “I have been living among the Muslims in order to understand them and to make friends without revealing my job for the last three years. I have no visible result in my ministry. This has been a very stressful life. But I know that without understanding and respecting them it is hard to share the gospel with them.”

Second, ten national interviewees out of twelve regarded Korean missionaries as teachers rather than learners (item 5.8). Nine nationals regarded the missionary as the leader of their churches while only two insisted that they were the leaders of their churches (item 7.1). Also, most interviewees’ churches were patterned after missionaries’ sending churches (item 7.2). Ten national interviewees out of twelve mentioned that they adopted the Korean style of worship, music, and prayer meetings (item 7.5).

Third, to the question, “How do you compare the Korean missionary to other missionaries?” (item 5.5), nationals responded with interesting answers. Of national interviewees, four who have worked with non-Korean
missionaries responded that foreign missionaries are organized, educational, communicative while Korean missionaries are enthusiastic and passionate for witnessing the gospel message, and hard workers.

Fourth, Korean missionary interviewees did not have much financial difficulty in spite of the economic crisis in South Korea. This suggests that Korean churches still have a strong zeal, vision, and support for world mission. In fact, presently the number of Korean missionaries is increasing, which means the fire for world mission in the Korean church still burns.

Korean mission is in a period of transition. It has a short overseas mission history, so there have been many mistakes and problems for various reasons. It is time for the Korean church to reform her mission structures and strategies. A Korean missionary said, "I recognize that many problems exist in Korean mission work. Those problems are both personal and institutional. Today mission fields urgently need well-trained incarnational witnesses. A missionary is not born but made."

**Discussion**

This section discusses the findings of the research. In this chapter several issues appeared during the process of the evaluation of the training
programs (Chapter 5) and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. The purpose of this study was to test the relation between cross-cultural missionary training in Korea and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. It is to determine to what extent cross-cultural missionary training predicts Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. The hypothesis was tested: Inadequate cross-cultural missionary training relates to a missionary's poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry. Consequently, inadequate cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment predict a high rate of missionary attrition.

A relational design was employed to test this hypothesis. The predictive relationships between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment were tested by computations through the CCAI and the Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries (QFKM). Also, interviews with Korean missionaries and nationals were examined to provide relevant information about issues: language, health (physical, psychological, and spiritual), and interpersonal relationships.

The results of the statistical data analysis supported the research hypothesis described above. The factors of cross-cultural missionary training (Chapter 5) were reliable predictors of cross-cultural adjustment and effective
cross-cultural ministry. The result of the CCAI by the training centers revealed that cross-cultural missionary training is positively related to cross-cultural adjustment. The analysis of the questionnaire for Korean missionaries also supported that cross-cultural missionary training was positively related to the effectiveness of cross-cultural ministry: satisfaction in ministry, language competency, health, and relationships. The interviews with Korean missionaries and nationals related to these issues provided important implications about an urgent need for cross-cultural training for Korean missionaries. The research findings revealed some important issues to be discussed.

1. Considering the comparison between the result of the CCAI and that of the QFKM, is there consistency between the two results? Was there any result of this research which did not support the hypothesis? The more effective training centers had significantly higher mean scores than the less effective training centers on the results of the CCAI and the QFKM. GMTC that ran the most effective training program among the eight training centers had a higher score consistently on both the CCAI and the QFKM. There were some unexpected results on CFWM and MTI in the QFKM. CFWM had the lowest total score among the training centers even though its training
program was more effective than MTI, IMTI, GMTI, and KMTI. MTI had the second highest total score in spite of its ineffective training program. It may be explained that its language competency ranked high. This can also be explained in that the MTI training program emphasized training in English and the 92.9 percent respondents were second and third-term missionaries (Table 22 on page 290). However, MTI had the lowest mean score on health.

2. Comparing Korean missionaries’ CCAI result of this study to the missionary group in Kelley and Meyers, Korean missionaries were significantly lower in mean scores. What are the possible reasons for this difference? Considering the monocultural and monolingual background of Korean missionaries, this result was not surprising. A majority of Korean missionaries interviewed recognized that their monocultural background negatively affects their adjustment to other cultures (Table 6 on page 149). They also recognized that their cultural values negatively affect their relationships with fellow missionaries (Table 7 on page 198). In fact, this affects every relational area such as relationships with nationals, sending churches, and mission agencies, as seen in the research findings. They admitted that it is important to understand Korean cultural values and worldview in their understanding of other cultures (Table 5 on page 146). If a
cross-cultural missionary training program is related to a missionary’s cross-cultural adjustment, considering this tendency, then cultural awareness training must be strengthened in cross-cultural missionary training programs in Korea.

3. The opposite results on Personal Autonomy (PA) between the Korean missionaries and the subjects of Kelly and Myers are interesting (Table 26 on page 304). Korean missionaries with longer terms of service had higher scores in contrast to Kelly and Myers. This possibly relates to cultural factors. Korean missionaries are seldom free from the hierarchical and authoritarian leadership structure of Korean society and the Korean church. Among Korean missionaries, seniority and missionary careers play an important role in leadership. For example, first-term or junior missionaries must respect the senior missionaries and submit to their leadership. In other words, in the decision making process junior missionaries do not play important roles. Their personal autonomy is restricted by circumstances. However, their personal autonomy becomes stronger as they move into the senior group.

In contrast, American missionaries are individualistic and have a strong autonomy. They are self-confident and autonomous as American culture
shapes their social character. On the mission field, junior missionaries usually raise their voices in the decision making process without hesitation and hindrance. But when they become adjusted to the host cultures which are more collective, their personal autonomy becomes restricted.

4. The results of the CCAI score indicated that missionaries trained in interdenominational missionary training centers scored higher than missionaries trained in denominational training centers (Table 24 on page 300). What are the possible reasons for this difference? It is possible that due to excessive intervention by denominational leadership which is usually authoritarian, hierarchical, and autocratic, it is difficult for trainers, administrators, and program developers to manage and develop effective training programs.

In this respect, mission policy and administration can directly influence the missionary training program. Consequently, poor mission policy and hierarchical administrative structure managed by authoritarian leadership contribute to a missionary's poor cross-cultural adjustment hindering ministry effectiveness. Incarnational ministry must be carried out not only at the level of the missionary, but also with the church and mission administration.

5. It is also assumed through the results of the CCAI and the
questionnaire that the more conservative the denominations the missionaries belong to, the more difficulty they experience in adjusting to other cultures. In the research findings, most missionaries who belong to denominations regarded as having conservative and even fundamental theological tendencies were less adaptable than the rest.

6. In the result of the CCAI, GMTI (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Hapdong) had a low score though it had a better training program than MTI. While all subjects trained in GMTI were first term, missionaries trained in MTI were second and third-term missionaries. In fact, they belonged to the same denomination, the Presbyterian Church of Korea (Hapdong).

Regarding the duration of missionary service, if the CCAI score is significantly different according to length of missionary service, how much is the length of overseas experience related to cross-cultural adjustment? Is this variable more closely related to cross-cultural adjustment than to training? What variable can affect more people’s cross-cultural adjustment? Length of overseas experience may be a factor in determining the level of adaptability to other cultures, but this contributes little to be considered significant.

7. In the result of the CCAI, what are the possible reasons for a significantly lower score of the Korean missionaries on Flexibility and
Openness than the Kelley and Meyers group (Table 26 on page 304)? This tendency may be embedded in one of the most important cultural values, the so-called “ingroup-centered collectivism” or strong “we” consciousness.

In this respect, Korean cultural values and worldview are closely related to Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment as well as to missionary training. Particularly, in relational areas Korean national values such as ingroup-centered collectivism, intolerance to difference or exclusive attitude toward people of other cultures, and hierarchical and authoritarian leadership patterns negatively affected overall Korean mission work.

In order to do incarnational ministry, Korean churches, mission agencies, and Korean missionaries must undergo a radical change in their preconceived ideas and attitudes toward people of other cultures as Peter underwent a cross-cultural conversion. They must live out the gospel under the lordship of Jesus Christ.
Notes

1. The boxplot shows the distribution of the CCAI scores for each training center, and displays the median and quartiles. Each box represents the CCAI scores between the twenty-fifth percentile and the seventy-fifth percentile, and a line across the box is the median (fiftieth percentile). N represents the sample of each training center.

2. Student’s t-test and the F-test are two of the most commonly used tests for a brief analysis of multiple sample data sets. The t-test is a parametric test for testing differences between two groups. The F-test determines whether two samples have the same or different variables, as measured by their variances.

3. In order to determine the level of significance, the value of student t must be greater than critical value $t$.

4. In order to determine the level of significance, the F value must be greater than critical value $F$.

5. In the CCAI, Kelley and Meyers’ study group consists of the following nationalities: U.S. citizens were 516 (79 percent) out of 653 subjects, other 129 (19.8 percent), and not specified eight (1.2 percent) (1995:23).

6. The unmarried missionaries were excluded from the category “Relationships.”
CHAPTER 7

Cross-Cultural Missionary Training for Korean Missionaries

The purpose of this chapter is to propose a cross-cultural missionary training model for Korean churches with particular emphasis on cross-cultural adjustment and cultural learning. The training model suggested in this chapter integrates research findings along with suggested models: formal, informal, and non-formal models of education; and Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model. This model integrates research findings and the merits of the eight missionary training programs. It intends to address the needs of the curriculum developers of the training centers in Korea and Christians who devote their life to world mission.

Contributing Factors to Developing a Missionary Training Model

What are the most important elements for an effective missionary training program helping trainees to adjust to other cultures successfully? Various elements and factors found through the analysis of the data in this research helped the researcher propose a model of cross-cultural missionary training. Those elements and factors are integrated into a proposed model.

In general, directors of the eight missionary training centers and
Korean missionaries insisted that in order to be effective, cross-cultural missionary training programs should place their emphasis on informal and non-formal training rather than formal training. In other words, cross-cultural missionary training needs to be learner-centered, experiential, and competency based.¹ This does not mean that formal training methods and mission degree bearing programs are less important than informal and non-formal training methods. David Lee insists, "The program as it stands is unsuitable for training missionaries, at least not in most of the Two-Thirds World, unless it is drastically altered to encompass both theory and praxis, individual and family as a unit, academics and character, cross-cultural knowledge and spiritual formation" (1999a:8).

Informal and non-formal training methods cannot be separated from formal training methods because without knowledge it is hard to carry action into practice, and to reflect on and respond to what was done. In this regard, cross-cultural missionary training is contextual and holistic in its nature concerning the development of trainees' knowledge, spirituality, character qualities, and cross-cultural skills. Also, it is concerned with transforming the trainees' worldview. Table 30 presents the result of the questionnaire given to 125 Korean missionaries (item 2.1-2.32). The courses are ranked
according to how helpful they were in helping missionaries with their cross-cultural adjustment, noting that the most helpful was an overseas field trip (non-formal) and the least helpful was a course on community development (formal).

