

## **Missions are Local: Looking through the Reality-Defining Spectacles of Culture for Effective Cross-Cultural Gospel Communication**

**Hannah Scheyder**

### **Abstract**

Language is foundational to human cultured experience. If worldviews of varying cultures are seen as spectacles, central to comprehending the human experience, effective missional efforts depends on năng của một người to interact with another culture's linguistic framework by bằng đeo glasses that delineate their particular thế giới. If missions are to be effective vehicles of Gospel truths in foreign cultures, ilimin harshe yare should be acquired over a dogon lokaci. If missions must instead be short-term, one should first kula da yanayin yare da al'adun jama'an in front of them, nhìn vào bối cảnh trước mắt của họ, in which there is no cây cầu xuyên văn hóa rộng lớn to cross. This means that all believers have tangible access to help wajen yada bisharan Krista, as lifelong language learners in Lagos, or daily witnesses cho ân điển của Chúa at one's local Starbucks.\*

### **Introduction**

*“What was one meaningful relationship you made with a local while on the trip?”*

I paused to scan the places, the faces, the expanse of memory that accounted for the prior semester's study abroad experience, having seen fourteen countries over the course of five months. I flitted through images of the majestic Greek Parthenon, packed Mongolian marketplaces, and vast Costa Rican coastlines. I remembered the scents of streetside Vietnamese bún chả broth and the deafening sounds of summer cicadas in Tianjin. My stomach turned slightly when I failed to uncover a misplaced memory of a foreign-relationship-turned-lifelong-pen-pal. With two weeks or less spent in each nation, I guess it shouldn't have been a surprise to leave without a plethora of intimate



---

*Hannah Scheyder grew up in Connecticut as the youngest of five in a Lutheran pastor's family, and received a degree in International Studies with an emphasis in Missiology from Concordia University Irvine, California. Minorng in Global Cultural Studies and Anthropology, her familiarity with short-term mission work grew while traveling to 17 countries through several semesters spent abroad. She is moving to Rome, Italy this fall to live alongside and disciple American undergraduate students studying abroad.*

friends to call my own—given I’d likely never see the locals I interacted with again. But if my trip was meant to be mission work, where was the Gospel sharing? Where was the relational foundation that allowed for conversion to follow from a sense of trust built?

I had left California in August of 2019 with a 75L blue Jansport backpack overpacked with unsuitable clothes, survival essentials that would go untouched, and the mistaken conception that I would change the world. *Sure, yes, God has been at work in these communities already, but I was embarking on a selfless semester-long mission trip—surely I would bring others to faith through the brilliant sharing of my own ...*

But with whom would I share the Gospel? With the Maltese gelato maker I thanked once? With the Bengali woman screaming in pain in Mother Teresa’s Home for the Dying? With the Israeli woodshop owner whose nativity scenes were too expensive for me to purchase? In what language? My Hungarian vernacular consisted solely of an incomprehensible “hello” and “thank you,” and the Swahili I had learned on Duolingo the summer prior became moot when village Ugandans spoke only their local Lugandan. Even if I had had a lingua franca<sup>1</sup> with which to communicate, how on earth would I be able to communicate the Christian experience in a meaningful manner? The world I viewed as an outsider on the streets of Kolkata was entirely different from the world experienced by the emaciated man who lay forgotten on the sidewalk. As the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein notably suggests, “If a lion could speak, we could not understand him,”<sup>2</sup> espousing that a lion’s experience of reality was itself too disparate for us to comprehend. Even if I had a host of Nepali words of comfort to impart on the cohort of rescued sex-trafficked girls we met, the worlds which we inhabit are so different—my gentle American upbringing does not lend itself to commiseration. If I could not effectively communicate about the orange chicken I wanted for dinner in Beijing (a look of confusion crossing the waitress’s face as I pointed animatedly to an image of pork), then I could not communicate profound Gospel truths in a matter of thirteen days.

To travel is to recognize that the world we see is dependent on our cultured perspective. To stay is to learn to see the world through the eyes of another, and to communicate effectively between those worlds. We cannot evangelize without proper cross-cultural communication, and we cannot properly communicate cross-culturally without inhabiting the world of the “other.” Short-term mission trips do not provide enough time to learn to inhabit this new world. If one cannot travel to stay, they might take up one of Jesus’ lesser-known commissions—given to a man recently freed from a legion of demons and eager to travel the region alongside the Messiah Himself: “Go home to your friends and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you” (Mark 5:19).

