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1. Essay – Select one of three options

a. Write a paper highlighting a cross-cultural experience that involved a project or work-related activity to which you could have applied Community Development principles. Discuss principles you violated and principles you used. Give a synopsis of, now being aware of the principles, you could have proceeded for a positive outcome.
b. Develop a project plan related to your work that will focus on a cross-cultural strategy and enumerate practical applications of the Community Development principles.
c. Choose a factual event in a cross-cultural setting from books, media, or personal knowledge that was development-focused and critique it through the grid of the 10 principles.

2. Structure (Paper Evaluation includes the following structure below).

a. Download the “OGS APA Course Assignments Template 7th Ed 2021” template
from the General Helps folder in the AA-101 The Gathering Place Course on
DIAL. Using the template create the following pages.
b. Title Page (Not included in page count).
c. Copy and paste the assignment instructions from the syllabus starting on a new page after the title page, adhering to APA 7th edition style (APA 7 Workshop, Formatting, and Style Guide, APA 7 Quick Guide).
d. Start the introduction on a new page after the copied assignment instructions.

3. Be sure to meet the following expectations.

a. Begin with an introductory paragraph that has a succinct thesis statement.
b. Address the topic of the paper with critical thought.
c. End with a conclusion that reaffirms your thesis.
d. Document all sources in APA style, 7th edition (APA 7 Reference Example, APA 7 Quick Guide)
e. Include a separate Works Cited page, formatted according to APA style, 7th edition
f. Use a minimum of fifteen scholarly research sources. Three to four books and the remaining scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles, ideally from your developmental reading.

4. Submit the completed paper to DIAL.

The Dynamics of A Common Tongue

According to the Bible, man, having been created as the only God-like “animal species”, had disembarked from Noah’s Ark with a single language through which to communicate with one another in a manner that gives him the means by which to accomplish tasks well beyond the capacity of all other animals. What was especially important about his linguistic facility was that all the members of his species were able to exchange their ideas with one another, simply because they had only “one” language, unencumbered by the fact that its vocabulary was sparse and unsophisticated (Gen 11:1 *KJV*). In addition to this ability to communicate with his fellows, man also possessed an inordinately high level of creativity, reflective of one of the aspects of God’s nature in him. So, man departed from the mooring of the Ark as one people, with one language, on a journey toward a kind of group self-actualization—his quest to uncover his unique, post-flood-identity as that single race of animals known as humans. To that end, His first task was to find a place which would provide an ample supply of what he needed for individual and group survival—the most basic level of his “hierarchical needs” (Taormina and Gao, 2010; Kenrick et al, 2010). That man and his entire family decided to settle in Shinar (Gen 11:2), suggests that he, had collectively, made that choice based on the availability of the basic “necessaries of life” (food, water, etc.) as well as the abundance of natural resources from which he would be able to extract raw material to build a habitable place to live. Man decided to build a city, but that was only the germ of his idea. The fullness of it included an incredibly high tower, stretching far up into the sky (Gen 11:4 *KJV*). Such a massive undertaking was obviously going to be an extremely challenging task, which, on the surface, one would think, was driven by a deep-seated urge in him to build a permanent nest, while yielding to his creative instinct. The principles of modern economics that would have insisted that there be reasonably easy access to a proportionate distribution of the three factors of production, in their entirety—land, labor, and capital—would not even have been up for consideration, since man’s tiny vocabulary did not, as yet, entertain the concept of “scarcity,” or “supply,” and “demand” (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 2003). But did man already possess what it would take, then, to execute such a mammoth task? Ostensibly, most of man’s time and energy was concentrated in the Tower-project with a singularity of purpose. They had the collective strength of numbers, and, most importantly, they had a common language (Gen 11:1 *KJV*). With a common language, in tow, what would man not be able to do (Gen 11: 6)!? (THESIS]

The Book of Genesis suggests that behind man’s decision to build the Tower was a motive of evil. It goes on to say that man’s plan to build the Tower in Shinar was an attempt to thumb his nose at God. To me, the suggestion that man’s decision to build the Tower had been sparked by anything other than the desire to create a settlement that would stand out as an architectural wonder over time, seemed absurd. But, while I believe that such reasoning for man’s decision to build the Tower may have been as much a mythological mis-characterization of that historical event, as it was equally mythological that God threw something of a hissy fit over what he saw as man’s uppity behavior. Whatever the reason for man’s decision to build the Tower of Babel, God seemed to have decided to tear it down, and to scatter them around the world in smaller community clusters (Gen 11:4 *KJV*) for some other more important reason. I am convinced that since language is the most powerful single instrument for any creative act, or the most single catalytic force of change, God had certainly made a conscious decision to halt the project, or slow man down by transforming man’s single common language into multiple languages, for whatever reason.

Imagine a carpenter asking his assistant for a hammer but is handed a chisel, instead. And when that was not the case, the sounds of their common familiar language just collapsed into wild, boisterous outbursts of unintelligible confused noises (Gen 11:7 *KJV*). Even if the Tower, itself, was nothing more than a metaphor, no longer would each man be able to play his part in the optimization of the creative project through the “division of labor,” for the common good, as man strove toward that single goal of building the city and its great Tower at Shinar.

