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A majority of cross-cultural workers in the Catholic Church now hail from the Southern hemisphere, in particular from Africa and Asia. This switch among “sending nations” from the North and West to the South and East of the globe has radically altered the whole dynamics of cross-cultural church presence. Clearly, this is a positive development in a multi-cultural globalising world. My concern is with professional missioners among these cross-cultural workers. Unease has arisen about some of these missioners who return to their home country “early”. As a case study I look at the situation of the largest professional cross-cultural mission organisation in the Catholic Church, the Divine Word Missionaries (SVD), taking up the case of Indonesia.

I shall look at global data collated at the Roman headquarters of the SVD, and also at more detailed data from Indonesia which, at present, is the largest sending nation in the SVD. The Indonesian data will be placed within the context of data concerning other Catholic religious orders in the country.

In looking at this information I ask: is a lack of cross-cultural communication a key factor with the early returnees? If so, how and why?

Global Data from the SVD

Robert Kisala at the Roman Headquarters of the Divine Word Missionaries (Kisala 2011:6-7) has collated data on early returnees from the past twenty years (1991-2010). Some 1374, or about 56% of all those accepted into the SVD during this period, received a first assignment outside their home country. Of these, 106 could be considered early returnees, that is, they returned within seven years for personal reasons. And so, early returnees come to 7.7% of all those who received a first assignment abroad.

In terms of country of birth, countries with a higher than average rate of early returnees are the USA, Philippines, Brazil, Togo and Korea. By place of formation, confreres who completed their basic formation in Tagaytay (Philippines), Chicago (USA), Tamale (Ghana) and Malang (Indonesia) had a higher than average rate of early returnees.
overall averages for country of birth by zone were Pan-America (PANAM) 6.5%, African-Madagascar (AFRAM) 6%, Europe 4.1% and Asia-Pacific (ASPAC) 3.9%. For place of formation by zone the averages were PANAM 6.6%, AFRAM 5.4%, ASPAC 3.9% and EUROPE 3.7%. Receiving provinces/regions that had a higher than average rate of early returnees are Italy (ITA), Philippines North (PHN), Kenya (KEN), Togo (TOG), Congo (CNG), Argentina East (ARE), Argentina South (ARS) and Columbia (COL).

While it was not easy to establish the reasons why these confreres returned early, Kisala suggests that, from information available, about one-third returned because of issues of affectivity (difficulties in living celibacy), while somewhat less than one-half had difficulties with inculturation, that is, with language learning and/or cultural adaptation to the situation in the mission or in his SVD community. This latter reason forms the focus of this paper.

Kisala rightly notes that, from information presently available, it is impossible to say whether a higher percentage is returning now than in the past. While the number of early returnees in the past twenty years is by no means overwhelming, the fact that about 1 in 13 of those receiving first assignments abroad return to their home country within seven years after final vows is a matter of concern to anyone interested in cross-cultural communication. Kisala trusts that we do not see any particular group of confreres, or any particular SVD province or region, as a “problem,” but rather hopes that we explore the data to obtain a better grasp of the issues involved.

**Cross-Cultural Missioners from Indonesia**

Indonesia is the largest sending area of the SVD. This needs putting into the broader context of the church in Indonesia. The Mission Commission of the Indonesian Bishops’ Conference (KKM-KWI) has collated data on all cross-cultural missioners sent from the country.3

In 2010, of 55 male religious congregations (Brothers and priests) in Indonesia, some 33 have no less than 585 members working abroad as cross-cultural missioners. There are 184 working in other Asian countries, 154 in the Americas, 118 in Europe, 78 in Africa and 36 in Australia and the Pacific. Of these 349 are engaged in pastoral work, 68 in formation or administration and 153 in “other work”. The male religious congregation with the largest number of members working overseas is the Divine Word Missionaries (SVD) with 293 confreres working in 39 countries. Some 151 of these men hail from Ende Province (East and Central Flores, Ambon, Papua), 56 from Ruteng Province
(West Flores and Sumba), 50 from Timor Province, and 36 confreres from Java Province (which includes Bali, Sumatra and Kalimantan).

Of the 123 female religious congregations (Sisters) in Indonesia some 60 have sent no less than 791 missioners overseas, namely: 394 to Europe, 246 to other Asian countries, 74 to Africa, 64 to the Americas, and 13 to Australia and the Pacific. Of these Sisters some 343 are engaged in pastoral work, 105 in formation and administration, and 343 in “other work”. The Sisterhood with the largest number working overseas, namely 132 Sisters, is the Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters (SSpS).