Table 30

Evaluation of Training Courses for Cross-Cultural Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Numbers Taken</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overseas Field Trip</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prayer meeting</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power Encounter &amp; Spiritual Warfare</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communal Living</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MK Education</td>
<td>F/I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spiritual Formation</td>
<td>F/I</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discipleship/Leadership Training</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Culture Shock</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Case Studies/Simulation Games</td>
<td>F/I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cross-Cultural Communication</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cross-Cultural Discipleship</td>
<td>F/I</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Linguistics</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Practical Skills</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cross-Cultural Adaptability Test</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. World Religions</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Physical Examination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Evangelism and Church Planting</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Contextualization</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Personal Counseling</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Psychological Testing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Leadership/Management/Administration</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Biblical Theology of Mission</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Korean Cultural Values and Worldview</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mission Theology</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Cross-Cultural Counseling</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Urban Mission</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. History of Mission</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Area Studies</td>
<td>F/I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Community Development</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=125; Scale: 1-5 (low-high), F = Formal, I = Informal, N = Non-Formal
In the questionnaire, Korean missionaries responded that the most helpful training methods for cross-cultural adjustment are related to non-formal training (overseas field trips, discipleship/leadership training), informal training (communal living, prayer meetings, spiritual formation, MK education, and interpersonal relationships), and culture learning in a formal setting (power encounter/spiritual warfare, cultural anthropology, culture shock, case studies/simulation games, and cross-cultural communication).

In the same questionnaire given to 125 Korean missionaries (item 2.34), “If you were a missionary trainer, which courses among the above courses definitely would be necessary/unnecessary for the Korean missionary training curriculum?,” the top ten necessary courses for a missionary training curriculum in Korea were suggested in rank order: overseas field trips, spiritual formation, communal living, cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, cross-cultural discipleship and leadership, interpersonal relationships, culture shock, Korean values and worldview, and MK education.

On the basis of interviews with directors of the eight training centers and twenty-four missionaries, the course “Korean Cultural Values and Worldview” is regarded as one of the most important courses for cross-
cultural adjustment. But Table 30 shows a different result from the above data. It ranks twenty-fifth out of thirty-one courses. This can be explained perhaps by the fact that this course was taken by only thirty-six missionaries out of 125. This is because very few missionaries were exposed to this course and the training centers did not offer it except GMTC. It seems that most missionary training centers in Korea seldom recognize or they underestimate the importance of cultural awareness training which is the first step in cross-cultural training.

In interviews with twenty-four Korean missionaries (item 5.1), all were convinced that understanding Korean culture is absolutely essential to the understanding of other cultures. Also, in the interviews with twelve nationals (item 4.2), all indicated that Korean missionaries’ understanding of the host culture and cross-cultural adjustment are very important for their ministry effectiveness. A Thai minister said,

Most Korean missionaries in Thailand seldom understand the local culture. When Korean missionaries come to Thailand, they usually show strong zeal for planting churches and doing great things. They tend to ignore their relationship with Thai people and be paternalistic. This is why they cannot be with Thai people.

In the questionnaire, a majority of Korean missionaries pointed out that the ten most important reasons for Korean missionary attrition are (Table 29
on page 318): (1) problems with children’s education; (2) poor cultural adaptation; (3) problems with peer missionaries; (4) health problems; (5) lack of call; (6) lack of home support; (7) problems with local leaders; (8) marriage/family conflict; (9) disagreement with sending churches; and (10) loss of spirituality/immature spiritual life. Also, the ten most important ways of preventing missionary attrition were suggested by the missionaries in rank order: (1) on-field training (member care, supervision, mentoring); (2) pre-field training with special emphasis on field-based training; (3) maintaining spirituality; (4) home support; (5) maintaining good relationships with mission agency and sending church; (6) strengthening the selection process; (7) supporting children’s education; (8) maintaining health; (9) sabbatical; and (10) continuing education.

These data show where missionary training programs should be strengthened in order to develop trainees’ cultural adaptability for ministry effectiveness. In the Korean context, informal and non-formal training must be developed for equipping God’s people.

What are the key ingredients for developing cross-cultural missionary training in the Korean context? In training missionaries in the Korean context, one of the most urgent needs is to focus the training on behavioral
science, especially missiological anthropology and cross-cultural communication.

In interviews with twenty-four Korean missionaries (item 3.8), sixteen insisted that they adjusted to the host culture without much difficulty. Eight other missionaries admitted struggling with relationships with nationals and fellow missionaries, and with the local language, but the self-assessment of the sixteen missionaries out of twenty-four should be viewed as unreliable.

To a large extent, most Korean missionaries' adjustment to other cultures is at a superficial level such as eating local foods, wearing the local clothing, and speaking local language. They usually face difficulties in understanding the local values and worldview at the deep level internal culture. This tendency may be attributed to the authoritarian character of Korean people. Usually authoritarian persons are ethnocentric and seldom accept views different from their own, consider their cultural values to be absolute, submit to those above them but are aggressive toward those under them, and have no tolerance for ambiguity.

Some Korean missionaries seldom understand and appreciate that there are other ways of doing things than the Korean way. As a result, they are tempted to impose their ways on others. In this regard, effective missionary
training that is contextual and holistic to meet the needs of Korean missionaries is the most important way to help them change their worldview.

In fact, cross-cultural adjustment is a core factor in cross-cultural missionary training. As seen in Table 29 on page 318, poor cultural adaptation ranked second in the reasons for missionary attrition following children's education, and strengthening pre-field training is the second most important way to prevent missionary attrition. Cross-cultural training must be community-based and field-based as it aims to grow trainees in Christ and change their values and worldview to kingdom values and perspectives. David Lee points out that in the Korean context a missionary training institute with communal living can be a balanced holistic training including classroom experience, development of character qualities, and interpersonal relationships (1991a:71).

The more accurately trainers can conceptualize cross-cultural effectiveness, the more likely they are to design and implement a sound cross-cultural training program. However, it should be remembered that the ultimate purpose of cross-cultural missionary training is not just for missionaries to adjust to other cultures but to do incarnational ministry. Also, it must be experiential and competency based training. In other words, cross-
cultural missionary training must be judged by its practical effectiveness. In this sense, the scope of missionary training is much wider than cross-cultural training. Missionary training is multidisciplinary in its very nature. It deals with biblical, theological, and cultural understanding of cross-cultural ministry as it aims to change people’s values and worldview for the sake of the kingdom of God.

Training Goals

The overarching goals of most cross-cultural training programs are: (1) the ability to manage psychological stress; (2) the ability to communicate effectively; and (3) the ability to establish interpersonal relationships (Fowler and Mumford 1995:xiii). Jonathan Lewis points out that the desired outcome of cross-cultural missionary training can be achieved through reconsidering and reexamining the methods and the contexts (1998:1). This is because the program developers’ worldview assumptions and values affect the development of missionary training programs.

Without doubt, the ultimate goal of missionary training is for trainees to build kingdom values and have biblical perspectives. This enables trainees to grow in Christ. Robert Ferris insists that “missionary training aims at growth in Christ-likeness and growth in ministry effectiveness” (1995a:13). In
relation to the issue of cross-cultural adjustment, cross-cultural missionary training aiming toward worldview change and continuing growth through the empowerment of the Holy Spirit enables trainees to understand and appreciate perspectives and customs different from their own. Also, it prepares trainees to tolerate cultural differences. It expands trainees’ ability to think creatively and to envision alternative models of thought and action. To a large extent, this kind of training leads trainees to do cross-cultural ministry effectively. Unless any training program aims toward change and growth, it is inadequate and cannot be effective, nor does it help trainees to develop their knowledge, skills, and character.

In this respect, whatever missionary training model we use, the focal point is how the model helps trainers equip trainees with kingdom values. Here we can see the significance of the trainer as a program developer. In developing a training program, worldview assumptions and values must be examined and tested by biblical perspectives and kingdom values because they underlie our behavior and decisions.

As seen in Chapter 4, Confucian values such as authoritarian and autocratic leadership style, hierarchical mission structure, inability to cooperate or extreme competition embedded in ingroup-centered collectivism,
and formalistic tendencies hamper Korean mission work. These values should be challenged through pre-field training as trainees are made aware of their own values and worldview in the light of the kingdom values, and through various training methods like role playing, overseas field experiences, and community living. This challenge can be continued as they live and minister among the local people. Here, we can recognize the importance of on-field training.

A Holistic Cross-Cultural Missionary Training Model

Jonathan Lewis draws a broad picture for cross-cultural missionary training.

When we speak of outcomes, they can be classified into three primary areas: cognitive, skills, and affective domains. When speaking of methods, we refer to three classifications: formal, non-formal, and informal. When speaking of contexts, I'd like to suggest that there are also three of these: the school, the workplace, and the community. The non-formal and informal contexts will both weigh in to the achievement of this cognitive objective which is assumed to be best learned in a formal context. The point is that cognitive outcomes may be most efficiently transmitted in and through formal means in a school setting. Needed skill components, however, may most effectively be transmitted through non-formal methods in a work context. The non-formal methodology for skill acquisition may be applied, where the trainer goes out with the student and demonstrates how to witness. He then allows the student to practice and apply what he has learned, but under the eye of the trainer. Once the candidate begins working on his/her own, the trainer continues to help grow through a mentoring
relationship. The third set of outcomes, related to the affective domain, seems to be "caught" not "taught." We can memorize the command to love God with all our heart, soul, and mind and its corollary, to love our neighbor as ourselves—but love is only learned and assimilated in the practice of community (our networks of relationships) through "informal" means. (1998:1-2)

Figure 11. A Holistic Cross-Cultural Missionary Training Model

Cross-cultural missionary training must be holistically balanced between formal, informal, and non-formal training methods. In doing so, it can accomplish its main purpose, transformation of trainees' worldview and continuing growth in Christ for incarnational ministry. Figure 11 presents a
holistic model of cross-cultural missionary training focusing on trainees’ worldview change and growth in Christ through formal, informal, and nonformal training methods.

A holistic missionary training model can be presented in a dynamic metaphor, the Oriental folding fan metaphor of a missionary as a whole person. Figure 12 shows how a missionary becomes a whole person. The folding fan represents the missionary’s outward appearance. When the fan is folded, every fan looks the same. People cannot see its real shape or its quality and functions. We only see its real shape when it is unfolded. The frames of the fan represent the missionary’s spirituality, character, and attitude. If a fan’s frame is broken, it can hardly function. The paper of the fan which is sustained by the frames represents knowledge. That means knowledge cannot play its role unless it is based on one’s character and spirituality. In other words, the knowing dimension cannot be understood without understanding the being dimension. If the paper is torn, it can hardly function. The picture of the fan, which is the missionary’s life and ministry, symbolizes skills acquired by doing and experiencing.

Cross-cultural missionary training is like making a folding fan, which is a cooperative venture among missionary, trainer, mission agency, and church.
As the fan does not exist for itself, a missionary is trained to be incarnated in another culture for the sake of witnessing to the gospel. In this respect, the ultimate purpose of missionary training is to change his/her worldview to kingdom values and biblical perspectives and to grow in Christ. So, the missionary as a whole person must be the one who proclaims the good news to the world as the wind of the Holy Spirit transforms people’s life.

Figure 12. Oriental Folding Fan Metaphor of Missionary as a Whole Person

In their cross-cultural training model, Sikkema and Niyekawa propose three stages of cross-cultural training in a pre-field setting: classroom-based cognitive learning, field experience, and post-field seminar. They say about
the training program:

The design begins with a cognitive phase conducted in the classroom, focused on culture, perception, and concept of culture learning. This is followed by cross-cultural living experience and a field seminar designed to provide the opportunity for immediate integration of the cognitive and experiential learning. In the final phase, the students return to the classroom to formulate a theoretical framework based on their learning for use in any situation. (1987:20)

The differences between this model and the holistic missionary training model is that the holistic model adopts communal living in order to develop trainees’ character qualities, spirituality, and interpersonal skills. What we can learn from Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model is culture learning, field seminars, and post-field seminars. This model needs to be modified to combine with the missionary training model.