What was certain about the whole thing was that if man was still going to be searching for himself, in the process of building some kind of habitable place to live, he would now have to try to do it with an immensely diminished labor force, at some other sites, broken up into smaller groups that shared common tongues. In this way, what had begun as, and still is, a single species of the highly conscious, wise animal—*homo sapiens* (Lieberman et al., 2022, pp. 1134-1139)—who exhibited, roughly, the same set of instinctual drives, habits and of mores, would soon develop superficial interests under smaller splintered group-labels such as tribes, nations and races; differences that would soon became the source of millions of diverse cultures spawned from group to group, and place to place, that is even now being newly cultivated into separate cultural groups of a dislocated species of mankind (Gen 10:5 *KJV*). Such may have been the source of so many different human cultures that have been emerging among this God-like animal who just so happened to have lost that common tongue (Hudson, 1996).

In this article, Prof. Nicholas Hudson, a late twentieth-century “definitive scholar” of Samuel Johnson and the eighteenth century, suggests that no more expansive denotation of “race” outside of that which spoke of the single-animal species in question was entered in any lexicological form until that which appeared in the first edition of *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française*, in 1694.1 There, the definition for the word “race,” given in French, suggested that the lexicographers saw it, essentially, as that which identifies the ancestral linage of a person or group of people who carried a similar set of familial traits because of where they come from. He informs us that the *Encylopédie* (Volume 13),published in1765, simply borrowed the identical definition from *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française ’s* earlier volume in without any alterations or additions. After his own translation, Hudson, indicates that the 1835, entry of the word which appears in the sixth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française*, was revised to carry a definition of “race” that more closely resembles that of our own contemporary denotation, today. In other words, Hudson suggests that the *Dictionnaire* seventeenth century definition of race comes closer to his connotation of “race”, as “. . . .a subdivision of human species, identified by a shared appearance and other inherited traits” (Hudson, 1996). What I see, more specifically in the original French is that the Idea of “race” is framed in the same way as it is in Genesis: “***Une multitude d’ hommes qui sont originaires du meme pays, et se ressemblent par les traits du visage, par la conformation extérieure***.” In that piece of French, “race” is a group of humans who have originated from the same geographical location, and who bears roughly the same phenotypic characteristics in their facial appearance and their physique. That is, at once, a definition of the original man departing from Shinar after the debacle with the tower, and that of man after he had adjusted physically and otherwise to the various geographical situations in which he finds himself—among others with a common tongue. Thus, he begins to see himself as a tribe or “race” distinct from other races. But truly, when thrown into a melting pot with other races, man’s DNA proves that he only belongs to “one race”, the single race of humans. So, it becomes quite absurd to suggest that if the progeny of a man, who migrated to the sunbelt region of America, four hundred years ago, were to pass on certain genes that may have been altered through “population genetics” (Okazaki et al, 2021), were born and reared in a much more moderate climate today, turn out to be of a darker hue than their neighbors, that would make them “a sub-division of the human species” (Hudson, 1998). The progeny would probably “suffer” a similar linguistic departure from the man’s tongue in accents or more as the people of Shinar, as well.

One can imagine that in such a chaotic atmosphere as that which occurred at Shinar, where a complete communication breakdown has resulted wholesale departure from such a major to build a tower to heaven, most of the groups would have to have found themselves in places which had a plenitude of certain types of new sounds in nature, along with the availability of natural resources, as well as climatic and other external imposing conditions that make them appear to change outwardly, but they would really still be only one “race”—man without that universal common tongue. That was how it probably would have been in each locality that became home to various groups of the animal man. Such conditions would definitely have had some influence on language development, and the new look, and patterns of behavior within each group as the group emulated environmental background noises—like the squawking sound of hawks, the howling sounds of baboons, or the sound of cascading waterfalls. So naturally, look, the attitudes, behaviors and beliefs that man would develop in one place, as against another, would, at least, to a great measure, be their response to the external stimuli in that particular place where the group has chosen to settle.

Environmental sounds and other natural conditions are probably the best ways of explaining why it is so nearly impossible for people from one part of the world to duplicate the phonemic nuances of languages spoken by people from another part of the world. For instance, there is such a vast difference between the heavy guttural, or raspy, roof-of-the mouth sounds of Middle-Eastern languages and English.

The people who fled Shinar did so while becoming members of new smaller social units which banded together on the basis of the fact that the members of each group had a language in common and a new burgeoning culture. In the end, it was mainly the common language that people shared which cemented their membership in a particular group within an organized tribe or nation, and to a lesser extent, by blood. Most groups perhaps would certainly have undergone some spiritual shifts in their belief systems that might no longer have allowed them to entertain a clear “picture” of the God they had known prior to the linguistic debacle. And now, because of geography and other environmental factors, some may even have gradually come to a different understanding of God and what He expected of them. Others may have lost touch with God, altogether, or may even have developed an appetite for worshiping gods of their own, or their neighbor’s making. Therefore, in time, God would see the necessity to carve out a path for man’s redemption; a path by which He would allow Himself to be incarnated. And, in that form, He had discipled a coterie of trainees whom He would place on the frontline against the forces of evil and deception in the world. It is through these concentric waves of trained missionaries, rippling out from the Center with the ring of twelve immediately around Him, into the ever-widening waves of those commissioned thence with the task of disseminating the message of salvation. So, Jesus had laid out a business-plan, from the onset that was designed to operate from a schema, fashioned after the rippling pattern of well trained deployed troops, fanning outward exponentially, from the earliest Christian missions into a groundswell of the present contemporary workers who have reached the farthest corners of the globe, evidenced by visible marks—of new Christianized communities—made by the footprints of God’s missionary foot soldiers, armed with His Word and a malleable tongue. One object is to always try to find that linguistic string that threads God’s message through the needle’s eye as it pierces the opposing principles resident in the targeted culture and its language, though not always completely opposite to the culture and the local language of those being ministered to—not always those who share a common tongue, but still cannot get it. For, the most difficult question that persists for the missionary still, is how do we deliver God’s message across, what has become, an extremely vast human diaspora of cross-cultural riptides and cross-currents, and hence, over the enormous gaps of cultural and linguistic differences?