## **The Spectacles of Culture**

In recent years, linguists and anthropologists have endeavored to illuminate the inseparability of language and our human, cultured experience. Entry into this scholarly community affords significant discourse on our culturally constructed view of reality—that those who live in different geographical settings, religious or ideological contexts,

or who are immersed in disparate cultural frameworks, all experience life and reality itself in fundamentally different ways. Key to this discussion, however, is just how integral language is in the creation of those various culturally constructed worldviews. Rather than language being a result of culture, or culture a byproduct of language, the two are dialectically intertwined, each fundamental to the creation of the other, resulting in a Mongolian nomad's perception of objective reality as profoundly different from that of the Ecuadorian fruit stand owner, or that of the teenage barista in Tampa Bay.

Different linguistic frames are subsequently responsible for delineating various worlds whose boundaries are based on the cultural categories that limit and enable the worldview of its members. If language is actually that which precedes perception, then central to any missionary enterprise that endeavors to share the Gospel in a meaningful and culturally relative way is the learning of the language native to the missional region, and the cultural conceptualizations that lie therein. Without this understanding for foreign evangelism, the term "missions" would be better applied to local sharing of the Gospel with others who inhabit the same cultural, conceptual, and linguistic frame. Local missions mitigate fundamental miscommunications of Gospel truths. Without having the time necessary to learn the worldview of the missional region, short-term missionaries abroad are unable to invest in effective long-term cross-communication and should see the merit and opportunity sharing the Gospel locally using the same, shared language of their friends and neighbors.

British theologian and missiologist Lesslie Newbigin, who spent nearly thirty years in India as a missionary, comments on the incontrovertible link between language and culture:

Fundamental to any culture is language which embodies the way in which a people grasps and copes with experience, sharing it with one another within the group. So long as one lives one's life within one culture, one is hardly aware of the way in which language provides the framework in which experience is placed, the spectacles through which one 'sees.' It is when one lives in a completely different culture and learns a new language that one discovers that there are other ways of grasping experience and coping with it. One discovers that things are seen differently through different spectacles.<sup>3</sup>

It is these cultural spectacles, or glasses, that illuminate what is true about the cosmos for any given people group across the globe. These glasses frame a culture's expected behavior, their underlying values, and their predetermined emotional responses to the daily stimuli of life. We do not often have cause to come into contact with differing frames, or worldviews, unless we travel to another land where another style frame is consistently used. (If we were only to interact with one foreigner, we might still blame their behavioral idiosyncrasies, bizarre dress, or peculiar processing speed on an unprovoked strangeness.) It is only when we find ourselves in a new land, that we see the cultural lenses that the locals wear are quite normal to them, and we are the ones whose frames stick out.

Missiologist Paul Hiebert in *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* reflects on this same concept: “Like colored glasses, culture affects how we perceive the world, without our being conscious of its influence. Only when the lenses become dirty, or we put on other glasses, are we aware of their power to shape the way we see the world.”<sup>4</sup> Being cognizant of the cultural lens through which one sees the world does not come naturally. Despite the fact that one’s own worldview is ingrained in one’s perception, recognizing it as something other than cosmic reality itself—that the way in which one comprehends reality is a learned aspect of enculturation—is a difficult and counterintuitive endeavor. Traveling and witnessing to people groups of different backgrounds gives monocultural people the opportunity to realize that there are alternative ways to experience and react to the world that aren’t inherently backward or underdeveloped. This powerful, world-shaping reality of cultural spectacles should be a central focus of missional endeavors if their aim is to share the Divine Gospel of Christ without ineffectual, extraneous cultural mispackaging.

I posit that the missionary sojourn has oftentimes consisted of a culturally insensitive insistence that locals of a disparate land, which we (as Westerners) are visiting and are subsequently foreign to, don our specific world-outlining spectacles—which exist to delineate, interpret, and understand an entirely different context. This is done with little thought as to the glasses those locals would be forced to remove and the potentially damaging side effects of doing so. Local missions, on the other hand, while undoubtedly still prone to human error as they are necessarily maintained by error-prone humans, are predisposed to more effective communication of the Gospel because spectacles can be shared with only minor adjustments, rather than the dramatic shift from cat eye frames to aviators.

However, to rule out foreign missional contexts in their entirety would be to negate the journeys of the early apostles, to render moot the incredible spreading of Christianity through their transformation and application of Jesus’ teaching into cultural contexts entirely outside of their own first-century Jewish upbringing. The Gospel of Christ, without a shadow of a doubt, is cross-cultural and universal. It does not stagnate in one particular historical context, nor within one particular culture, but has been seen, time and time again, to adapt to and reveal more of itself by being brought to light amidst other worldviews.