Knowing (Theory and Information): Formal Training Method

What are the most appropriate tools for facilitating trainees’ cross-cultural adaptability? Proverbs 14:8 says, “The wisdom of the prudent is to understand his way, but the folly of fools is deceit.” An awareness of the strengths and limitations of one’s culture is essential in order to understand other cultures.

Figure 13 shows main objectives of formal training. The first step to cross-cultural training is cultural awareness. In other words, understanding
Korean values and worldview is an essential ingredient for cross-cultural missionary training. Understanding the negative side of Korean values such as authoritarian or top-down leadership style, strong hierarchical social structure, strong competition, emphasis on visible outcome, formalism, and ethnocentric attitude, enables trainees to compare those values to biblical perspectives and kingdom values. It also helps trainees understand other cultures and motivates them to change their values and worldview. In addition to this, cross-cultural missionary training must focus its emphasis on spiritual awareness in order for trainees to maintain their spiritual vitality as they encounter other religions in a new culture. In this respect, formal training aims for trainees to be aware of their own culture and other cultures. It must be connected to non-formal training such as field experiences in order to change trainees' values and attitudes and enable them to grow in Christ.

Figure 13. Objectives of Formal Training
### Table 31

#### Overview of Formal Training Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cross-Cultural Awareness** | 1. Geert Hofstede’s Five Dimensions of National Culture²                | 1. Trainees need to be aware of the influence of Korean cultural values on their mission work: authoritarian values, hierarchical, ingroup-centered mission structure, and intolerant and formalistic tendencies in mission work.  
2. Trainees need to study other cultures through comparing with their own culture.  
3. Trainees need to carefully examine biblical worldview in order to change their worldview which is the goal of the program. | 1. Lecture  
2. Presentation  
3. Reading  
4. Area Studies  
5. Self-Awareness Inventories⁷  
6. Psychological Tests  
7. Case Studies  
8. Simulation Games  
9. Role Plays  
10. Critical Incident  
11. Videos and Films |
| **Spiritual Awareness**    | 1. Spiritual Gift Test  
2. Marguerite G. Kraft’s Book “Understanding Spiritual Power”              | 1. Trainees need to understand that without maintaining spirituality it is very hard to adjust to other cultures and do effective ministry.  
2. Trainees need to understand that power encounter and spiritual warfare deal with the local people’s everyday lives in relation to worldview theme. | 1. Workshops on Spiritual Gift and Spiritual Formation  
2. Workshops and Seminar with Missionaries on Furlough |
| **Connection to the Field** | 1. Grove and Torbiorn’s Model¹  
2. Understanding how to overcome ethnocentrism when to enter into a new culture. | 1. Lectures  
2. Workshops  
3. Small Group Discussions |
Table 31 presents formal training methods which represent objectives, tools, content, and activities. As mentioned above, the main objectives of cultural awareness training is for trainees to increase their understanding of their own culture and consequently other cultures. Thus, to be effective, cross-cultural training must be designed to help trainees not only to be aware of their own cultural values and worldview but to understand the values of other cultures. If trainers skip cultural awareness training, their chances of success are small. In Nida's model of effective missionary identification (1990), knowing ourselves would be the first step to doing cross-cultural ministry. He says, “We must know ourselves before we can expect to know others or to communicate with them” (1990:220). Although cultural awareness training is crucial in pre-field training, it is not done in pre-field training but in process through interaction with people in the host culture.

Jack Levy demonstrates two basic approaches to developing cultural awareness in cross-cultural training:

One is called “inside-out,” the other “outside-in.” In the former, participants are led from cultural self-awareness to other-culture awareness; in the latter, from other-culture awareness to self-awareness. In the inside-out strategy, the training may concentrate on the participants’ own cultural identity and the culture groups to which they belong—national, gender, and/or ethnic, for example. Once they have established an understanding of culture and its influence on their
group, they can examine its effect on their personal behavior, which desirably results in an increase in cultural self-awareness. From there the group can explore the nature of their relationships with other culture groups, come to grips with culturally loaded problems which exist between them, and develop skills in intercultural communication and problem solving. The process can be reversed, of course, resulting in the outside-in design. (1995:4)

In the Korean context, which is monocultural and monolingual, cross-cultural missionary training may be inclined to adopt the inside-out strategy. The first step to cultural awareness is done through classroom-based activities such as lectures, presentation, small group work, demonstrations, role playing, dramas, stories, case studies, simulation games, critical incidents, area study, projects, audio-visual materials, and so on (cf. Hoke 1995a:98-99). But these activities are not enough to change trainees’ attitudes and behavior. So, intellectual awareness must also become emotional or affective awareness. In other words, the intellectual knowledge must connect with experiential training in order to create the conditions for change and growth in trainees. Stephen Hoke insists that “for developing cross-cultural communication skills, both classroom-based and field-based strategies could be employed effectively. Trainers must have extensive cross-cultural experience for effective personal illustration of the principles and skillful demonstration of the skills taught” (1995a:99). To be a good trainer it is
essential to know one’s values and assumptions, skills and limitations.

While knowledge can be presented didactically, it is most often learned experientially. That is why cross-cultural training places its emphasis on non-formal and informal training methods. In the Korean context, one way in which missionary training centers facilitate their trainees’ cultural awareness is living with foreign students and trainers. For example, the CFWM (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Tonghap) training program uses an informal training method where each trainee family adopts a foreign student.

In fact, the knowledge domain in cross-cultural training includes definitions, concepts, theories, and information. In the knowledge domain, the most important courses are cultural anthropology and cross-cultural communication which overlap in their emphases.

Regarding the formal training sessions, the questionnaire given to 125 Korean missionaries, and the interviews with directors of eight missionary training centers and twenty-four Korean missionaries commonly indicated that informal and non-formal training methods are much more effective than formal training methods. This should be fully recognized. Korean missionaries insisted that the formal training sessions exerted little influence on their cross-cultural adjustment and ministry. For this, Sikkema and
Niyekawa insist that “the problem lies in the fact that most orientation programs deal with the content of the culture rather than the process of learning it” (1987:25). In a formal training setting, trainees must learn how to learn culture and apply that learning to a real situation through non-formal field experience and informal communal living.

The purposes of learning cross-cultural knowledge, theory, and information are: (1) to provide a knowledge base drawn from cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and social psychology, that trainees interpret and organize for their learning in the field; (2) to help trainees understand the goals of the program in the context of the design; (3) to enable trainees to become aware that they are imprisoned in their own cultural values and worldview; and (4) to open trainees’ eyes to see other cultures.

Cultural anthropology and cross-cultural communication provide the foundation for subjects of cultural learning such as the concept of culture, values and worldview themes, ethnographic research methods, and culture change (cf. Kraft 1996:4-13). In “Missionaries’ Competencies Profile,” proposed at First Southern Cone Consultation of Mission Trainers held in Cordoba, Argentina in 1991, competencies of cultural anthropology and
cross-cultural communication (1991:4-5) were listed as follows:

I. Cultural Anthropology

1. Is able to analyse his [her] own culture
2. Is conscious of his [her] own ethno-centricity
3. Is informed on ethnic groups within the country
4. Respects other cultures
5. Knows biblical anthropology
6. Can contextualize biblical principles
7. Creates a kingdom culture
8. Has short-term missionary experience
9. Can see with anthropologist eyes
10. Can adapt to another culture

II. Cross-Cultural Communication

1. Knows the host culture
2. Is willing to identify with host culture
3. Knows what communication is
4. Knows how to manage culture shock
5. Values all without racial prejudice
6. Is willing to incarnate self
7. Confronts communications problems
8. Interprets verbal and nonverbal messages
9. Distinguishes biblical principles and customs
10. Can detect cross-cultural bridges for evangelism

As seen in Table 30 on page 344, the course, "Power Encounter and Spiritual Warfare," ranked third out of twenty-five courses for helping cross-cultural adjustment. This indicates that without maintaining spirituality it is impossible for Korean missionaries to adjust to other cultures and do effective ministry. Also, this subject may reflect characteristics of Korean Christianity
which are deeply embedded in shamanistic influences. Along with religious studies, power encounter and spiritual warfare often deal with the worldview themes. For this reason, this course ranked high along with prayer meetings (second) and spiritual formation (sixth).

The duration of formal training varies depending on the training context, but as indicated above, Korean missionaries prefer more than six months in length along with communal living and overseas field research. Thus, training in a formal setting accompanying communal living should last at least four months in order to acquire adequate cross-cultural knowledge, theory, and information as well as biblical and missiological studies, and to prepare for the field through domestic field experiences and studying appropriate research methods. Particularly, formal training needs to focus on cultural learning drawn from cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and social psychology.

**Being (Character, Spirituality, and Interpersonal Skills): Informal Training**

David Harley says, “Missionaries go out as disciples of and witnesses to Jesus Christ. What they are is infinitely more important than what they do. Christ-likeness will have a far greater impact than any sermon they preach” (1997:2). “Rudy” Giron writes,
Spiritual formation is essential throughout the overall development of a missionary. It does not end when the missionary arrives on the mission field either. On the contrary, a new level of spiritual development begins at this point. The real test of a missionary is whether the person is able to cope with the new spiritual realities and demands of missionary life.

Spiritual Formation must be present at every step along the path of a missionary. We must avoid the tendency to reduce missionary training to a mere academic exercise. To be truly effective, any training program must have at its core a very strong spiritual element. (1997:31)

In this sense, it was not surprising that three courses—prayer meetings, spiritual warfare/power encounter, and spiritual formation—ranked in the top ten most important courses for cross-cultural adjustment in the questionnaire (Table 29 on page 318). In cross-cultural contexts, unless one maintains spiritual vitality in daily life and ministry, it must cause many problems physically, emotionally, and psychologically. It also affects the relationships with family members, fellow missionaries, sending agencies and churches, and national workers. As a result, it brings a high rate of missionary attrition. In the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (item 2.1-2.32), prayer meetings and spiritual formation ranked second and sixth. Also, in the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (item 3.22.1), loss of or lack of spirituality is the tenth most important reason for Korean missionary attrition. However, loss of or lack of spirituality is connected with every arena of missionary life and
ministry. In fact, factors such as physical, emotional, spiritual, and relational problems contributing to cross-cultural maladjustment are not separated from each other, but closely connected. The best way to maintain one’s spiritual vitality in cross-cultural situations is through various methods of pastoral care such as supervision, mentoring, and spiritual activities. In pre-field training, the main purpose of communal living as the most important informal training method, is to develop trainees’ spirituality and character qualities, and to change attitudes. Also, trainees can develop their interpersonal skills in relationship with other trainees.