Initially, man could not even conceive of a reason that would cause him to be broken up into tribal, racial, or national groups. But once he lost the common tongue of the post-Noah human family, as a whole, it was inevitable that he would become dismembered from himself (humankind), and from God. However, archeologists, linguists and other experts may explain what happened on the site of the Tower of Babel, at Shinar, the collapse of man’s broader common language, had to have been the central reason why each man had to pick a side, and go with it (Gen 11:8 *KJV*).

The story about Language is always going to be at the forefront of why man suddenly halted the execution of one of his major pivotal creative projects and took off running in different directions. It must have been a situation similar to the one in which a whole chunk of humanity, working and living together, in near perfect harmony, suddenly turned into nonsense-talk. Man had suddenly stopped doing what he was doing as if he had an attack of dementia. Imagine an individual attempting to communicate with others through the language they share when the language suddenly explodes into insane, verbal noises Gen 11: 9 *KJV*).

The Bible says that God did not like what seemed to have been man’s encroachment in his effort to build a skyscraper into the heavens, so He decided it was high time He brought the tower down. It suggests that God made the decision that the way to do it was to rip down man’s powerline of communication—his “broader” common language—but with it, man further lost some connection with God, to boot. The flood was supposed to be man’s re-do, but the Moses’ version of the Tower-story suggests that man had gotten worst, and God went back to implement His plan A (Gen 3: 15 *KJV*). This time God was not going to change man from a distance, but He was going to change Himself in the process so that He could rub shoulders with men.

To that end, the Messianic Christ, the Son of God, had to be born as the Son of Man so that He could be on earth in fleshly state. In this state, He would be able to feel hunger, as well as the pangs of pain, the various passions and sufferings that could only be felt in the flesh. And so, from the human vantage point, God would be undertaking the spiritual task of, first, gathering together a dozen men (disciples) from diverse cultural backgrounds and bring them together for retraining into the fresh new understanding of His message.

The new message, or Gospel, was about how God’s love would be the predicate that would make Him subject Himself to the pain of death for man’s salvation. “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends” (John 12:13 *KJV*). In demonstration of it, He did not only teach His disciples that “love”, the brand-new path to God’s Grace, rather than strict obedience to rules (the “law”), was being modeled by Him, first.

So, as we follow His ministry, we see Him keeping his part of the bargain, leading the way through a ministry that would inevitably culminate in his crucifixion, on the first tier. And so, upon His parting, Jesus had left behind a completely new sub-culture of self-sacrificial “mendicants” with the single-mindedness of spreading the message of love of God and of fellowman to the still-babbling crowd on their way out of Shinar. The question, even today, is how does a person whose only language is English deliver that message to someone whose sub-culture is steeped in an unintelligible English dialect or, in the extreme, one who does not share a common language with the one who is trying to deliver the message?

Well, on the second tier, Jesus had kept his promise to send a comforter—the Holy Spirit. And that was precisely the wind that blew open the doors of the Upper Room on the day of Pentecost (Acts 3: 2 *KJV*). Until that day, none of Jesus’ disciples had experienced the

Holy Spirit ’s expression of Himself within their persons, and with such overwhelming force of a windstorm on arrival as that which had been foretold in Scripture (Job 40:6). But what occurred in the Upper Room that day was not merely for show, nor a way of providing comfort to the disciples. It was more about how God had chosen to use the Holy Ghost-aspect of his personage to put words into the mouths of the disciples of Jesus. So, God’s idea was for the Holy Spirit to come upon them and give them the gift of tongues, among other gifts while they were in the Spirit. Once they were in the Spirit, their thoughts would become spoken words, out of their mouths, to the peoples of other cultures and other tongues who were present (Acts 3:4). The moment they opened their mouths, on that special the day, the people in attendance from diverse cultures were astounded that the disciples were speaking their languages with the fluency of native speakers (Acts 3:5 *KJV*).

This Upper Room event was meant to exemplify the power of what I call, “spiritual linguistic adjustment”. Imagine how invaluable the gift of *glossolalia* (Stitzinger, 2003; Isbell, 1975) would be to those who accepted the commission to deliver the message of Christ across cultures. The gift of the Holy Spirit that is referred to as “speaking in tongues,” is given specially to members of the congregation who have an anointing for the purpose of communicating across cultures as well as those of a somewhat different worldview within the Christian culture (I Corinthians 2:13, *KJV*).