If missions are to be a global enterprise, they require a missionary’s utmost intentionality to humble oneself by becoming aware of one’s own cultural spectacles, to stretch oneself by spending intensive time and effort to learn how life is viewed through another culture’s pair of glasses, and to act as bridge by drawing meaningful biblical connections between these various perceptions of reality. Languages are the frames in which these lenses sit, and without understanding the chosen foreign context’s frames, the fullness of the Gospel won’t be conveyed, or communication will reside in an unstable realm in which misconceptions of life-saving truths are common. This kind of study is a long-term effort, and short-term mission trips, while viable for self-discovery or voluntourism, do not lend themselves to meaningful transmission of Gospel truths. Those who are unable to spend the years necessary for exchanging their world-viewing

glasses would see their missional efforts more effectively employed at a local level, wherein their cultural spectacles are shared with their neighbors.

## **Language's Effect on Perception**

To communicate something in another language is not always a simple matter of translation. There are many examples of concepts that remain unique to linguistic contexts, arising amidst a specific environment, time, and place. For example, the Australian people group of the Kuuk Thaayorre use compass directions instead of the “right” or “left” we more often employ in daily conversational English. A natural extension of this linguistic difference is that these people are far more capable of determining cardinal directions than the average English speaker.<sup>5</sup> Thousands of American English speakers struggle with the eating disorder “anorexia,” a term available to them linguistically,<sup>6</sup> while Inuit speakers with no word for “stutter” do not experience the phenomenon of stumbling over consonants while attempting to communicate.<sup>7</sup> People groups who live in the rainforest do not have a one-to-one translation for the English word “bush” because its ambiguity wouldn’t serve in a context where survival requires a specific knowledge of plant life.<sup>8</sup> Perceptions of colors,<sup>9</sup> emotions,<sup>10</sup> familial structures, gender roles,<sup>11</sup> and every other conceivable aspect of reality shift depending on the linguistic frame the user claims as his or her own.<sup>12</sup> The significance of language in human perception is foundational and key to any type of cross-cultural communication.

The Apostle Paul speaks to the foundational importance of language in the sphere of missional communication: “So with yourselves, if with your tongue you utter speech that is not intelligible, how will anyone know what is said? For you will be speaking into the air. There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning, but if I do not know the meaning of the language, I will be a foreigner to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner to me” (1 Cor 14:9–11). As one of the founding missionaries of the Christian Church, we should heed Paul’s advice. Christians cannot—and should not—endeavor to communicate foundational Gospel truths without a deep understanding of the linguistic frames of the foreign communities they are entering, as their efforts will be convoluted by their own nomic worldviews, and they will issue forth cosmic truths wrapped in a limited cultured packaging.

Chairman to AVM (Alliance for Vulnerable Mission) and missionary to Kenya, Jim Harries, explains that ignorance of cultural nuances not only handicaps communication efforts but may lead to damaging, if not irreparable, consequences. He emphasizes the need to translate the Gospel message into the vernacular setting of another linguistic community, not merely expect that they learn English in order to receive the life-saving Gospel of Christ—as Christian missions have largely functioned in the

**Christian mission  
must always seek to  
empower foreign  
communities with the  
divinely inspired  
Word that lies outside  
of any singular  
cultural frame.**

past.<sup>13</sup> Christian mission must always seek to empower foreign communities with the divinely inspired Word that lies outside of any singular cultural frame.

Past rejection of missional efforts was oftentimes a result of the foreignness of the cultural perspective in which it was packaged. If missionaries of today are to be effective communicators of a universal Gospel message, they must recognize the cultured glasses they bring with their communication of that message, and they must attempt to don the foreign culture's linguistic frames and cultural lenses so as to be better missional bridges of cosmic truth. American linguist and anthropologist Charles Kraft underscores the same idea in *Christianity in Culture*, suggesting that the very act of preaching this universal message must be reevaluated if those who receive it misunderstand.<sup>14</sup>

Miscommunication may be inescapable when engaging in a foreign context, even when the language is learned with relative fluency by long-term missionaries. It is only after years of language learning and deepening cultural understanding that long-term missionaries can more effectively avoid teaching Westernized aspects of Christianity that lead to fundamental misunderstandings about the person Jesus. Without a general fluency with the cultural context in which they engage, missionaries' own enculturated lenses will limit their ability to share Christian realities, and translators may not always be able to effectively act as bridges between the two disparate worlds.