Unlike formal training methods, in informal training settings trainees are not taught but caught by trainers through mentoring, supervision, and apprenticeship. It is called “implicit curriculum.” Informal training includes worship, prayer meetings, small group discussion, psychological tests, spiritual gift tests, personal counseling, family and marriage seminars, MK education, spiritual formation workshops, role rotation, and retreats. One of the most important aspects in informal training is that trainers must thoroughly understand trainees’ worldview and values. Without that, “the trainer is not able to touch on deeper problems that may haunt the trainee on the mission field” (David Lee 1998:3). In this sense, understanding trainees’
values and worldview is a key ingredient for covering every arena of cross-cultural training. Also, trainees are aware of their cultural values such as authoritarian, hierarchical, and formalistic values through living with other families.

Ferris and Fuller insist that staff, facilities, and use of time are three important areas of informal training (1995:57-62). The lack of facilities and qualified trainers affects missionary training programs. Particularly, the programs that provide communal living can produce the best learning community for trainers to model for trainees and for trainees to learn from each other, if there are adequate trainers and facilities. Also, informal training programs through communal living can bring family and marriage issues to interact with each other as a community of faith and develop interpersonal skills as trainees learn how to work together as a team. Another advantage of communal living is that trainees’ children can learn to be sensitive to each other cross-culturally if there are adequate MK trainers. These aspects of informal training through communal living may help trainees and their families to maintain spiritual vitality and effective interpersonal relationships on the basis of Christian character and spirituality.

Of the eight missionary training centers, IMTI only does not provide
informal training through communal living. Most missionaries trained at GMTC pointed out that communal living in GMTC was the most effective training method for trainees to develop character, spirituality, and interpersonal skills. In fact, GMTC has appropriate programs and proper facilities and trainers for effective training. In spite of a shorter length of training than GMTC, CFWM (Tonghap) and MTI run effective informal training programs through communal living. As mentioned above, each trainee family of CFWM adopts a foreign student during the training period (eight weeks). The trainees at MTI have communal living with foreign trainers (three months). Living with foreigners is a great advantage for trainees to develop interpersonal skills. The main problems of Korean mission work relates to the relational area rather than ministry (Table 29 on page 318). In this sense, interpersonal skills are needed by Korean missionaries before going to the mission field. Also, marriage and family issues should be carefully dealt with. It should be remembered that family related problems are among the most important reasons for Korean missionary attrition.

Figure 14 shows main objectives of informal training. Informal training aims for trainees to grow in Christ to be incarnational witnesses through the
development of character qualities, spiritual maturity, interpersonal relationship skills, and changing attitudes and behaviors. In other words, informal training focuses its emphasis on "being" dimension rather than knowing and doing dimension. Informal training methods can purposely be applied into the environment to affect trainees positively.

![Figure 14. Objectives of Informal Training](image)

Table 32 presents overview of informal training methods including objectives, effective tools, content, and appropriate activities. Living in a community is the best model for informal training along with modeling, mentoring, and apprenticeships. In informal training, various activities such as role rotation, group discussion, and leadership seminar can challenge the trainees to rethink authoritarian and hierarchical Korean values and worldview. For instance, role rotation and leadership seminar help trainees
acquire leadership skills not based on authoritarian top-down leadership style but based on biblical leadership. Also, team project and group workshop help trainees develop skills for cooperation and partnership. Through the communal living with other families and marriage/family seminar, trainees can learn how to maintain good relationships with family members and others.

Table 32
Overview of Informal Training Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Character Qualities</td>
<td>Communal Living Model (cf. Jesus’ Community)</td>
<td>Trainees learn from trainers and other trainees about how to live out the gospel through living in a community.</td>
<td>1. Role Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Small Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Personal Discipleship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Personal Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Psychological Test and Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop Spiritual Maturity          | Imitation Modeling Mentoring Apprenticeships (cf. Early Church Community) | 1. Trainees learn from trainers and other trainees through various group and personal spiritual activities.  
2. Trainees need to do self-discipline. | 1. Worship Services                                |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 2. Prayer Meetings                               |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 3. Spiritual Formation                           |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 4. Personal Meditation                           |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 5. Scripture Reading                             |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 6. Bible Study                                   |
| Develop Interpersonal Relationship  | Communal Living Model                      | In a communal setting, trainees can develop their interpersonal relationship skills through various activities and interaction with others. | 1. Leadership Seminar                            |
| Skills and Attitudes                |                                            |                                                                          | 2. Discipleship Seminar                          |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 3. Marriage/Family Seminar                       |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 4. Group Workshops                               |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 5. Team Projects                                 |
|                                     |                                            |                                                                          | 6. Exercise/Outdoor Activities                   |
Doing (Experience and Skills): Non-Formal Training

As seen in Chapter 5, common patterns of non-formal training in the eight missionary training centers are as follows: (1) weekend visits to foreign churches and institutions; (2) domestic field trips for evangelism; (3) seminars for marriage and family, children, cross-cultural leadership, cross-cultural discipleship; and (4) overseas field experience. To some extent, non-formal training programs conducted in Korea can help trainees develop their ministry skills, but the limitation of those programs is that trainees seldom have opportunities to experience culture shock except through overseas field experience, to apply their learning in formal settings, and to reflect on their experiences. While GMTC and MTI offer no overseas field experience trips, the other six training centers run two-week to four-week overseas field trip programs except OMMTC. The reasons that only two to four weeks are offered to overseas field experience are as follows: (1) high cost; (2) difficulty of caring for children; and (3) lack of experienced trainers and field leadership. Also they offer no post-field programs. This makes overseas field trips ineffective. In this sense, the KMTI's one-week post-field training program gives a good example of running an effective non-formal training program. Also, denominational training centers such as GMTI (Hapdong)
and CFWM (Tonghap) as the two largest missionary sending denominations in Korea can utilize furloughing missionaries as facilitators in non-formal settings such as seminars, area studies, and case studies. Also, denominational field leadership can make overseas field trips effective as missionaries guide, discuss, and interact with trainees in order to develop trainees’ interpersonal, ministry, and communication skills. In fact, developing and designing effective non-formal training methods is an urgent task for missionary training centers in Korea.

Without doubt, non-formal training is the weakest area of missionary training programs in Korea. Table 30 on page 344 shows where the missionary training programs need to be strengthened in the Korean context. Overseas field trips ranked first as the most helpful program for cultural adjustment. Needless to say, short-term cross-cultural experience must be gained before going to the mission field because of the monocultural background of Koreans. To be effective, experiential cultural learning should be an organized and well-planned program offered by experienced trainers. This is the stage where trainees apply what they have learned into the practical cross-cultural context. However, it is almost impossible for overseas field experience to accomplish its main purpose unless courses like
field research methods and field orientation in pre-field settings are provided before going to the field. Those courses include domestic field research trips and weekend cross-cultural activities.

Experiential learning is the core element in culture learning. The field learning experience aims for trainees to develop a new style of learning through culture shock experience. In other words, through learning from living in another culture trainees may see their values and assumptions called into question, and find that their behavior patterns do not work because the cultural cues of the host culture differ from their own. Sikkema and Niyekawa write that an objective of overseas field experience is "the development of the ability and willingness to take some emotional risks in situations where one's sense of self-esteem is involved" (1987:42). The goals of cross-cultural experience is to learn to communicate with people of another culture, to develop an awareness of one's own cultural frame of reference and behavior, to develop interpersonal skills, and to solve problems.

What is the process of the field experience? Sikkema and Niyekawa suggest four stages for overseas field learning in eight weeks: disorganization or disintegration (two weeks), reexamination (one week), reorganization (two weeks), and new perspectives (three weeks) (1987:44). The first stage is
characterized by disorientation, anxiety, acute feelings of physical and personal discomfort, difficulty in making decisions, and frustration because usual ways of behaving do not work.

The second stage is reexamination and reflection. Trainees could reflect and reexamine a sense of readiness to explore what is not understood and some awareness of their own cultural biases. In this stage, most trainees will show an increased awareness of their own cultural values through encountering the host cultural values along with developing relationships with people of the host culture.

The third stage is characterized by the emergence of new feelings about trainees' own and the host culture. They become more confident and able to risk involvement in relationships with people in the host culture. Through cultural observations and participation, trainees develop attitudes of acceptance of the differences and respect for the host culture.

In the fourth stage, trainees can put together the pieces of their experience and evaluate or critically respond to it. In this stage, trainees tend to be aware of changes in their attitudes and that an active understanding of a culture is essential to cross-cultural communication. Also, trainees will develop an expanded awareness of their own culture and be ready to engage
in examining and evaluating aspects that they had previously taken for
granted and considered universal, and will be able to articulate some of these
new perspectives (Sikkema and Niyekawa 1987:44-45).

These four stages in overseas field experience contain a cross-cultural
adjustment cycle (cf. Grove and Torbiorn 1993:73-108): a honeymoon period,
a state of disillusionment or disintegration, culture shock, recovery from
culture shock, and adjustment. Usually expatriates experience a honeymoon
stage when they enter into a new culture. But unlike tourists, some trainees in
overseas field experience seldom experience any honeymoon stage, moving
instead almost directly into a state of disorientation and stress because pre-
field training enables them to prepare for culture shock and overseas field
experience is a part of training courses, not an exotic tour. A Korean
missionary whom I interviewed said that he barely experienced a honeymoon
stage, but went directly into a state of disorientation and stress when he
regarded himself as the one who would stay in the host culture at least five
years. He had no mental stability with which to enjoy the new cultural milieu.

What are the main purposes of non-formal training? Figure 15 shows
that knowledge learned through formal training must be connected to field
experiences in order to develop trainees' cultural awareness, language
competency, communication skills, and interpersonal relationship skills. In other words, non-formal training aims to develop trainees' cross-cultural competencies. The nature of non-formal training is change and transformation. For example, Jesus used mostly non-formal and informal training methods in training his disciples. He lived with his disciples as a role model and taught them in various places. What the disciples learned was through doing and experiencing. Jesus showed them examples and then sent them out to preach the good news (See Chapter 3 on page 118).

Figure 15. Objectives of Non-Formal Training

Before going to the field, trainees must prepare for their overseas field experience through experiential learning such as domestic field trips, research methods, case studies, simulation games, role playing, and so on. During overseas field trips, trainees must keep writing in their journals and
participating in the field seminars. The daily journal plays an important part both in field experience as a whole and specifically in the field seminars.

The journal functions as a psychological support, enabling the trainees to release negative feelings and articulate positive learning. It forces trainees to reflect immediately on their experiences. Also, it can produce insight at the moment or later upon rereading. The daily journal also serves as an educational tool for the field seminars as trainees read each other’s journals before each seminar session. It can serve as a strong stimulus to discussion in the seminar as students challenge each other. The field seminar provides the opportunity for trainees to think and interact through their experiences and reading the daily journals. In the field seminars, the function of the trainers is to help trainees translate their feelings and insights (Sikkema and Niyekawa 1987:47-48).

In cross-cultural missionary training, field leadership plays an important role in planning an overseas field trip. Missionaries can help trainees have a cross-cultural ministry experience, give important information and insights for cultural adjustment and ministry effectiveness, and interact with them in the field seminars. In the case of using an overseas training center, if adequate facilities and trainers are provided, an overseas field trip
would be organized and effective. Using a foreign training center overseas may be effective for developing interpersonal skills.

After overseas field trips, the follow-up is important for trainees to have the opportunity to reinforce their learning and consequently prepare for being sent to a mission field as a missionary. The length of this follow-up program would be at least one month. During this phase of the program, trainees review the total learning experience and connect the learning in a formal setting to the overseas field experience. Sikkema and Niyekawa state the functions of a post-field program: (1) it enables trainees to reinterpret, integrate, and formulate their learning into a whole experience; (2) it enables them to stand back and see the structure or connectedness of things; and (3) it helps them avoid closure at a time when they are still uncertain about the new concepts and consciousness they have been exploring within themselves (1987:50).