When Isiah wrote about being in the spirit, he gave several reasons why the Spirit had fallen upon him. He said that the Spirit was upon him because there were several things God wanted him to do which included healing the sick, opening the eyes of the blind, prophesying about the coming of the Messiah, and so forth. These are among those spoken of as areas of Christian ministry by Paul in his message to the church at Corinth (I Corinthian 12 -14 *KJV*). Paul tells us that when we are able to understand that the church is one body, and that the several gifts of the Holy Spirit, given to members in the congregation, should be handled as one multi-pronged instrument for the singular purpose of performing God’s service in unison and interdependence as one whole body (I Corinthians 12:12-31 *KJV*).

So, although Isaiah claimed that one of the gifts of the Spirit was given to him so that he would be able to take God’s message (missionary work), to the indigent, the other gifts that he claimed to have been given by the Holy Spirit, including healing and prophecy, may have been meant to be complementary gifts for his missionary work. Who knows? Whatever the case, while in the Spirit, Isaiah finds himself with a gift that would help him to verbally pass God’s message to that particular audience [principle # 1] maybe underserved, segment of society at their level, and in a language that they are able to understand. Whether he spoke in tongues to the poor does not matter. What mattered was that by being in the Spirit he was able to tap into the language he needed for his missionary work. That is *Charisma*! (Rev. Fr. Prof. Nwaigbo, 2019).

The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because

He hath anointed Me

 To preach [speak God’s message] the Gospel to the poor

. . . .To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord (Isaiah 61 *KJV*).

In Luke’s account of what happened to Jesus at the inception of His ministry, was that once He was baptized by John, the Holy Spirit took on the material form of a dove and landed on His head while a voice from the sky said, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, hear Him!”(Mark 1:10 *KJV*). Immediately thereafter He was filled with the spirit and went on to reject Satan’s temptations. For all practical purposes, that moment had initialized the start of His ministry (Luke 3:21-22 *KJV*).

One might think that Jesus went into the Spirit, in similar fashion as his disciples did on the Day of Pentecost. But that would not be the case, since, unlike the rest of us, possession of the Holy Spirit, was literally in His DNA. Jesus was born of the Holy Spirit (Matt.1:18 *KJV*). This means that Jesus would not have needed any gifts of the Spirit the way Isaiah, the disciples, or even John (on the Isle of Patmos) would have needed them in order to be able to perform God’s work on the fly, as the situation may have warranted. Does this mean that, believers, like the disciples (later apostles), would not always have the Spirit at their beck and call? If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, why would Christian missionaries need to be trained in how to bridge the language gap [principle # 1] when they are taking God’s message to people of cultures very different from their own?

What one should take away from this, is that, while being in the Spirit, those of us who are on track to do missionary work, and also possess the gift of *glossolalia*, should be able to do what the disciples did In the Upper Room on the Day of Pentecost. They should be able to speak in foreign languages that were completely unknown to them. For clearly, missionaries, like the disciples in the Upper Room, would definitely not seem able to retain any of the lingering effects of the spiritual influence of the Holy Spirit on a permanent basis, as Jesus did. But since that surmise is exactly consistent with the Holy Scriptures, it is reasonable to conclude that man’s access to the Holy Spirit may be a bit unsteady.

And the Lord said, “My Spirit [the Holy Ghost] shall not always strive with man, for that [even though he has a soul which makes him a spiritual being like Me] he also is flesh” (Gen 6:3 *KJV*).

It begs the question, then, what does a would-be missionary do if he has no known spiritual gifts but the cultural climate of the population in which he would have to serve has a host of cultural issues that conflict radically with his own cultural perspective, his message and a huge language gap? As we have seen, there is no guarantee that a believer might, on any given day, suddenly become filled with the Holy Spirit. And, if we agree with the argument that language is the basis of all processes out of which things are produced, created, or transformed, language would then remain the most vital piece in any program that deals with the training or preparation of believers for missionary work. For one thing, if we were to examine just a tiny, weeny bit of the linguistic phenomena of the general bio-chemistry which underlies what goes on inside the zillions of life forms around us on earth, we should find ourselves being awakened to a vague sense that there are, going on everywhere, constant conversations in the light as well as in the dark, in order for there to be any creation, rebuilding, or transformation of people or things.

Genes, carrying the DNA which are a syntactical arrangement of four proteins (just like words in the human languages), adenine (A), Thymine (T), Guanine (G), and Cytosine (C). The collection of these proteins, together called Nucleotides is synthesized into a specific order to form DNA strands or statements. A strand may be, “ATTGTAGCTGA. . . C,” which could mean, let us say, blonde hair. The RNA is the ordered arrangement of A, T, G, and Uracil (U). This is technically, the genetic pen and paper, which is ordinarily, the coded form (written description) of the DNA as a message in a one-to-one correspondence

(Okazaki et al, 2021).

In this “relation”, let us say that the T and A in the DNA strand erroneously switch places (frame switch error) while they are being encoded in the mRNA strand. Once the messenger RNA (mRNA) describes what the DNA statement is, the transcript (tRNA) transcribes the coded form back into the original DNA statement. If, however, a mistake such as “TAACTACUACT. . . U” is made during the coding by the mRNA, the final transcribed form, the errant message, would be ATTGATGCTGA. . . C. If we match up the original DNA strand with its remake by the tRNA, the error is obvious.