Seeing that the largest numbers – and percentages – of any religious congregation in Indonesia with members working cross-culturally overseas are the Divine Word Missionaries (male) and Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters (female), it is also interesting to note that these two congregations have the largest number of expatriates living and working in Indonesia itself. Of 280 male foreign missioners working in Indonesia some 55 are SVDs, and of 202 foreign Sisters working in Indonesia some 22 are members of the SSpS. The multi-cultural communities of the SVD and the SSpS, as well as the high numbers sent overseas, are the clear results of the cross-cultural policies of these mission congregations. Such a policy for relatively large numbers of personnel who are living in multi-cultural communities while working in cross-cultural situations, points to the absolute necessity of adequate education, preparation and practice in vision, attitudes and skills.

**Case Study: Indonesian SVDs working Overseas**

Due to unease about early returnees, an Indonesian SVD team has collated data from Indonesian members working abroad and from those who once worked abroad and have now returned to Indonesia. The 28 questions sought their opinion on a whole range of issues. While only 77 of the 326 confreres who received the questionnaire returned it, and therefore their responses are not necessarily representative of either those still abroad or of the early returnees, nevertheless the responses are a sufficient indication of problems with cross-cultural communication.

Since 1983, when the first batch of Indonesian confreres received their appointment for overseas, some 326 have received assignments abroad. Of these 84.3% (275 confreres) are still working overseas while some 51 or 15.7% have returned. Of those who studied at the Major Seminary of Ledalero (Flores Island, eastern Indonesia) 89.1% are still overseas while 10.9% have returned, while 58.8% of confreres who studied in Malang (East Java) remain overseas, 42.2% having returned.
We must be very careful in interpreting this data for the category of “returnees” includes not only those who returned “with problems”, that is, for personal reasons, but also those who were officially recalled by the Society for work “back home” in Indonesia, those whose short-time contracts had finished, and those who returned with health issues. These three categories are not included in “early returnees” in the data from Rome, and they should not be included.

Reasons for returning to Indonesia given by the early returnees themselves are firstly problems with provincials and/or other confreres overseas, and secondly personal problems. To understand each of these issues we would have to check these responses with official correspondence between the sending and the receiving provinces which I am not in the position to do. Nonetheless, the personal views of the early returnees are of value in themselves.

What attracted my attention in this survey were questions that elicited opinions about the people and culture of the receiving mission, including comparisons with the “home” situation. Unfortunately, I have no way of separating the responses of those who remain abroad with that of early returnees.

Opinions regarding adapting to the receiving context

Most respondents (63 out of 77) said that they could adjust easily enough to the cross-cultural situation overseas, just 17 said they had adjustment difficulties. Main difficulties were with language learning (31). Of these 10 work or worked in Latin America, 8 in Africa and 7 in Asia. Twenty confreres also found difficulties with the culture of the people (7 in Latin America, 5 in Asia, 4 in Africa). Apparently on arrival only three to six months are allowed for language learning and introduction to the local culture and the ecclesial scene. Some 18 had interpersonal problems in community and/or with SVD superiors. Just six confreres claimed no difficulties at all in the countries where they live and work.

The value in this survey is that it highlights the opinions of the confreres concerned, including early returnees. Clearly it would be valuable to place their observations side by side with the views of the people among whom they worked and of their fellow confreres.

Acceptance by the People
No less than 67 of the 77 respondents said that they had been welcomed enthusiastically by the people in their place of work, particularly in Latin America (27). Others have found that trust came slowly. Problems among the people they served – according to these confreres – centred on sexual morality (34 respondents), for instance, partners living together without the sacrament of marriage, “high rate” of divorce, polygamy and “free sex”. Secondly came economic poverty (32 respondents) and thirdly socio-cultural issues (31 respondents) such as strongly patriarchal societies and a culture of consumerism in particular the penchant for feasting among the poor.

Comparing the Situation Overseas with that in Indonesia

Question No.26 requested the respondents to compare the customs and culture of Indonesia with that of the people among whom they work, or once worked, overseas.

Those who work, or once worked, in Europe responded in positive terms. They noted that differences in ways of thinking are very marked. While Europeans seem to give priority to personal relationships, rational thinking and acting in individualistic ways, Indonesians prioritise togetherness and affective and emotional relationships. They found personal discipline and general cleanliness attractive. In some European countries church going is minimal, yet the Indonesian SVDs found deep personal faith, whereas in Indonesia, where church going remains high, the quality and depth of religious commitment was questioned.