Table 33 presents an overview of non-formal training methods including main objectives, effective tools, main content, and appropriate activities. As mentioned above, the nature of non-formal training is the transformation of trainees’ values, attitudes, and behavior. Non-formal training methods can function as trainees act, reflect, and respond for their
own growth and change in facilitating cross-cultural competencies. Action in active participation of trainees is essential to cross-cultural training. Reflection enables trainees to develop what they have learned.

Table 33

Overview of Non-Formal Training Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Cross-Cultural Competencies</td>
<td>Sikkema and Niyekawa’s Model and Action-Reflection-Response Model$^9$ (cf. Paulo Freire’s Action-Reflection Model)</td>
<td>Trainees experience or take actions on what they have learned in the classroom. Through various field experiences, trainees change their values and attitudes, and finally grow as they prepare for cross-cultural ministry. In this stage, the role of trainers and missionaries on the field are important for trainees.</td>
<td>1. Domestic Field Trip: Visiting Foreign Seamen and Workers, Visiting Foreign Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop One’s Own Cultural Awareness and Other Cultural Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Overseas Field Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop Cross-Cultural Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Field Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transformation of Values and Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Individual Mentoring and Supervision by Trainers and Missionaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In this chapter, I suggested a cross-cultural missionary training model based on formal, informal, and non-formal models of education, plus Sikkema and Niyekawa’s model of cross-cultural learning. This model integrates research findings and the merits of the eight missionary training curriculums. Korean missionaries pointed out that in the Korean context, informal and non-formal training methods are needed to help trainees acquire adequate
cross-cultural knowledge and skills, develop character qualities, spirituality, and interpersonal relationship skills, and transform worldview.

As seen in the holistic training model in this chapter, the main goal of cross-cultural missionary training is to transform the trainees’ worldview to kingdom values and biblical perspectives such as servant leadership of Jesus Christ (Matthew 20:28), Jesus’ sermon on the mount (Matthew 5-7), the fruits of the Spirit through total commitment to Jesus Christ (Galatians 5:22-24), and so on. It is also to enable trainees to grow in Christ as cross-cultural witnesses. As mentioned in Chapter 4, to be a cross-cultural witness one must give up one’s ethnocentric attitudes toward people of other cultures and also grow holistically in order to adapt to another culture for effective cross-cultural ministry. In fact, the conversion of Peter (Acts 10-11) reveals that to be a effective cross-cultural witness one must have two conversion experiences: conversion to Christ and a cross-cultural conversion. Cross-cultural missionary training encourages trainees’ conversion before going to the field. That means that trainees’ worldviews are broadened to see a more biblical worldview and to adopt kingdom values.

I have described objectives and appropriate tools for cross-cultural training according to formal, informal, and non-formal training methods.
Each of them has both weaknesses and strengths (cf. Clinton 1984:136-149). These dimensions interrelate with one another in order to maximize the effectiveness of cross-cultural training. First, formal training as a classroom-based training method aims to provide adequate cross-cultural knowledge, theory, and information through various methods such as case studies, area studies, simulation games, and so on. Particularly, it focuses on cultural awareness training through which trainees learn to understand their own and other cultures. Hofstede’s model of national cultures can be used effectively for self-awareness and other culture awareness.

Second, informal training aims to develop trainees’ character qualities, spirituality, and interpersonal and leadership skills. Informal training must be residential with communal living. In informal training, trainers play an important role as facilitators. Many effective informal training methods are used in the eight missionary training centers such as various seminars, workshops, small group discussion, counseling, mentoring, using various inventories for measuring trainees’ personalities, spiritual gifts, and cross-cultural adaptability, spiritual formation, prayer meetings, Bible study, and worship.

Third, non-formal training as a field-based training method aims to
change trainees' attitudes toward people of other cultures and to develop ministry skills, coping skills, and communication skills. The important element of non-formal training is in overseas field experience. As seen in Sikkema and Niyekawa's model of cross-cultural learning, effective tools for non-formal training are daily journals, field seminars, and post-field seminars. Before going to the field, trainees need to learn appropriate research methods and have cross-cultural experiences in domestic settings through interaction with foreigners. During the field seminar, discussing Grove and Torbiorn's model and Milton Bennett's model can facilitate trainees' understanding of cultural shock stages, cross-cultural adjustment processes, and overcoming ethnocentrism. Follow-up post-field seminars are needed for trainees to reflect on and to integrate their field learning as well as other learning experiences into future ministry.

This model can be generally applied to developing missionary training programs for Korean missionaries. As a model is a window through which to view reality, through this model program developers may recognize what kind of programs the training centers in Korea need, where they must be strengthened, and where they need to be developed.
Notes

1. As a form of non-formal training, experiential training is learning from experience. The experiential approach is learner-centered and allows the individual trainees to manage and share with their trainers responsibility for their own learning. Experiential training provides opportunities for trainees to engage in activities, analyze these activities critically, draw some useful insights from the analysis, and apply the results in a practical situation (McCaffery 1993:231; cf. Kohls and Brussow 1995:7-8). Competency based training aims to achieve many non-formal training goals such as change, growth, and acquirement of various intercultural skills. The main purpose of competency based training in cross-cultural missionary training is for trainees to acquire the ability or skills to do successful cross-cultural adjustment and ministry.

2. Bloom (1956) offered guidance in the classification of educational goals in three domains: cognitive, psychomotor, and affective. Missionary trainers (Ferris 1995; Lewis 1998) prefer the term “skill” to psychomotor domain. Also, they insist that character qualities and spirituality are much more substantial than “affects” (Ferris 1995a:11).

3. See Chapter 4 about discussing Korean values and worldview using Geert Hofstede’s model.

4. See Chapter 2 on page 89-90.

5. See Chapter 1 on page 37-40.


7. In Intercultural Source Book: Cross-Cultural Training methods Vol.2 (Sandra M. Fowler and Monica G. Mumford, eds. 1999:19-72), self-awareness inventories are presented along with explanation by authors. They are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument, the ACMEN Inventory, the Four-Value Orientation Exercise, the Overseas Assignment Inventory, the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory, and the Intercultural Development Inventory.
8. See Chapter 1 on page 40-45.


10. In contrast to the theory-application model which uses a two-part sequence, learning a theory and applying that theory into practice, the action-reflection-response model of culture learning features three elements in a sequence. First, action is called praxis, practicum, field experience, or learning on the job. Second, reflection is the process of attaining greater knowledge of something as a result of thinking through the action, a process made possible through gaining more information about, assimilating, and accepting ownership of the experience. Third, in the process of response, the new knowledge is not enough; there must be a corresponding attitudinal or behavior modification and change (Hess 1994:21-22; cf. Freire 1970).
CHAPTER 8

Training Missionaries for Cross-Cultural Effectiveness:
Missiological Implications and Recommendations

Summary

This study began by recognizing critical problems that Korean missionaries face in mission today. In spite of the Korean economic crisis since late 1997, the number of Korean missionaries increased each year because of the Korean church's ongoing concern for and commitment to overseas missions. Each year hundreds of new Korean missionaries with their vision and calling go abroad into unfamiliar cultures.

However, Korean missionaries have been criticized for their ethnocentric and paternalistic attitudes in spite of their investment of enormous effort and materials. The problem was raised that Korean missionaries seldom adjust adequately to their host cultures, consequently producing a high rate of missionary attrition. Then Korean missionaries who experience difficulty in mission work, especially in relationships with fellow missionaries and nationals, questioned their inadequate cross-cultural missionary training before they were sent to various fields of mission.
In this study I attempted to find the relationship between cross-cultural missionary training in Korea and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. The hypothesis of this research was that inadequate cross-cultural missionary training is related to a missionary’s poor cross-cultural adjustment, hindering effective cross-cultural ministry.

For this, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies were adopted. A questionnaire and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) for Korean missionaries were administered. Also, I interviewed directors of eight missionary training centers in Korea, Korean missionaries trained in these training centers, and nationals in the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and Bangladesh. The research studied the eight training centers in Korea; 125 Korean missionaries responded to the CCAI and the questionnaire, and I interviewed twenty-four Korean missionaries and twelve nationals.

The research of this study provided statistical data that revealed that effective cross-cultural training is related to effective cross-cultural adjustment. The more effective training centers, such as GMTC, OMMTC, and KMTC, were significantly higher in mean scores on the CCAI and the questionnaire for Korean missionaries (QFKM) than the less effective training
centers. The factors related to cross-cultural adjustment, such as language competency, health, and relationships, were related to cross-cultural missionary training. To a large extent, interviews with Korean missionaries and national ministers also supported the importance of cross-cultural missionary training for effective ministry and adjustment.

Directors of the training centers and Korean missionaries trained in the centers, suggested that informal and non-formal methods were better than formal training methods. Important factors that influence Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment are length and place of training, trainers, and training facilities. Also, the directors and Korean missionaries recognized the importance of understanding Korean values and worldview as a prerequisite for understanding other cultures. This is especially important because Korean is a monolingual and monocultural nation.

Finally, in Chapter 7, I suggested a holistic cross-cultural missionary training model which integrates research findings and the strengths of the training programs. This proposed missionary training program is holistic, balancing training between formal, informal, and non-formal methods. In order to develop trainees' cross-cultural knowledge, formal training must focus on cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and social
psychology. This classroom-based training must connect with field experiences. Informal training with communal living should focus on developing trainees’ character qualities, spirituality, interpersonal skills, and changing values and attitudes. Non-formal training, as experiential and competency based training, must focus on developing trainees’ cultural awareness, coping skills, communication skills for effective ministry, leadership skills, and team ministry skills through domestic and overseas field trips and post-field seminars. The final stage of missionary training focuses on integrating cultural learning through various methods and on evaluating results for developing the program.

**Missiological Implications**

In cross-cultural life and ministry, culture shock and stress are inevitable. So one of the most urgent tasks for the missionary is to successfully adjust to the host culture for effective cross-cultural ministry. However, without adequate cross-cultural missionary training it is much harder to adjust to the host culture than the missionary expects. In this regard, cross-cultural missionary training is directly connected to missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment.
Missiologically, the underlying assumption of cross-cultural training and cross-cultural adjustment is based on the model of Jesus' incarnation. The goal of cross-cultural missionary training and adjustment to other cultures is to be an incarnational witness. From this perspective, this study discussed the biblical roots and missiological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training in Chapter 3 and the anthropological foundations of cross-cultural missionary training in Chapter 4.

Paul Hiebert and Eloise Mensese write, "The goal of incarnational ministry is not that people understand the gospel. It is that they respond to God's invitation and are transformed by his power. They become new creatures through Christ and members of a new community, the church" (1995:373). They mention three dimensions of transformation: transformation of individuals, of the missionary, and of the social structure (1995:373-375). In fact, cross-cultural ministry through effective cross-cultural adjustment aims to convert people to Christ, but without transformation of the messenger and the mission structures, effective cross-cultural ministry is unlikely.