For, while the fifth and sixth proteins T and A, in the original DNA, were properly coded as A for T and T for A, in the mRNA, they erred by switching places. And, by so doing, the T and A remained in the same position in the mRNA as they were in the DNA which is indicative of the “frame switch”. So, the new copy of the original DNA shows error in the shifting of the fifth and sixth nucleotides ((Zhan, Liqin et al., 2015). This means that the blonde hair could become brunette.

Among humans who speak and write the same language, within the same culture, there are similar mis-readings and frame shifts that come under all kinds of heading. Similarly, throughout the universe, there are constant linguistic exchanges going on between two or more forces of transmission and reception, and hence, constant conversations—the universe is chatting.

In doing the course readings, I noticed that the segment on “Communication Dynamics” indicated that communication is a two-way-street. I am able to see how that is true in genetic communication, but I find it not to be universally true. In genetics, the statement made by the DNA is picked up by the mRNA and transcribed through the tRNA back to the original DNA form. But out of my tendency to bring a measure of healthy skepticism to new ideas, I found myself reflecting on the day I arrived at Berry College and saw written in bold Roman letters, the statement, “To Administer Not to be Administered To.” It took me a while to realize that it was saying, simply, “We are not interested in your opinion!” Perhaps it might seem to be a bit out of step with contemporary thinking, but there is also a place for one way communication.

Recently, I called my brother who is a retired electronic engineer. I wanted to find out how audio or video signals are transmitted and, eventually received by the speaker or the screen. He explained that the signal or wave is picked up by a frequency-driven transmitter and placed on the carrier or modulator which transports it to the speaker or the screen, depending on whether the signal is audio or video. The modulator functions like a bus and the signal takes the appropriate seat on the bus, based on how well suited the seat is to the particular signal or wave. In the process of transmission, the de-modulator or director recognizes whether the signal is AM (amplitude modulation) or FM (frequency modulation) and buckles it in for the ride, at a rate of speed within the range, 550–1600 KHZ. If the belt is a bit slack, it will bounce out of that range of amplification to create distortion (static). It could bounce to such extremes that the sound or resolution could be completely unintelligible.

Likewise, with FM, the carrier signal must be carried at a rate within the range of 88 to 108 MHZ. Within that range of speed, one unit of the signal must occur in a 60o cycle frequncy. If all the conditions are met, there will be no distortion when the signal arrives. This would mean that the language or the transmission of the signal had perfect commonality between the transmitter and the receiver—the speaker or the screen. In this explanation, I was able to see that, although the “Communication Dynamics” model [in LDR 810-42 Resources, Lesson 4, p. 29] is almost identical to the way the radio signal travels from transmitter in this conversation where the message is an electrical signal, the communication is only one-way. One thing that is universally true about “communication dynamics” is that, in any form of communication, there is ample amount of incidences where the signal jumps off track, where there may be some misunderstanding, or where there is static.

What this means is that the intended signal or message is not always received properly due to distortion. The issue is what do we do when the amplitude or frequency is out of whack and the detector or de-modulator does not automatically identify the slippage and bring it back on tract? We intervene; we apply “cultural intelligence” while manipulating the language the way teachers or missionaries do to enhance appreciation enroute to transformation. We do “linguistic adjustment”.

Since even in the language of life there are “misreadings”, “frame shifts,” and so forth, how much more of a chance for there to be errors in the message the Christian missionary is attempting to transmit across culture or sub-culture. William Wordsworth wrote in the *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads* that “Language is, at best, an inadequate means of communication”. With that in mind, a strong case can be made for training in the use of such tools as “cultural intelligence” when one is involved in missionary work, regardless of spiritual gifts. The Apostle Paul, himself talks about the advantage he derives from his training and experience.

Althia Ellis tells us that an amply fitted-out toolbox of Cultural Intelligence, together with a wide “global perspective”, has become invaluable to those of us who have taken on leadership roles in the culturally diverse workplace today (Ellis p.1). To be specific, the very important reason why cultural intelligence has become such an invaluable piece in the quora of tools for managing the growing cultural diversity around us, is that a very large slice of the workforce, today, is comprised of multilingual workers, and workers who have very vastly differing religious beliefs.

In the United States public schools, today, it has become an act of vital necessity to inject heavy doses of cultural intelligence into leadership mostly because of the rapidly growing immigrant student population. Based on that fact, leadership is beginning to realize that there is a real need for it to design professional development training sessions to address aspects of cultural intelligence which recognize that there is a need for the race and ethnicity of students to be reflected in the race and ethnicity of faculty. Based on P.C. Earley’s and S. Ang (2003) theory involving the nature and uses of cultural intelligence [principles #2 & # 6], the term has become generally understood to mean “. . . .the mindset, behavior, and motivation best suited in interacting effectively with individuals from dissimilar cultures” (Ang et al., 2015, p.1).

In this sense, it seems that cultural intelligence could even be applicable to the mental positioning one brings into one’s conjugal relationship with another, since each family is truly a subculture within the larger culture. By the same token, Princess Diana, the daughter of Viscount Althorp who had descended directly from King Charles, II (Wikipedia) got married to Prince Charles Mountbatten-Windsor (Seri), a direct descendant of the sister of King Charles, II (Wikipedia). Yet, they were culturally at loggerheads with one another and remained “incompatible” to the end. Stories about their conflicts and differences suggest that neither side demonstrated any commendable facility with cultural intelligence.