Those with experience in Africa noted many similarities with Indonesia, but were aware of big differences in family life: polygamy, husband/wife-exchange, married life without the sacrament, abortion and rather free sexual encounters. One said that Indonesia was more advanced and that expressions of Christian faith were deeper in Indonesia where Christians are much more self-reliant.

Those with experience in the Philippines also noted many similarities with the situation in Indonesia: similarities in language, mutual help and the sharing of burdens, rice cultivation and house building. Also while many Filipinos were active in church they also retained indigenous rites and ceremonies to the spirits.

Hong Kong is recognised as a modern city with strong western influence. The respondents also noted the openness of the people to the outside world, were appreciative of the working democracy, equal treatment afforded to people in similar
professions, the closeness of the bishop and priests with the people. They thus made somewhat unfavourable comparisons with the situation in Flores, which is one of the poorer areas of Indonesia, where most people are small scale farmers, where outside influence is not as obvious and where bishops and priests belong to a special caste, adopting paternalistic attitudes.

Clear comparisons are also made by those with USA experience: a high divorce rate yet divorced parents still care for their children; the open, dynamic, spontaneous culture, respect given not so much for seniority but for good character; discipline, hard working, sincerity, sportsmanship, equality before the law.

Those in Brazil have the impression that the Christian faith is not rooted deeply in the life way of the people, those in Paraguay regard religious practice as “mythical-magical”; in Mexico “people pay more attention to statues than to theology”.

And so on. I must say at once that on reading these responses, the researchers themselves were somewhat embarrassed and concluded that the question should never have been asked. True enough, as it is invidious to make such cultural comparisons. And yet we can learn something about the mind-set of these cross-cultural workers from these “spontaneous” assessments.

In economically advanced technological societies such as the USA, Europe, Hong Kong, and Australia, the place of work is generally found to be more impressive than that back home in Indonesia, although certain issues are found troubling (odd) such as divorced parents jointly caring for their children. However, where the situation is economically similar or poorer than Indonesia, as in much of Africa and some parts of Asia, then the culture and values of Indonesia tend to compare favourably. These responses indicate with whose eyes these early returnees were seeing – and judging – the people among whom they worked.

Learning to Leave: Prerequisite for Dynamic Cross-Cultural Communication

My suggestion is that the responses to the so-called “inadmissible question No.26” by early returnees (comparing the situation overseas with that in Indonesia) point to “the un-evaluated insider’s mythical understanding of themselves.” (Redfield 1960) Unconsciously (?), these men were holding up their home culture as the norm. As SVD cultural anthropologist and cross-cultural missioner Jon Kirby has put it, we need to
learn to “exit” (“exit formation”) from our own culture before we can “entry” into another’s (Kirby 2000).

By “exit formation”, Kirby means cross-cultural “field education” to learn “how to leave” our first culture and everything about it. Kirby’s experience in running such courses for many years in Northern Ghana for a variety of incoming workers from the Church, NGOs and the UN, has convinced him that this is the necessary context for fostering a new missioner’s first – and most important “cross-cultural conversion”.

Broadening Understanding, Overcoming Cultural Blind-Spots

Looking at the above data regarding members of the SVD, any “un-evaluated insider’s mythical understanding of themselves” cannot be due simply to a lack of appropriate courses in the basic curriculum, although here and there this may well be an additional cause. Courses in missiology, cultural anthropology, cross-cultural communication and contextual theology are given in all the SVD seminaries and places of basic formation mentioned in the survey. These courses certainly broaden the understanding of mission among the students but, according to Kirby’s experience, “they cannot help mission candidates overcome their cultural blind spots, prejudices and ethnocentrism so that they can begin to ‘do’ ministry cross-culturally.” (Kirby 2000: 6-7)

Academic courses can teach students about inculturation (the ongoing dialogue between faith and culture) but cannot offer an experience of the social and ecclesiological consequences of inculturation. Cross-cultural courses, Kirby continues, “can teach church-planting and methods for evangelism but they cannot bring about the “cross-cultural conversion” of the candidate.” (Kirby 2000: 6)