Biblical roots and missiological foundations have been discussed through the examination of narratives about worldview shifts leading to authentic conversions in the cultures of the early church and the event of the
Jerusalem Council in the book of Acts. As cross-cultural missionary training aims to change trainees’ worldview and expedite their growth in Christ, the biblical narratives in Acts (9-11) offer important insights on how God’s incarnational nature broke down cultural barriers between Jews and Gentiles as seen in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15). In this sense, cross-cultural missionary training is an important stage because through adequate missionary training before going to the field, trainees can undergo a cross-cultural conversion as messengers of the gospel that is as significant as conversion to Christ.

Cross-cultural ministry must start from the awareness of the deeper meaning of Jesus’ incarnation from a missiological perspective. As a model of cross-cultural ministry, Jesus’ incarnation forces us to cross all cultural, social, and economic barriers. Cross-cultural adjustment is not only the missionary’s immersion into the host culture’s deep level, but it also is living out the gospel for the sake of the kingdom of God. Hiebert and Meneses argue, “In missions, transformation takes place not only in the lives of the new converts, but also in the life of the missionary. In incarnational ministry our lives are transformed as much as are those of the people we serve” (1995:375).
Needless to say, cross-cultural adjustment is a process of changing one’s worldview. In fact, worldview change requires a radical conversion experience culturally and spiritually and is often a long process. This is done through the work of the Holy Spirit who is the real agent of change. Without a radical cross-cultural conversion experience before going to the people a missionary will serve, transformation will unlikely take place in the lives of the host people. In this regard, cross-cultural missionary training is one of the most important factors in cross-cultural ministry.

Luke’s conversion narratives move the church from the particular dimension to the universal dimension as we recognize the risen Christ as Lord of the universe as well as Lord of the church. Harold Dollar says that the challenge of the conversion narratives “speaks more to the issues of process and relationships as they have to do with the church’s universal nature and mission” (1996:111-112).

Paul Hiebert and Meneses also insist,

Transformation must be corporate. Christian conversion is not confined to the private, personal areas of peoples’ lives. It transforms them, and through them the systems of which they are a part. In this transformation, we use the text of divine revelation to judge human contexts. . . . Corporate transformation must begin in the church. It is the outpost of God’s reign on earth. It must manifest the social order of the kingdom of God, which is based on love, reconciliation,
servanthood, and submission to Christ. The explicit beliefs and underlying worldview of the church [and mission organizations] must both be transformed to fit those in Scripture. (1995:374)

From this perspective, cross-cultural missionary training must be a cooperative venture of churches, mission agencies, training centers, the host churches, and missionaries. First of all, in cross-cultural missionary training, self-awareness takes the first step toward awareness of other cultures. Cross-cultural missionary training is closely related to a given context—the values and worldview of the training community. In this respect, most problems of Korean missionaries relate to areas such as relationships between authoritarian denominational leadership and missionary training center, between sending churches and mission agencies, between missionaries and sending churches, between missionaries and mission agencies, between missionaries and nationals, and among fellow missionaries. In other words, the characteristics of authoritarian and autocratic leadership style, hierarchical mission structure, a lack of cooperation, competition between missionaries, and intolerance of uncertainty cause problems in Korean mission work. Especially, the intolerant tendency to uncertain situations of Korean missionaries causes them to pursue visible outcomes that can be reported to their mission and church back home in Korea.
Lois Dodds points out six dimensions of human development in relation to cross-cultural missionary training and member care: spiritual, physical, actualization, relational, emotional, and organizational (1999:4). She says,

In one sense, the sixth dimension of care could be placed first, for it is within the context of the organization that our other needs are either met or left unmet. We believe that missions need to take much more seriously the degree to which the organizational personality, ethos, philosophy, leadership style, culture, and policies color the lives of the people within them. It seems this reality is often overlooked. We teach about cross-cultural adjustment, but rarely about organizational adjustment. In reality, we usually have to adjust simultaneously to both a new cultural context and a new organizational environment. (1999:13)

Effective cross-cultural adjustment is important in order for the missionary to have genuine relationships with the host community, but organizational adjustment is as important as cross-cultural adjustment. Missionaries often have as much problem with “mission shock” as they do with culture shock. Mission organizations’ values which are not consistent with kingdom values must be challenged biblically and transformed for the sake of the kingdom of God.

Since mission is the work of God who transforms the world by the power of the cross and through the work of the Holy Spirit, the church as
being sent by God is essentially missionary by its nature. David Bosch says, “Because church and mission belong together from the beginning, a church without mission or a mission without the church are both contradictions” (1991:372). In this sense, missiological education is essential for the church because “mission is always a cross-cultural movement—from the realm of the Kingdom into the world” (Elliston 1996:253).

In general, the missiological education of the church enables the people of God to cross socio-cultural, economic, and other barriers with attitudes shaped by Jesus Christ and spiritual maturity. In particular, cross-cultural missionary training is an essential part of the church in which the people of God participate in God’s transforming work by sending missionaries.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several possibilities for further research can be suggested through the findings of this research. As has been noted, this research was limited to the investigation of pre-field training programs in relation to Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment. Nevertheless, this research can serve as a foundation for further research relating to cross-cultural missionary training and cross-cultural adjustment. Ferris and Fuller insist, “Since cross-cultural
ministry competence is a life-long pursuit, missionary training cannot be limited to pre-field preparation. Continuing training for professional development must be planned, however, if missionaries are to realize the highest levels of spiritual maturity and ministry competence” (1995:51).

It is suggested that further research be done in the following areas:

1. As discussed in this study, Korean cultural values and worldview have deeply influenced Korean mission work. Regarding this, research focusing on the relationships between Korean cultural values and worldview and Korean missionary work needs to be done. This research enables us to be aware of Korean cultural values and worldview at a deep level, especially in comparison with and contrast to biblical and other cultures. Also, it helps us to rediscover biblical perspectives and kingdom values that can facilitate our effort for the contextualization of cross-cultural missionary training programs in Korea.

This research needs to be conducted through various methods such as questionnaires, in-depth interviews, inventories, and observations in order to increase its validity and reliability. This project is not an individual’s research but a cooperative venture of churches, mission agencies, missionaries, and missionary training centers in particular, because it needs
professional researchers, research funds, and prayers.

2. As noted in this research, on-field training is a vital issue for the cross-cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries; thus it must be addressed in depth. Adequate on-field training is one of the most important ways of preventing Korean missionary attrition. Wide research regarding on-field training should be done by future researchers in order to provide effective training programs. Particularly, a study on the relationship between on-field training and Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment will help missionary training centers and mission agencies develop on-field training programs such as supervision, member care, mentoring, and counseling. Also, it enables Korean missionaries to encourage the field leadership to function effectively in helping junior missionaries adjust to a new culture. In this respect, on-field training needs to be initiated by field leaders in partnership with the local church.

3. One of the findings in this research was that Korean missionaries had lower CCAI mean scores than the Kelley and Meyers’ study group. A comparison study between Korean missionaries’ cross-cultural adjustment and that of Western missionaries will contribute to discover effective cross-cultural adjustment skills and training methods.
4. One of findings of this research was that missionary training centers in Korea except GMTC do not offer MK training programs. Korean missionaries reported that problems with children's education was the biggest reason for Korean missionary attrition. In this regard, study on the cross-cultural adjustment of MKs will contribute to develop MK training programs in Korea. Also, it can be connected to research on adult MKs to reflect their cross-cultural experiences in order to develop training programs.

**Recommendations for Training Korean Missionaries**

As discussed in this study, cross-cultural missionary training should focus its emphasis on biblical understanding of cross-cultural conversion and understanding of one's own cultural values and worldview in order to be incarnational witnesses. For the Korean church, mission agencies, and missionaries, developing areas for cross-cultural ministry effectiveness are suggested in the following.

1. In training missionaries, the mission structures of agencies and churches are important. Particularly, denominational leadership must be examined by the biblical principle of leadership in order to develop effective cross-cultural missionary training programs. This can be achieved by
cooperation between mission agencies and missionary training centers. Also, sending churches and mission agencies must cooperate with each other in supporting and caring for missionaries in order to facilitate their mission work.

2. As mentioned in Chapter 5, there is an average of 200 furloughing missionaries who belong to GMTI (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Hapdong), but GMTI has no training program for them. Among the eight missionary training centers, only GMTC runs a three-month, post-field training program for missionaries on furlough. GMTC is a forerunner in this area. In this sense, there is an urgent need for missionary training centers in Korea to develop post-field training programs. Missionary training centers in Korea already run pre-field training programs; post-field training is a new area for cross-cultural missionary training in Korea. In this area, program developers should keep in mind that most furloughing missionaries need physical, psychological, and spiritual recharge and care, so the circumstances and curricula must be different from pre-field training programs. Also, the role of the trainer in post-field training should be that of caregiver and counselor. In fact, effective post-field training helps furloughing missionaries to recharge their energies for the next term of missionary service.
3. In my interviews with directors of the training centers, I learned that no training center trains the trainers (item 2.3.4). Having cross-cultural ministry experiences is not enough for missionary trainers. They should continue to develop their training skills, character, spirituality, and cultural sensitivity as well as their knowledge. In this sense, training programs for missionary trainers need to be developed. For this, missionary training centers need to share their merits of the program and to have a consortium to train missionary trainer. Also, competitive attitudes between mission agencies and training centers must be examined by the biblical principles of partnership. In order to develop this area, research on training programs for missionary trainers should be conducted. Most training programs for missionary trainers are run by missionary training centers in the United States. On the basis of the research data, missionary training centers in Korea need to develop a cooperative training program.

4. Because missionary selection significantly affects cross-cultural missionary training, biblically-based mission policies for missionary selection are needed. Missionary attrition starts from missionary selection, so in order to avoid missionary attrition and facilitate pre-field missionary training, careful selection is needed. Missionary selection must be a cooperation
between church and mission agency. In missionary selection and training, culturally relevant psychological tests and cross-cultural adaptability tests are needed. Mission agencies and training centers in Korea use foreign inventories for testing missionary candidates’ personalities and spiritual gifts.

5. With the increasing number of Korean missionaries, continuing education programs for furloughing missionaries are needed in order to produce mission leaders and trainers. Sending churches and mission agencies should support furloughing missionaries to study missiology both in Korean and abroad.

6. With the increasing number of tentmaker missionaries, missionary training centers need to develop programs for tentmaker missionaries.

7. The importance of field leadership must not be overlooked. Effective field structure can produce effective on-field training and member care with the cooperation of the host church. Needless to say, it can facilitate effective ministry and partnership.

8. As discussed in Chapter 5, most overseas field experience programs in Korea seldom meet trainees’ needs, nor do they produce satisfactory outcomes. In this sense, developing overseas field experience programs for pre-field training is one of the most important tasks of missionary training
centers because overseas field experiences enable trainees to see and change their own culture-bound values and behavior patterns.

9. In cross-cultural missionary training, case studies and area studies play important roles in trainees understanding the field situation and gathering information on the countries in which they will serve. In this respect, it is helpful for furloughing missionaries to participate in the training program as part-time trainers to share their field experience and information.

10. In my interviews with directors of missionary training centers, some of them spoke of the need for a consortium of missionary trainers to develop cooperative training programs. This will help missionary training centers to share their own know-how with each other and strengthen their training programs. Also, cooperation with foreign mission agencies and missionary training centers is needed for developing effective training programs in a global era.