According to Ellis, the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CIS) has four dimensions. They range from (1) Motivational (2) Cognitive (3) Metacognitive, and (3) Behavioral. Some experts (Kouzes & Posner, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Bucher 2008) and are referred to as the “leadership Practice Inventory”. The pre-supposition, then, is that these inventories are at play whenever a person is able to help someone else jump over difficult hurdles to achieve their goal. Those who are able to reroute others to success are leaders because they manage to do so by (1) Modeling the Way (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision (3) Challenging the Process (4) Enabling others to Act, and (5) Encouraging the Heart. Truly, leadership is strictly about practice (Ellis, 2017, p.2).

Cultural intelligence is the set of tools that leaders utilize to motivate, to manage cognitive ability, to stimulate higher order thinking, and to modify behavior with the object of improving the condition of an individual or by “building a working relationship” [principle#2] with the individual (Bucher 2008, pp. 3- 6). A metaphorical way of representing cultural intelligence is by presenting it as the building of a bridge of interpersonal relationship with others of diverse backgrounds with a pragmatic design in mind. For instance, a history teacher is assigned to teach a NY Regents history class of thirty students from diverse nationalities, ethnicities, races, and with a number of different native tongues. If he or she succeeds at getting a 75% passing rate, he or she would have to have used cultural intelligence in a pragmatic way somewhere along the line (Kadam et al, 2021).

As a teacher, there were numerous situations when my colleagues and I employed applicable culturally intelligence and community building principles within our school, even though none of us had heard of either the term “cultural intelligence” or “community building”.

My friend-colleague (Sackey) and I always had lunch together. During those times, we treated lunch-break as a typical half-time surcease for recharging our batteries for the latter part of the school day. But, in truth, our thoughts and discourse never took pause from the issues concerning the school and the children.

One day, at lunch, Sackey informed me that there was a serious mis-programming of four bilingual students. Sackey told me that one girl, Pat Hernandez, was found by one of our female colleagues (Miss. G) in a “non-emergent bilingual” ninth grade Algebra class during an impromptu visit to the class. The class was on the two-year Regents track for slower students. Our colleague saw the girl (Pat) at the chalkboard doing a difficult problem; her algorithmic manipulation of the laws and properties were crisp and solid. But when she was asked by the teacher to explain it, she fumbled with the words and eventually gave up. She did not have the linguistic facility explain it, and she was not comfortable in the setting, or with the language, not with English words, anyway. Sometime before lunch, Miss. G spoke to Sackey about how brilliant the girl was but that she clearly had a language problem.

I would think, she also had a cultural-adjustment problem. In this case, the girl was the community we were trying to transform. Our job was to find a way to make the culturally intelligent adjustments to apply #1, #2 and #5 of the community building principles.

Sackey later told me that he had found the girl at lunch, sitting by herself, not eating. He told her that he wanted to put her in Mr. Thompson’s class during her lunch break so that she could be taught Algebra I in a manner consistent with the accelerated syllabus of the one-year track. She was excited.

At lunch, that day, Sackey told me what he had done, and that he wanted me to prepare Pat-H for the January seating of the Algebra Regents examination. In the meantime, he had put three other children from his only two-year (slow track) Algebra I class, into my one-year (fast track) Algebra I afternoon class. He wanted me to do the same thing for them that I was doing for Pat-H in her lunch hour. We notified all four moms about what we were doing to help their children accelerate. Sackey and I each kept a copy of the signed “parent consent” letter. That was protocol. Because our assistant principal would normally allow us to take that kind of liberty, as long as it was in the best interest of the children, we did not see the necessity to notifying “guidance” or our new principal.

 The only real problem was that I was actually teaching Pa-H a two-year Algebra Regents class during her lunch hour—not kosher. And by the way, she never missed a class. I had assigned her to a seat by my desk where I could teach her between the instruction I was giving to my regular class. Cognitively, Pat was definitely on the right side of the normal distribution curve and that took away the challenge of teaching her in the manner I did. In the case of the other three children, it was more of a challenge, but I was still able to covered the one-year curriculum from October to mid-January. When they took the exam in January, they all passed with a 65% or higher. Pat-H had blown the exam away with a 95%, the highest score on the mid-year, NYS Algebra I Regents that year.

Sure, it was not the typical “community development” (CD) situation, so a number of the ten principles did not fit as snugly as one would wish. But community development principle number seven is a big deal in education. It one of the principles we use routinely as a way to make the students get better at the skills and knowledge they have mastered, while using it as a tool by which to develop socialization skill (Kietzman, 1977, p. 44). The practice is to have the more capable students go around and assist weaker students in the class. Pat-H turned out to be tremendously helpful in that respect [principle # 7].

Technically, although the faculty in any New York City public school is licenced to operate in *loco parentis,* in respect to students’ instruction, we are expected to deal with safety and general well-being at something of a microscopic level. Meanwhile, the principal has the sole responsibility of executing the office of *parens patriae* over all members in the school community—at a macroscopic level.