Communication: The giving of Self in Love

In fact, this has been the understanding of “social communications” in the Catholic Church since the Vatican Council of 1962-1965, and explicated in some detail six years later in the pastoral instruction Communio et Progressio written by order of the Vatican Council (1962-1965). This holistic understanding of communication has been promoted in Asia by the Office for Social Communication of the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences. Time and again in meetings of bishops and communication experts, training in communication has been concerned with skills and technologies, but more fundamentally with formation that affects the whole person and his/her basic inner
dispositions. (Eilers 2002:12) As stated in the Vatican pastoral instruction, communication is “the giving of self in love” (Communio et Progressio, 1971, No.11). Cross-cultural communication is a basic attitude demanding the whole person. The crucial point apparently missing from the “basic attitude demanding the whole person” is the early returnees willingness and ability to exit from their own culture in order to be present in another’s.

Eilers quotes the stages outlined by Carlo Martini: we see, we listen, and only then do we act. Martini then asks: with whose eyes are we seeing, with whose ears are we listening? (Eilers 2002: 19 quoting Martini 1996). Without altering the cultural lens we see through and the frequency of the ears we hear others with, academic courses in cross-cultural communication on their own, will not necessarily create greater sensitivity. Eilers concludes by speaking of cross-cultural communication as a “total commitment, for “communication must flow out from a genuine commitment up to laying down our life for others.” (Eilers 2002: 21)

*Sparking Cross-Cultural Sensitivity*

Indonesian – and any other – cross-cultural missioners from Asia and Africa bring along with them cultural diversity in line with our globalising world, but they do not automatically bring sensitivity, let alone the skills necessary for acquiring a bi-cultural identity. As with their forbears and confreres from the North and West, their “spontaneous” approach to mission arises from the particular mission history of the region they hail from, and from the concerns of their own people. Being Indonesian does not give them an automatic “in” with other Asian cultures, just as being English does not give me an automatic “in” anywhere else in Europe.

If my surmise is correct that a key issue for early returnees is that they have been working and evaluating another’s culture through an “un-evaluated insider’s mythical understanding of themselves”, then Kirby’s emphasis on “cross-cultural conversion” is highly appropriate. The few early Indonesian returnees who found it difficult to negotiate a foreign ethos have tended to retreat into a romanticised past and now tend towards cultural rigidity. Unable to function in another culture, they become dysfunctional back home.9

*From Understanding to Conversion*
Cross-cultural missioners from the South and East are in danger of being just as culturally blind as their forebears from the North and West, and their ministry could become just another instance of attempting to re-make “them” like “us” unless we have the theological and anthropological vision, attitudes and skills, in a word “total commitment” that allow us to “exit” from our own cultural home and “enter” into another’s.

My own experience over the past ten years is with guiding a programme in “social theology” at Ledalero Institute of Philosophy (STFK) for post-graduate SVDs, most of whom subsequently received appointments overseas. Participants chose to accompany a particular marginal group in town – some with Muslim dock workers, others with shop assistants, prisoners, HIV/AIDS carriers, motor-cycle taxi drivers, kitchen staff at the local general hospital, or vegetable sellers at the market. This experience was then written up and analysed during group work, class presentations and lectures in the light of the social teaching of the Catholic Church in Indonesia, in Asia (FABC) and in papal and conciliar teaching. My experience is, that while the course broadened understanding, each year no more than one student out of around 50, underwent a “cross-cultural conversion”. While information and understanding increased, there has been little, if any, learning of the ability to “exit” one’s own culture and “entering” that of another. And this despite the “seeing, hearing, acting” methodology, the personal insertion accompanied by systematic reflection. My impression is, this is a general problem in basic formation. Philosophy, the social sciences and theology, even when taught “inter-culturally” or “inter-contextually”, succeed in imparting knowledge and understanding; they do not of their own trigger conversion.

Those who wish to enter another culture must learn to leave their own, learn how to leave their first cultures, leave its places and things, its cherished ideas and values, its familiar perspectives, its enhanced technologies, its seemingly “superior” philosophies and theologies and, ironic as it might seem, above all its religious forms and established ministries. According to Kirby this requires a special kind of learning situation – “a cross-cultural internship”. (Kirby 2000:8)

We can know our own culture only by comparison, but with whose eyes and ears do we compare? In cross-cultural incidents we naturally use the same set of responses given us by experience in our own culture. We can only enter into another culture to the extent that we are able to break away from the ethnocentrism that binds us to our first
culture. And this ethnocentrism is not usually challenged by any illogical aspects that we are aware of in our own culture, but rather by the negative feedback provided by the clash with another system of meanings, another culture. This happens to the extent that we have the capacity to listen and begin to see and listen with the eyes and ears of the “other”. From the Indonesian survey among SVDs, this seems to have been happening fairly successfully with many missioners in the USA, Europe, Hong Kong and Australia, but apparently not so successfully among some confreres in Latin America, Africa and other parts of Asia.