Concluding Remarks

This research has established a relationship between cross-cultural missionary training and Korean missionaries' cross-cultural adjustment. The relationship between cross-cultural missionary training and the effectiveness
of cross-cultural ministries—language competency, interpersonal relationships and spiritual, emotional, and physical health—has been demonstrated. A positive relationship showing the impact of Korean cultural values and worldview on the cross-cultural adjustment of Korean missionaries has been also established through this study. Often that impact has been negative.

This study has contributed to the development of cross-cultural missionary training for the Korean church in the following ways. First, it enables the Korean church to be aware of an urgent need for producing qualified missionaries. Second, it enables missionary trainers and mission educators to develop a cross-cultural missionary training curriculum to produce effective cross-cultural witnesses. Third, it also helps Korean missionaries learn how to develop their cultural sensitivity and competency to adjust to other cultures for effective mission work.

Finally, this study helps those who are involved in world mission understand the nature of incarnational ministry as they participate in a cooperative venture of cross-cultural missionary training and missiological education world-wide. Also, it will be a helpful resource for cross-cultural missionary training as it shows how to train missionaries to be incarnational
witnesses by helping them adjust to other cultures.

I conclude this dissertation with the following implications for Korean missionaries and the Korean church. I am proud of Korean missionaries who sacrifice their lives for the sake of witnessing to the gospel message in foreign lands and of Korean Christians who support the missionaries with strong zeal for world mission. Also, I appreciate missionary training centers in Korea for their dedication and effort to accomplish the Great Commission.

It is time for the Korean church to mature in doing missions and in developing missiological education in general and missionary training in particular. It is time for Korean missionaries to be challenged to become incarnational witnesses through the transformation of their worldview and attitudes; it is time to train Korean missionaries so that they can rise above the cultural constraints of their Korean values and worldview. Also, it is time for missionary training centers to develop contextualized missionary training programs.

In this dissertation I have evaluated Korean mission work and its developing areas by pointing out some negative and positive aspects coming out of my love for the Korean church. To be sure, every evaluation indicates certain aspects of the whole picture. It can never be a perfect evaluation.
The only one who can judge our mission work is Jesus Christ who wants us to accomplish his commission to make disciples and commandment to love. I hope the evaluation made in this study can bring about a constructive reformation in Korean mission work.

I believe that a missionary must not be judged only by his/her visible achievement because a tiny grain of wheat that falls into the earth cannot be seen. The seed must die in order to bear precious fruit. The fruit of Christian mission is produced by the community of faith who are willing to follow Jesus Christ by taking up their own crosses. The cross-cultural challenge of the Korean church today is to produce viable incarnational witnesses, a cooperative venture among sending churches, mission agencies, missionaries, and the host church.
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Questionnaire for Korean Missionaries

Direction: Please read carefully each question and respond with the best answer.

1. Personal Information

1.1 Name (optional):

1.2 Gender: Male ___ Female ___

1.3 Age:

1.4 Marital Status: Married ___ Single ___

1.5 Place of Ministry:

1.6 Year/Month of entry to country in which you work:

1.7 Denomination and Mission Agency:

1.8 Name of Missionary Training Center:

1.9 Your Current Missionary Job Assignment/Position:

1.10 Other Job Assignments/Positions:

2. Cross-Cultural Missionary Training

Direction: Rate the helpfulness of courses, tests and informal and non-formal training taken at only your sending agency for the pre-field training to your cultural adjustment and effective ministry from the period of entry until the present. Please 1) check √ the underline of the course title and 2) rate the level of helpfulness by circling the appropriate number.

Mark √ each course you took

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Helpfulness of Cultural Adjustment</th>
<th>Helpfulness of Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Communication</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Culture Shock</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Korean Cultural Values and Worldview</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Biblical Theology of Mission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Mission Theology</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Contextualization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>History of Mission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Evangelism and Church Planting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Leadership/Management/Administration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Discipleship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Spiritual Formation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>World Religions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Power Encounter/Spiritual Warfare</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Area Studies (e.g. Asia studies)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Urban Mission</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.20 **Cross-Cultural Counseling** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.21 **Psychological Testing** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.22 **Physical Examination** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.23 **Cross-Cultural Adaptability Test** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.24 **Practical Skills (Computer, Carpentry, Motor Mechanics, etc)** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.25 **Case Studies, Simulation Games, etc** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.26 **Overseas Field Trip** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.27 **Communal Living** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.28 **Personal Counseling** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.29 **Discipleship & Leadership Training** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.30 **Prayer Meeting** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.31 **MK Education** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5
2.32 **Other (Specify)** | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5

2.33 If you have ever been trained or educated for overseas mission at other institution(s) besides your current training institution, please describe below: 1) the period of the training and the name of institution and 2) mark the courses and other training methods listed above by "X" on the underline and rate their level of helpfulness to your current cultural adjustment and ministry.
2.34 If you were a missionary trainer, which courses among the above courses definitely would be necessary/unnecessary for the Korean missionary training curriculum? List the courses:
Necessary courses:

Unnecessary courses:

2.35 Which courses in the listing given above have you never heard about or are unfamiliar with?

2.36 How long was your course of training in your current missionary training center?

2.37 What is your opinion about the ideal length of a missionary training program in the Korean context?
A. less than a month  B. one to three months  C. three to six months  
D. six to nine months  E. more than nine months

Please briefly describe the reason(s) for your choice.

2.38 What are the strengths and weaknesses or developing areas of the missionary training program you received under your current mission agency?

2.39 Do you give any feedback to the missionary training center regarding your missionary training program? If yes,
   How often:
   In what way: (e.g. attending mission committee, etc.)

2.40 What would be your ideal missionary training?

3. Cross-Cultural Adjustment

Direction: Please read each statement carefully and choose the response that best fits you. Circle your response. Please answer the following:

3.1 What was your expectation of the target country before you entered the new culture?
A. very difficult  B. difficult  C. moderate  D. good  E. very good

3.2 How much difficulty did/does the language difference cause you during the first year of your ministry?
A. a great deal  B. a considerable amount  C. a fair amount
D. a little  E. virtually not at all
3.3 How well do you speak the local language?
   A. very fluently   B. fluently   C. moderately
   D. poorly   E. not at all

3.4 How often do you use interpreters in your ministry?
   A. Never   B. Rarely   C. Sometimes   D. Often   E. Always

3.5 What languages do you use in your ministry (e.g. evangelism, preaching, conversation with nationals)?

3.6 How do Korean missionaries' mono-cultural backgrounds affect their adjustment to another culture?
   A. very negatively   B. somewhat negatively   C. no effect
   D. somewhat positively   E. very positively

3.7 How acceptable are your living conditions?
   A. very bad   B. bad   C. moderate   D. good   E. very good

3.8 How favorably would you describe your satisfaction with the ministry you actually perform now compared with the ministry you expected to perform?
   A. very disappointed   B. somewhat disappointed   C. meets my expectation
   D. satisfied   E. very satisfied

3.9 How is/was your health during the first year of your ministry?
   A. very poor   B. poor   C. moderate   D. good   E. very good

3.10 What have your relationships been with the nationals?
   A. very poor   B. poor   C. satisfactory   D. good   E. very good

3.11 What have your relationships been with your fellow missionaries?
   A. very poor   B. poor   C. satisfactory   D. good   E. very good

3.12 What have your relationships been with your spouse and children during the first year of your ministry?
   A. very poor   B. poor   C. satisfactory   D. good   E. very good

3.13 What have your relationships been with your sending agency?
   A. very poor   B. poor   C. satisfactory   D. good   E. very good

3.14 How do Korean cultural values affect your relationships with fellow Korean missionaries?
   A. very negatively   B. somewhat negatively   C. no effect
   D. somewhat positively   E. very positively
3.15 How would you evaluate the vitality of your spirituality during the first year of your ministry?
A. very poor  B. poor  C. satisfactory  D. good  E. very good

3.16 How would you evaluate your psychological or emotional state during the first year of your ministry? Please mark the items ✓ and circle the level of intensity applying to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear/Frustration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of pleasure or interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17 If you have children, how have they affected your cross-cultural transition?
A. very negatively  B. a little negatively  C. no effect  D. a little positively  E. very positively

3.18 How important is understanding Korean cultural values and worldview to your understanding of other cultures?
A. a great deal  B. a considerable amount  C. a fair amount  D. a little  E. virtually not at all

3.19 On what level do you think that nationals respect and trust you?
A. a great deal  B. a considerable amount  C. a fair amount  D. a little  E. virtually not at all

3.20 On what level do you respect and trust national fellow workers?
A. a great deal  B. a considerable amount  C. a fair amount  D. a little  E. virtually not at all

3.21 In what ways have you maintained your emotional and spiritual balance as you have struggled with your life in a new circumstance? Circle all items that apply to you.
A. Spiritual activities (prayer, reading Bible, etc.)
B. Spouse's help
C. Supervision by fellow missionaries
D. Supervision by mission agency
E. Supervision by the local church ministers
F. Counseling  G. Without help  H. Others (specify)

3.22 Would you tell me about missionary attrition?
   3.22.1 What are your opinions about the reasons for missionary attrition?
   3.22.2 Rank the five most important reasons for missionary attrition in order of importance?
   3.22.3 Can you suggest the three most important ways of preventing missionary attrition?

3.23 What are most important things in mission?

3.24 Do you want to receive the result of this questionnaire? (Yes / No)
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*Interview with Directors of Korean Missionary Training Centers*

Date of Interview: 
Place of Interview: 
Interview Hour: 

General Information of Interviewee: 
Name: 
Denomination/Mission Agency: 
Name of Missionary Training Center: 
Address: 
Telephone/Fax/E-mail Number: 

1. **Historical Background and General Information**

1.1 Founding of Missionary Training Center
   1.1.1 When was your institution founded? 
   1.1.2 What is the governing body of your institution?

1.2 Number of Missionaries Trained
   1.2.1 How many career and short term missionaries has your institution trained since your institution was founded? 
   1.2.2 How many missionaries on average does your institution train every year? 
   1.2.3 How many trainees are being trained currently in your institution? 
   1.2.4 How many career missionaries who have been trained in your institution are working currently in overseas mission fields?

1.3 Number of Trainers
   How many missionary trainers does your institution have? 
   1.3.1 Full time: 
   1.3.2 Part time: 

1.4 Where do you train missionaries?
   Korea Mission field or Overseas Both
   Is your training program residential or non-residential?

1.5 What is the length of your training program?
   1.5.1 Pre-field: 
   1.5.2 On-field: 

1.6 What are the training goals of your institution?
2. Training Methods and Curriculum

2.1 What is the percentage of formal, informal, and non-formal training in your institution?

2.2 What classes does your institution provide for your trainees? (The written class materials or syllabus should be collected from the institution)
   2.2.1 Can you list class subjects and teaching hours?
   2.2.2 What are the learning and teaching methods in your training program?
   2.2.3 How do you approach the training task?

2.3 Regarding Trainers
   2.3.1 Does your institution have trainers from other cultures? If yes, tell me the number of non-Korean trainers and their nationality.
   2.3.2 How many of your trainers have cross-cultural missionary experience?
   2.3.3 In what professional areas are your trainers experienced?
   2.3.4 Do you have any program for training the trainers? If yes, please describe:

2.4 Language Acquisition
   2.4.1 What languages are taught in your institution?
   2.4.2 What is the level of trainees' language competence that your institution attempts to have trainees achieve?