In the end, we could say that, in our independent act to bring about positive transformation in the lives of four children, we had met the conditions of numbers one, two, three, five and seven of the principles of community building. We had done what we did for the children and their future. And on the way, we had secured a signed parent consent letter for each child, notified our immediate supervisor and the guidance counsellor of each child, although we did so *post facto*, as we have always done [principle # 8]. While at the same time, we had, in effect, violated the nineth principle of community building by not getting the principal involved.

The day after the examination results were posted, the principal was furious. She summoned Sackey and me to her office and scolded us for over-stepping. I imagine the situation would have been much the same if this were a whole larger community we had decided to build without involving the top leadership—the government.

Six years later, the little language-deficient ninth grader from the Dominican Republic, Pat Hernandez, came back to visit us and to let us know that she had not only graduated from college, but she had taken and passed the New York State Actuarial Boards. From there, Miss. G, Sackeyfio and I looked back at how what we did for her in mathematics was transformative. We were teachers and we did our job.

In school districts around America, one of the common methods being used to bring our extremely culturally diverse population up to speed with tidal waves of incoming messages, is bilingual education. Bilingual education experts have drawn comparison between two of the popular approaches to bilingual education, today.

Dr. Lizdalia Pinon speaks specifically to the nature and efficacy of the “emergent bilingual” and the “non-emergent bilingual” approaches. Both are used for students whose native tongue is not English. The first is done in a learning environment where bilingual students (K-12) are taught all their subjects in both English and their native tongue (Pinon). In the case of the “non-emergent bilingual” approach, the peers of those subjected to the first approach are submerged into a reservoir of content-areas (academic subjects) where English is the only “cultural” language of instruction. We say “cultural” language so as to differentiate the specialized languages of subject areas such as Mathematics, Chemistry, etc. from general cultural languages, such as English.

To make the point about which of the two approaches is more effective in giving students the linguistic means by which to receive the message of each subject, and those of their newly adopted culture, Dr. Pinon calls attention to a relatively recent finding by NAEP White, et al., 2021; Schwartz, 2021)..

On the 2019, National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), there was a 33-point difference in fourth grade reading proficiency between emergent bilingual students and their peers. Only 10% of emergent bilingual fourth graders and 4% of eighth graders scored at or above proficiency in reading. In contrast, among non-emergent bilingual students 39% of fourth graders and 36% of eighth graders scored at or above proficiency in reading” (White, et al., 2021; Schwartz, 2021).

It is clear that this method of “linguistic adjustment” is a sufficient means by which to transmit the message and to engineer cultural change in the ever-growing diverse school-age student-population in America, or elsewhere. The difference between this situation and that, in the missiological context, is that these children had voluntarily come into the American cultural-soup, asking for assimilation and cultural change. But in cases involving Christian missiology, missionaries are the ones who are on the offensive, going in pursuit of their target audience from some other, at times even hostile, sub-cultures or cultures that may have a completely differing worldviews. The prime objective of the missionary is to market the “Jesus-message”. And as such, the missionary must not only have a firm grasp of the message he or she is peddling, but he or she must somehow find a way to bridge whatever cultural gaps, viz., language gaps, there may be with sensitivity to local as well as the highest level of leadership involvement at every stage [principle # 9]. He must be prepared to custom-tailor his message to fit the local situation. In a manner of speaking, he has to come to the party with the inclination of one who is prepared to rub shoulders, or if not, be prepared with a willingness to jump through hoops if he has to.

A perfect example of the cultural hoops that Christian missionaries frequently have to jump through is very craftily presented in the Broadway musical, *The Book of Mormon.* The play is a musical slapstick-farce which manages, at times, to jar one’s religious sensitivity with some very daring billingsgate-like, sacrilegious quips. The story is, however, tightly woven through a plot of a somewhat clinical tale about a team of young Mormonswho are sent to a village in Uganda on a mission to convert the people of the village as part of the practicum for their missionary training program. But, all the while, there is a firm underlayment of a brazen unspoken social commentary satirically attacking the notion of, “Here comes the White man again from a situation that is not exactly welcoming to women, in general, or Black people, in particular, with his usual message of hope for African women and ignorant Black savages.” What would ordinarily have been a fairly difficult message to deliver across a vast cultural divide between the missionaries and the natives. In the missionaries’ attempt to pass on their message of hope to the natives, they are forced to forge a link between two diametrically opposite cultural extremes. They came as Mormons, speaking standard American English to a village of African agnostics who speak a Swahili affected-English when not speaking their native tongue. From the opening curtain, it was obvious that the enormous gap that existed between the two cultures would require a quantum leap in missiological communication, since not only was there an enormous rift in language and religious perspectives, but it was also an encounter of tremendous anticipatory suspense in the minds of those in the audience who already knew the fact that,

Over the past two centuries, the relationship between black people and Mormonism has included both official and unofficial discrimination.

It has prevented most men of black African descent from being ordained to the church’s lay priesthood, barred black men and women from participating in the ordinances of its temples and opposed interracial marriage (Bahooka).

The play begins when two young White men, appropriately dressed in a white shirt-dark-trouser uniform, appear on stage (in a village in Uganda), tugging their suitcases behind them. As they wandered around in apparent confusion about where they were, two local Ugandan men with machine guns appeared on the scene, demanding that the two White strangers hand over their luggage, and so they did. Shortly, thereafter, a small group of villagers arrives on the scene. The two missionaries-in-training complain to them in distress over their hijacked luggage.