Successful “negotiators” have the ability, “to recognise, define, analyse and select an approach to problems that involve cultural values, beliefs and assumptions from contexts other than one’s own” (Stallter 2009:544). Tom Stallter calls this “cultural intelligence” (2009:543-554). My point is, this ability is available only to those who have undergone “cross-cultural conversion” and are willing to communicate with their whole self in love.

Cross-Cultural Internship

With the clear teaching of the Church over the past 40 years and the ongoing training and awareness-building and skill training in the local, regional and global Church, it is amazing that the largest cross-cultural mission congregation of men offered incoming personnel with an average only three to six months introduction to language and culture. And this was presented more as input than as total commitment engaging the whole person. Jon Kirby emphasises that before an effective ministry can be initiated it will require at least a year of study, reflection, language and culture learning on the part of the new missioner. In own experience I found that a language as grammatically simple as bahasa Indonesia took me six months to begin to make sense of, a year before I was feeling comfortable with, two years to grasp many of the nuances and levels of meaning, and is taking a lifetime to master and enjoy. It has demanded – and continues to demand – a dying and a re-birth.

Thus “exit formation” is not primarily nor simply another academic course alongside the many missiological courses already on the curriculum, but rather a structured programme in the host country with all the necessary facilities and trained educators.

In Northern Ghana, at the Tamale Institute of Cross-Cultural Studies, Jon Kirby has not just professional educators but also support personnel such as trained village “helpers”
and local supervisors, native speakers and local cultural articulators. Language
learning, that is, cultural “unlearning” and re-learning, need to be intensive and
systematic. Above all, Kirby’s experience in Tamale suggests that there must be
adequate role models, as well as sufficient time and opportunity for learning but also
real incentives and sanctions. (Kirby 2000:9) Apparently, early returnees, “lack the
mandate, the support and the models they needed to get stared and keep going when
the going gets tough.” (Kirby 2000:6)

In short, academic courses are essential for increasing knowledge and broadening
understanding; however only by successfully completing an adequate cross-cultural
training programme will cultural blinkers fall away revealing one’s “un-evaluated
insider’s mythical understanding of oneself”.

Cross-Cultural Competence

One conclusion that we can draw from the above, is that neither cultural knowledge
imparted in basic formation, nor later cultural contact in the field, does not necessarily
lead to competence in inter-cultural communication. Living in another’s cultural
domain may lead to a reduction in stereotyping, however, language learning is not in
itself sufficient for acquiring inter-cultural sensitivity. As Janet Bennett has found (J.
Bennett 2011), what does lead to competence in inter-cultural living and communication
is an intentional and developmentally sequenced programme design; a balancing of
challenge and support to reduce anxiety in the cross-cultural worker; the facilitating of
learning before, during and after inter-cultural experiences; the quality of inter-cultural
experiences and language immersion; inter-cultural competence training; and the
cultivation of curiosity and cognitive flexibility. In elaborating the last point, she
suggests nine principles for enhancing cultural curiosity. They are, suspending our
assumptions and values judgements, practising cultural humility, enhancing our
perception skills, developing multiple perspectives, increasing our tolerance of
ambiguity, asking questions as culturally appropriate, becoming participant observers
as appropriate, becoming analytically inquisitive, and assessing the credibility of our
inter-cultural sources.

Reading this list of the six ways in which cross-cultural workers are trained in inter-
cultural sensitivity and the nine principles for enhancing curiosity, I have to say that
surely they chart a “minimal” programme for full-time, life-long cross-cultural missioners.