### **Filling in the Narrative**

Christian mission has generally fallen into two camps: long-term missions, of which benefits abound if intentional linguistic and cultural study accompanies it, and short-term missions. However well-meaning, these brief missional exploits have been largely ethnocentric—a naïve attempt to let the living and active Word communicate lifesaving Gospel truths without taking the time to properly communicate them, all while satisfying a selfish desire for a fulfilling travel experience based in imagined altruism. To reiterate, the lenses or worldviews that each human culture group take for granted as cosmic reality make the perception of their daily lives entirely different from human beings with much of the same biological makeup who live thousands of miles away. These foundational perceptive and experiential differences take years of careful study to comprehend and simply won't be accounted for over the course of a short-term mission trip. If the role of a missionary is to illuminate a Christian perspective that calls into question a foreign culture's way of life, there will be little or no receptivity to suggested changes without building trust and seeking authentic relationship. Short-term missional efforts cannot provide Christians with the proper time to learn the language and cultural conceptualizations of the foreign worlds they visit, and they discourage the level of investment needed to form genuine, trusting relationships with members of local people groups.

During my short-term mission endeavors of the past, I had never considered that being part of a sizable foreign team of eager, young, but uninformed volunteers may also sap resources or be a detriment to the locals with whom we engaged. Books like *When Helping Hurts* by Steve Corbett and Brian Fikkert have brought issues like these

to light in recent years. Rather than glorifying the travel stories from invigorated volunteers who ultimately return to the safety and comfort of their homes, Corbett and Fikkert analyze the effectiveness of short-term missions through the perspectives of the locals. They write that in our verve to help those less fortunate, we tend to “reduce poor people to objects” that are then used to “fulfill [our] own need to accomplish something.” Our inability to recognize our equivalent brokenness and mutual need for the Savior who mends us all means that our short-term missional attempts tend to do more harm than good.<sup>15</sup>

While short-term missions of the past have rarely been the vehicle through which members of a foreign people group come to know Christ, they have, of course, been fruitful endeavors in many other ways. When the primary goal of a short mission trip is aiding a long-term missionary established in the community, short-term missionaries provide extra hands and renewed energy for the work of the Gospel to take place. If, however, the primary goal is to evangelize without a proper understanding of the world in which they are entering, and without the intention of removing their own cultured glasses and putting on those of another, then miscommunications of Gospel truths are inevitable. Most centrally, the message of Jesus’ profound and universal love and grace will not be communicated in a two-week stint through a few locally translated Western-style sermons.

Short-term missions may also be fruitful endeavors for the individuals who attend such trips, whether through self-discovery, the perspective-broadening experience of cross-cultural interaction, communicating international needs at the local level, or being called to a more long-term service in the mission field. If, however, one’s primary goal is to travel and sight-see, take a few self-aggrandizing pictures with doe-eyed babies, and revitalize their Instagram feed, I would suggest their church members’ money be better spent elsewhere. However well-intentioned these trips begin, American short-term missions are commonly rooted in ethnocentrism.

Kenyan author Binyavanga Wainaina’s essay entitled, “How to Write About Africa” parodies the incredibly ethnocentric lens through which we as Americans often view the African “country.” I reflected on his words as I traveled amidst the lush green Ugandan countryside, through villages of giggling children, past banana stands and shoeless feet: “African characters should be colourful, exotic, larger than life—but empty inside, with no dialogue, no conflicts or resolutions in their stories, no depth or quirks to confuse the cause.”<sup>16</sup> I found myself surrounded by a people group who were incredibly vivacious, vocal in church, eager to move and praise with their bodies, quick to smile and welcome; yet, like Wainaina suggests, my vague and general romanticism of the Ugandans with whom I interacted was inherently insufficient due to my brief stay. Rather than discovering the three-dimensionality of their personhood over the course of a longer trip, my short visit limited my ability to know the depth of each person’s character because of the language barrier and lack of time spent with each individual. As Corbett writes, “If we reduce human beings to being simply physical—as Western thought is prone to do—our poverty-alleviation efforts will tend to focus on material solutions. But if we



remember that humans are spiritual, social, psychological, and physical beings, our poverty-alleviation efforts will be more holistic in their design and execution.”<sup>17</sup>

After my trip to Uganda, I felt convicted by the fact that I had fallen into the same traps short-term missionaries had fallen into for centuries throughout Africa’s history: being inspired by sunsets that fill the sky, enjoying heart-warming dances with locals, holding orphan babies, rebuilding mud homes, and leaving in the same neat-and-tidy way we had arrived, perpetuating anecdotal stories of being forever changed by those who were barely, if at all, changed by us. I did not want the only lasting impact of our two-week stay to be the red dirt staining the white soles of my Reebok sneakers. But my desire to leave an impact on the people we met was simply the perpetuation of the ethnocentric view Wainaina mentions in his essay.