The leader points to the sky, speaking in “Swahili” and a body language of apparent sympathy, says, “Whogunga!,” He then suggests that they do and say the same whenever they encounter such hardships. Although, not completely satisfied, they seemed to comfort themselves in the fact that they now knew what to do if a similar situation arose.

That was the first big jab at the laughs to come. Those who were to be ministered to were ministering to the ministers.

The two young men eventually meet up with another dozen fellow Mormon youth missionaries-in-training. This team of young men had been working at trying to convert the villagers for quite some time but had virtually no success. They got one baptism for their troubles, and, as a consequence, they contemplated giving up the missionary work and returning home, to Salt Lake City. However, Eli, the younger of the last two missionaries whose suitcases were stolen, made a connection with, Nabulungi [principle#2], the daughter of the village chief, Mafala Hatimbi. By then, he had surreptitiously altered some of Joseph Smith’s original doctrine in *The* *Book of Mormon,* in order to make the message more palatable to the villagers [principle #1]. One of the most critical alterations was the claim that Salt Lake City was the heavenly place of promise and bliss where Mormon converts would go during the afterlife (Nicholaw et al., 2011).

Eli came to realize that Nabulungi’s newly peeked interest in conversing with him was just the opening he needed [principle#2]. And so, he decided to take the opportunity and regale her with the lies and half-truths about Mormonism that he had concocted. To his pleasant surprise, Nabulungi had swallow the bait [principle #2] and before long, Eli was able to baptize her (Nicholaw et al., 2011).

From there, he prompted her went to explain the doctrine to her father, Chief Mafala Hatimbi, and he too was converted [principle #7]. Her father then gathered the other villagers together, explained the doctrine to them and urged them to accept Mormonism and be baptized [principle #4]. The women were especially welcoming of Mormonism because it would bring to an end the practice of clitoric castration. With the exception of his fibs he told, included in the Mormon doctrine (Alexander, 1978), Eli had pretty much followed all of Kietzman’s ten principles of community development.

Meanwhile, Nabulungi, who had learned from one of the other young missionaries that the Mormon doctrine does not say anything about the soul of the convert going to dwell in bliss at Salt Lake City, in the afterlife, was furious with Eli for lying to her. One of the women, salvaged the situation by explaining away the Salt Lake City bliss as a metaphor. Soon, Chief Mafala Hatimbi would introduce the gunmen to Mormonism and they too were converted and baptized (Nicholaw et al., 2011).

Still, in the case of missionaries who manage to bridge the cultural gap in their effort to transmit the message by means of “linguistic adjustment,” some of the culture may also rub off on the missionaries [principle #10] from the target culture. One of the common expressions that became an often-repeated expression during worship was the expression, “Whogunga!” One day, after worship, Eli turned to the chief and asked him, “What is ‘Whogunga!’ in English?” The chief turned to Eli with a kind of guileless innocence and said, using a particular four letter invective starting with the letter “F” for the word, “\_\_\_ [Curse] you God!” (Nicholaw et al., 2011).

Everywhere around us, and even inside of us, there is constant conversation going on. The key to the maintenance of any discussion always is that the language used is common, in the most important ways, to that used by those trying to transmit and receive information among one another. Ultimately, the object of using a language is to create something, motivate an action, or bring about change. The Bible states that if a group of people has a common language among them, nothing can stop them from accomplishing whatever they think is within their grasp (Gen 11:6). Yet, even among the characters on opposite sides of the set who are able to exchange ideas in a mode of English that seemed to be hanging just on the fringe of what could be taken as a common language, there were still snags in the Mormons’ effort to find those common threads of communication that run through the two very different frames of worldviews and cultural perspectives. These are often spoken of as misunderstandings or misinterpretations. But, as is shown in genetics, where such failure in the exactitude of the message that is being delivered, could result in a “misreading”, a “reading” comprehension glitch that could make all the difference. In other words, the language in one culture may be more varied (into dialects and special applications) than that in another culture. And, if that were the case, how much more difficult would it be when the attempt is to transmit the message to a person whose language is altogether foreign to yours, or to a people of a completely alien culture. This is the situation that Christian missionaries contend with on an ongoing basis, even though they sometimes have the advantage of speaking their message in *glossolalia*. The goal always is to approach, as perfectly as possible, a “linguistic adjustment” that can be measured by whether, in the end, something has been created, or someone has been motivated, or there is some kind of transformation of something, or someone.
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N.B.:

Just so you know,

In this assignment (C), I’m being asked to “Choose…a book, media [or] a personal knowledge” I had developed in the 60- Day Assignment, and then “critique it through the 10 principles”. I’m also expected to relate it to a Christian worldview and to my professional training or background. That’s a maze of intertwining problems and concepts, and doing justice to it takes a lot of words.

Please also note:

1. The “Works Cited” page is supposed to begin on p. 30 but it sometimes jumps into p.29 when it’s being sent.
2. Please re-read p.6 and the top half of p.7.
3. The rubric requires a minimum of 15 sources four books and eleven journals. I have provided at least
4. 4 books (including the Bible)
5. 12 journals
6. Wikipedia (APA-7, Chap. 10.3, #49, p. 264),
7. An “interview” of an expert on telephone (APA-7, Chap. 10.11, #84, p. 281.

Etc.