2.5 Cross-Cultural Adjustment Skill
   2.5.1 What kind of cultural adjustment skills does your institution provide for the trainees in the training program?
   2.5.2 Does your institution provide the following areas of study for the trainees?
      — Korean Cultural Values and Worldview:
      — Missiological Anthropology:
      — Cross-Cultural Communication:
      — Culture Learning Activities:
         — Film/Video
         — Case Studies
         — Simulation
         — Role Play
      Field Trip:
         — Overseas
         — Domestic
2.5.3 In what ways do the trainees learn the target culture where they will serve?

2.5.4 If your institution provides an overseas field trip for the trainees, How long? What kind of activities? The purposes:

2.5.5 If your training institution has a residential training program, what kind of informal training methods do you use? Can you list some of these below?

2.5.6 If your training institution has an on-field training program, please describe the program.

2.5.7 Does your institution test trainees in the following areas? Tests: (Yes/No) When Number of tests

___ Physical Examination
___ Psychological Testing
___ Cross-Cultural Adaptability
___ Others (specify)

3. Training Outcome

3.1 What are the objectives or outcome goals of your institution? Are these evaluated and reviewed regularly?

3.2 What are the evidences of effective outcomes in your missionary training program?

3.3 On average how many missionary candidates drop out of the program during the period of training? What are the reasons?

3.4 How many career missionaries who were trained in your institution have left missionary work (number of drop-out career missionaries)?

3.4.1 What are the causes of their attrition?

3.4.2 Would you suggest three important ways of preventing missionary attrition?

3.5 How well does your institution evaluate your training program? What are the strengths and weaknesses or developing areas of your missionary training program?

3.6 Do you receive any feedback from the missionaries whom your institution trained? If yes, how do you use it for developing your training program?
4. Philosophy of Cross-Cultural Missionary Training

4.1 What is your ideal missionary training and mission philosophy?

4.2 Tell me your opinion about the ideal length of a missionary training program in the Korean context?

4.3 To what extent do Korean missionaries’ mono-cultural backgrounds affect their adjustment to another culture?

4.4 How do you weigh the importance of learning both Korean culture and other cultures in designing your training curriculum?

4.5 What is your understanding of incarnational ministry?
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Interview with Korean Missionaries

Date of Interview:
Place of Interview:
Interview Hour:

1. General Information of Interviewee:

Name:
Gender: Male Female
Age:
Marital Status: Married ___ Single ___
Denomination/Mission Agency:
Name of Missionary Training Center:
Date of Entry:
Position /Job Assignment:
Address:
Telephone Number:
Fax or E-mail:

2. Orientation
(If I have the interviewee’s response to the questionnaire, the following questions will be adapted to confirm the data that I received from the interviewee.)

2.1 How long have you served under the current sending agency?

2.2 How long did you receive missionary training before and after you were sent by your mission agency?

2.3 What was your occupation before becoming a missionary?

3. Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Ministry

3.1 Tell me about you and your family’s commitment and motivation to be missionaries.

3.2 How have you spent the first year of your life as a missionary in this country?
3-2-1 First three months
3-2-2 Four months to six months
3-2-3 Seven months to nine months
3-2-4 Ten months to first year
3-2-5 After first year to the present

3.3 What have you done to adjust to in the host culture?
3.3.1 Language Learning Methods and Length of Language Study
3.3.2 Studying History of Host Country
3.3.3 Familiarity with the Local Customs

3.4 Please describe your ministry since you entered this country.
3.4.1 Ministry goals:
3.4.2 Ministry roles:
3.4.3 Mission strategies:
3.4.4 The results:

3.5 Please tell me about your personal relationships with nationals.

3.6 Would you tell me about the difficulties you have experienced in your life and ministry?
3.6.1 Physical
3.6.2 Spiritual
3.6.3 Financial
3.6.4 Relational
   3.6.4.1 Family
   3.6.4.2 Other fellow missionaries
   3.6.4.3 Mission agency/denomination
   3.6.4.4 Supporters
   3.6.4.5 Nationals
3.6.5 Emotional/Psychological

3.7 Describe your own definition of cultural adjustment.

3.8 How do you evaluate your cultural adjustment?

4. Missionary Training

4.1 Would you tell me how effective the missionary training that you received has been to your cultural adjustment and cross-cultural ministry?

4.2 Please tell me, in your opinion, how the missionary training center should educate or help prepare missionary candidates.

4.3 How well did your missionary training center’s program meet your needs?

4.4 How was the ideal missionary described during your missionary training?
5. Mission Philosophy and Understanding of Culture

5.1 Would you tell me your thoughts and opinions about culture and implications for cross-cultural ministry? Please tell me your insights and understanding about the relationship between knowing your own culture and understanding and relating to other cultures.

5.2 Would you tell me your opinion about national leadership?

5.3 Would you tell me your opinion about nationals' interpretation of Scripture?

5.4 Do you think that the missionary needs to be under the national leadership?

5.5 Would you tell me about your own mission philosophy?

5.6 What is your standard of missionary evaluation?

5.7 What is the ideal missionary that you hope to be?
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Interview with Nationals (Local Ministers)

Date of Interview:
Place of Interview:
Interview Hour:

1. General Information of Interviewee

Name:
Age:
Gender: Male Female
Marital Status:
Position in Your Church:
Denomination:

2. Language

2.1 How many Korean missionaries have you worked with? How is the missionaries’ proficiency in the local language? (Low level: simple greetings, middle level: common conversation, high level: preaching and teaching)

2.2 Is the missionary’s language proficiency continuing to develop? Why or why not?

2.3 Do you speak the Korean language? If so, how well?

3. Family and Physical and Mental Health

3.1 Tell me as much as you know about the missionary’s physical health.

3.2 Tell me as much as you know about the missionary’s family situation.

3.3 Have you seen any symptoms of frustration, anger, conflict with others, etc. from the missionary since his/her arrival in your country? Please, describe them.

4. Understanding of the Host Culture

4.1 How well does the missionary understand your culture?

4.2 How important is the missionary’s cultural adjustment and understanding of your country for his or her ministry effectiveness?
5. Relationships with Nationals

5.1 What is your personal relationship with the missionaries?

5.2 In what ways do you respect and trust the missionaries?

5.3 How long have you worked with the missionary?

5.4 How long do nationals work with Korean missionaries on average?

5.5 Have you ever worked with non-Korean missionaries? If yes, how do you compare the Korean missionary to other missionary(s)?

5.6 Give your own opinion about the role of the missionary.

5.7 Please select four or five adjectives that would describe the missionary.

5.9 Which description of the two images best fits your image of the missionary?
   Teacher --------------- Learner
   Foreigner --------------- Friend
   Master --------------- Partner
   Guest --------------- Family
   Policeman --------------- Helper

6. Missionary Life

6.1 How do you regard the missionary's life style?

6.2 How does the missionary's level of living compare with the standard of your country? (lower, middle, higher level)

6.3 What is the reputation of the missionary in your society, especially among non-Christians?

7. Ministry

7.1 Who is the leader of this church? (Who owns this church?)

7.2 What is the name of this church?

7.3 Which denomination does this church belong to?

7.4 How much does the missionary pay per month to you and other national workers?
7.5 Has your church adopted a Korean style of worship service, music, prayer meetings, Bible studies, etc?

8. Exit Questions

8.1 If you want the Korean missionary to change any thing(s) for more effective ministry and deeper relationships with nationals, what would it/they be?

8.2 What have I failed to ask you about that would be important for me to know?
Appendix E

Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to help you assess your ability to adapt to living in another culture and to interact effectively with people of other cultures. Read each statement carefully and choose the response that best describes you right now. Indicate your response by circling the appropriate abbreviation to the right of the statement. For example, if you think a statement "tends to be true" about you, circle T T next to that statement.

Some items may sound very similar. Don't worry about being consistent in your answers. Just choose the answer that best describes you right now.

Use a ball point pen or a pencil to circle your answers (DT T T NT DNT). Press firmly when making your choice. If you decide to change an answer, draw an X through your original answer and then circle your new answer (DT T T NT DNT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have ways to deal with the stresses of new situations.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that I could live a fulfilling life in another culture.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I try to understand people's thoughts and feelings when I talk to them.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel confident in my ability to cope with life, no matter where I am.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe that I can accomplish what I set out to do, even in unfamiliar settings.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can laugh at myself when I make a cultural faux pas (mistake).</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like being with all kinds of people.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a realistic perception of how others see me.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When I am working with people of a different cultural background, it is important to me to receive their approval.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like a number of people who don't share my particular interests.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe that all people, of whatever race, are equally valuable.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I like to try new things.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If I had to adapt to a slower pace of life, I would become impatient.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If I had to hire several job candidates from a background different from my own, I feel confident that I could make a good judgment.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If my ideas conflicted with those of others who are different from me, I would follow my ideas rather than theirs.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I could live anywhere and enjoy life.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Impressing people different from me is more important than being myself with them.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I can perceive how people are feeling, even if they are different from me.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I make friends easily.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When I am around people who are different from me, I feel lonely.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I don't enjoy trying new foods.</td>
<td>DT T T T T NT DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I believe that all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel free to maintain my personal values, even among those who do not share them.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Even if I failed in a new living situation, I could still like myself.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am not good at understanding people when they are different from me.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I pay attention to how people’s cultural differences affect their perceptions of me.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I like new experiences.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I enjoy spending time alone, even in unfamiliar surroundings.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I rarely get discouraged, even when I work with people who are very different from me.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. People who know me would describe me as a person who is intolerant of others’ differences.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I consider the impact my actions have on others.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. It is difficult for me to approach unfamiliar situations with a positive attitude.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I prefer to decide from my own values, even when those around me have different values.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I can cope well with whatever difficult feelings I might experience in a new culture.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When I meet people who are different from me, I tend to feel judgmental about their differences.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret their behavior in the context of their culture.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I can function in situations where things are not clear.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. When I meet people who are different from me, I am interested in learning more about them.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My personal value system is based on my own beliefs, not on conformity to other people’s standards.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I trust my ability to communicate accurately in new situations.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I enjoy talking with people who think differently than I think.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. When I am in a new or strange environment, I keep an open mind.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I can accept my imperfections, regardless of how others view them.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I expect that others will respect me, regardless of their cultural background.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I can live with the stress of encountering new circumstances or people.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. When I meet people who are different from me, I expect to like them.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. In talking with people from other cultures, I pay attention to body language.</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

An Example of Graphical Explanation of t-Test and F-Test

| Score | N=11 | GMTI | | Score | N=19 | GMTC |
|-------|------|------| |-------|------|------|
| 170   | 187  | 204  | 221  | 238  | 255  |

Mean for GMTC = 218.05
Mean for GMTI = 201.27
t test value = 3.04
Critical t test value = 2.46
Because t test value > Critical t test value, therefore significant difference in mean

Variance for GMTC = 235.27
Variance for GMTI = 172.41
F test value = 1.36
Critical F test value = 2.41
Because F test value < Critical F test value, therefore no significant difference in distribution

It is important to understand that the difference in means can be understood to be real not only because the t test shows a significant difference but also because the distribution of GMTI and GMTC are essentially the same. If the distributions were significantly different the difference in means could not be as full a picture of the differences between the two groups of data.
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