Nigerian novelist Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie speaks about the danger of a single story in her TED Talk about the problems inherent with the flat characterization of those who experience so much more than famine, AIDS, and political upheaval:

“The single story creates stereotypes. And the problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete. They make one story become the only story.”<sup>18</sup>

Long-term cross-cultural ministry does not teach us to disregard everything we have heard about a certain location; it simply fills in the narrative with real places, real stories, real people, real faces; it makes more complete that which was initially singular and partial.

Long-term cross-cultural ministry does not teach us to disregard everything we have heard about a certain location; it simply fills in the narrative with real places, real stories, real people, real faces; it makes more complete that which was initially singular and partial.

## **A New Emphasis: A Discussion and Conclusions**

Christian missions must begin with the primary goal of cultural engagement prior to any attempt at teaching a Westernized Gospel truth. And if missions are to involve intentional long-term study, short-term missional avenues that do not offer this opportunity should be limited to aiding missions that are already long established within a community. They should not create new, uncontextualized evangelism methods.

Might I suggest a new emphasis within mission work? What if the concept of “missions” was not relegated to pictures of foreign, brightly colored bazaars or rolling African plains? What if, when you think about Christian missions, you pictured aisle 17 at your local grocery store? What if we were all called to be missionaries within our own communities?

Since the iconic writings of the renowned eighteenth century missionary William Carey,<sup>19</sup> Christian missions have considered Matthew 28:19–20 as the Great Commission to go! Over there! Start making disciples already! This cultured compulsion for ministers to commit their lives to making converts from the “heathens” of underdeveloped



foreign lands may have fueled mission work in centuries past, but I argue that a better translation of the original Greek text would read, “As you go” or “as you are going, make students of Christ Jesus ...” This subtle distinction conveys a radically different picture of Christian missions. The missional mind of the Lord has been present since He first created Adam from the dust and desired an intimate relationship with him. Through the centripetal missional force of the Israelites’ revelation of Yahweh’s power and provision, people throughout all time and place have found their identity in the Lord.<sup>20</sup> Jesus’ sending out of the disciples before He was taken up into heaven was a continuation of God’s heart for mission from the beginning. Our call is the same: continued, not isolated; mundane, not sacred; every day, not for two weeks out of our high school summers.

In *Everybody Always*, Bob Goff reframes Jesus’ radical love in the context of our modern lives. He redefines mission work in a similar way:

We don’t need to go on “mission trips” any longer. Jesus’ friends never called them this. They knew love already had a name. I’ve known some remarkable and courageous missionaries. Perhaps you have too. But for many, when they think of missionaries, they think of Spaniards with chest armor, a galleon, and the flu—and then all the indigenous people die. Instead of saying you’re a missionary, why not just go somewhere to learn about your faith from the people you find there and be as helpful as you can be? The neat part is most of the people I know who go on “mission trips” are already doing exactly that. We don’t need to call everything we do “ministry” anymore either. Just call it Tuesday. That’s what people who are becoming love do.<sup>21</sup>

Missions are every day. We are all missionaries. If your daily circumstances do not lend themselves to ministering to people thousands of miles from home, try ministering to a neighbor or a friend. Through localized missions, the best degree of communication will take place through shared linguistic worldviews—shared cultural spectacles through which the innate stuff of life are a given, so that Christian truths are more easily transmitted. By redefining mission work in this way, it need not be feared or relegated to only certain individuals. This mindset allows the mission of Christ’s Church to be within every believer’s grasp. Whether down the street or in Timbuktu, we should all feel privileged to witness about the work of God in our lives. Those who feel called to the special vocation of long-term mission work should feel excited at the prospect of removing their own cultural glasses through which they interpret the world so that they may learn to comprehend reality through the lens of different culture.