A Model of Cross-Cultural Conversion

To achieve this goal, Milton Bennett has fleshed out a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, a path to lead one to cross-cultural conversion (M. Bennett 1993; cf. Kisala, 2009). Bennett’s model sketches out the development of increasing sophistication in one’s experience and one’s navigation of difference (M. Bennett 1993: 1-51). His model begins with three ethnocentric stages, in which one’s own culture is experienced as central in some particular way. The latter three stages are termed ethnorelative, in which one’s own culture is viewed in the context of another’s.
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After delineating the issue at each of the six stages, Bennett then outlines the developmental task, the challenge and support needed, and the appropriate intercultural skills needed as one passes from denial to defence, from defence to minimisation, from acceptance to adaptation and finally to integration. It is a model that opens up the cross-cultural worker to the necessity, and personal experience of “inter-
cultural conversion, a developmental path to exit from an ethnocentric standpoint and become increasingly bi-cultural as our cross-cultural mission demands. It is a model (readily available online as well as in print) that responds to the issues raised by Robert Kisala in his global survey, by Jon Kirby in his experience in Tamale, Ghana, and by Indonesian confreres in their survey of “early returnees”.

The Gift of Indonesian Cultural/Human Values

The above evaluation of one element of the Indonesian survey needs to be balanced by the positive cross-cultural engagement of the majority of Indonesian personnel. In meeting Indonesian cross-cultural missioners in each continent over the past 25 years, and in listening to them, the people they work with, and to their confreres from other nations, I can state without the slightest hesitation that the “ascendancy” of Asian, and now African, cross-cultural missioners in the world church is a mighty blessing. With the exception of the “early returnees” above, Indonesian SVDs are socially successful and personally popular (Prior 2010: 62-64). Their ancestral values are a winner and, with no innate feeling of cultural superiority, they are transparently friendly with, and respectful of, anyone. They willingly co-operate rather than compete and spontaneously seek a consensus that embraces minority viewpoints (musyawarah mufakat). They are invariably welcoming and openly hospitable however tight the schedule or minimal the budget. True to their native culture, they have yet to discover a reason for not partying! They are natural singers, musicians and dancers; life is a gift to be enjoyed.

Uprooted from their clan and their land, indigenous Indonesians quickly forge geographical and cyber networks. Rare is the week that friends do not meet, some perhaps travelling for miles, to gather round a rice cooker. They willingly “waste time” with others, for right relationships are at the heart of everything. Despite a strict upbringing according to an all-encompassing tribal adat (customary law), most manage to negotiate more open societies successfully. As underlined by confrere Leo Kleden, cross-cultural missioners from the South often lack the political, cultural and religious superiority of another age (Kleden 2007:275).
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1. According to the 2011 SVD *Catalogus* there were 6067 members of the SVD at the end of 2010, of whom 3017 work in Asia-Pacific, 1297 in Pan-America, 1173 in Europe and 580 in Africa-Madagascar. Twenty-two percent of the total are Indonesians.
2. This figure does not include those reappointed back in their own country, but only those who returned with personal difficulties.
4. When this data was collated (2009-2010), the SVD Timor Province included Timor Leste which has since become an independent “Region”.
5. This is not just an Indonesian scenario; the Australian Province of the SSpS has 55 members who hail from no less than 19 countries. These Sisters have experience of working in 18 countries outside their country of birth. (Data collected by the author during the SSpS Provincial Assembly 28-30 September 2011.)
7. According to government data, NTT Province (with a Christian majority), of which Flores is part (together with West Timor and Sumba), is the second poorest Province in the country, but among the top four corrupt Provinces.
8. See also the FABC-OSC Book Series which has published key documents, commentaries, issues on formation, and a handbook, and publishes a news service, and governs Radio Veritas.
9. I leave aside the whole issue of psycho-sexual maturity, important as it is. To quote Eilers again, communication is “not just skill, trick and technique but an inner disposition, grown as part of the personality.” A missionary “who was not able to settle his personal issues during formation years is always in danger of needing too much time and energy for himself instead of being free to serve others. Everything suppressed during formation years easily comes out after ordination and demands emotional and psychological energy.” (Eilers 2002: 22, 24 passim)
10. The Masters Programme at Ledalero Institute of Philosophy is in “Contextual Theology” using the methodology of “engagement / insertion” with systematic inter-disciplinary reflection.
11. Stallter writes in the journal *Missiology*, which for more than 40 years (pre-1974 under the title *Practical Anthropology*) has published regular articles on living and working in cross-cultural situations. Interestingly, many of these draw on business experience. Seemingly, monetary profit is a stronger motive for learning to live cross-culturally than the religious motives of Church workers!
12. In the Catholic Church, formerly in Europe and for the past decades in Asia, Franz-Jozef Eilers, svd, has been the major pioneer of studies in cross-cultural communication. The experience and expertise has long been available; practice lies woefully behind.