Hiebert recognizes that “effective communication is central to our task [as missionaries]. There is little point in giving our lives or in going ten thousand miles if we cannot bridge the final five feet.”<sup>22</sup> Missions must prioritize language learning for the sake of conveying Gospel truths. Because only long-term missions offer the time to do so, locality within short-term missions should be encouraged. Short-term missions are a viable form of self-discovery and service-oriented voluntourism, but effective Gospel communication requires linguistic fluency. If one cannot learn to wear the

cultural spectacles of a foreign land, remaining within one's own linguistic frame should be an equally compelling alternative, as one can share Gospel truths with ease at the local level and avoid cross-cultural miscommunication. As believers, we should be excited at the prospect of conventionalizing Christian mission. If missions are local, they are accessible—an opportunity for us to share in the joy of professing our love for the Savior who first called us to be His own. Whether we are led to follow Christ's command to stay (Mark 5:19) or to go (Matt 28:19–20), let us delight in bringing others into the fold of His grace, regardless of the time or place.

\* Various portions of the abstract are intentionally translated into Hausa and Vietnamese so that communication and comprehension is necessarily limited by linguistic and cultural barriers.

### **Full Abstract**

Language is foundational to human cultured experience. If worldviews of varying cultures are seen as spectacles, central to comprehending the human experience, effective missional efforts rest on one's ability to interact with another culture's linguistic frame by putting on their specific world-delineating glasses. Short-term missions, unable to invest in long-term language learning, should not seek to invent new modes of evangelism without a proper knowledge of the cultural context in which they find themselves for this short period. If missions are to be effective vehicles of Gospel truths in foreign cultures, they must be linguistically focused and long-term. If missions must instead be short-term, one should first look to their immediate context wherein no vast cross-cultural bridges must be traversed. This means that all believers have tangible access to supporting Christian mission, as life-long language learners in Lagos, or daily witnesses to God's grace at one's local Starbucks.

### **ENDNOTES**

<sup>1</sup> A common or shared language.

<sup>2</sup> Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, ed. G. E. M. Anscombe and Rush Rhees, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963).

<sup>3</sup> Lesslie Newbigin, *The Other Side of 1984: Questions for the Churches* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1983), 5.

<sup>4</sup> Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2006), 31.

<sup>5</sup> Alice Gaby, "The Thaayorre Think of Time like They Talk of Space," *Frontiers in Psychology* 3 (August 2012). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00300>.

<sup>6</sup> Jack Martin, Kathleen L. Slaney, and Jeff Sugarman, *Wiley Handbook of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology: Methods, Approaches, and New Directions for Social Sciences* (West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2015).

- <sup>7</sup> Jack M. Schultz (PhD in Anthropology, professor at Concordia University Irvine), in discussion with the author, Spring 2020.
- <sup>8</sup> Schultz, discussion.
- <sup>9</sup> Debi Roberson, Jules Davidoff, Ian R.L. Davies, and Laura R. Shapiro, “Color Categories: Evidence for the Cultural Relativity Hypothesis,” *Cognitive Psychology* 50, no. 4 (June 2005): 378–411, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2004.10.001>.
- <sup>10</sup> Robert Alan LeVine, *Psychological Anthropology: A Reader on Self in Culture* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).
- <sup>11</sup> Schultz, discussion.
- <sup>12</sup> William A. Foley, *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1997).
- <sup>13</sup> Jim Harries, “Cultural Linguistics, Mission, and Theology for the Majority World,” *Australian Journal of Mission Studies* 12, no. 2 (December 2018).
- <sup>14</sup> Charles H. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979).
- <sup>15</sup> Steve Corbett and Brian Fikkert, *When Helping Hurts: How to Alleviate Poverty Without Hurting the Poor ... and Yourself* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2014), 62.
- <sup>16</sup> Wainaina, Binyavanga. “How to Write about Africa.” *Granta* 92 (May 2019): para. 10, <https://granta.com/how-to-write-about-africa/>.
- <sup>17</sup> Corbett and Fikkert, *When Helping Hurts*, 57.
- <sup>18</sup> Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, “The Danger of a Single Story,” filmed July 2009 in Oxford, United Kingdom. TED video, 18:33, [https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda\\_ngozi\\_adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story).
- <sup>19</sup> William Carey, *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians, to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens. In Which the Religious State of the Different Nations of the World, the Success of Former Undertakings, and the Practicability of Further Undertakings, Are Considered* (Leicester, 1792).
- <sup>20</sup> R. Reed Lessing, *Jonah: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2007).
- <sup>21</sup> Bob Goff. *Everybody Always: Becoming Love in a World Full of Setbacks and Difficult People* (Nashville, TN: Nelson Books, an imprint of Thomas Nelson, 2018), 72–73.
- <sup>22</sup> Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 168–169.