LITERATE CHANGE AGENTS WORKING IN ORAL COMMUNITIES:
NAVIGATING PARADIGM SHIFTS

by

Regina Marie Manley

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Curriculum, Instruction and Foundational Studies

Boise State University

December 2022
DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the dissertation submitted by

Regina Marie Manley

Dissertation Title: Literate Change Agents Working in Oral Communities

Date of Final Oral Examination: 19 October 2022

The following individuals read and discussed the dissertation submitted by student Regina Marie Manley, and they evaluated the student’s presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Keith W. Thiede, Ph.D.              Chair, Supervisory Committee
Julianne A. Wenner, Ph.D.              Co-Chair, Supervisory Committee
David A. Gabbard, Ph.D.              Member, Supervisory Committee
Tom A. Steffen, Ph.D.              Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the dissertation was granted by Keith W. Thiede, Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The dissertation was approved by the Graduate College.
DEDICATION

This research is dedicated

- To all those whose mother tongue is not the dominant language. May you find the God who is intimately familiar with you, your people, and your language
- To all who have yet to discover the joy of hearing God speak through Bible stories and through the participants of a facilitated discussion group
- To the staff of Spoken Worldwide® who affirm minority, mother-tongue speaking communities, empowering them with hope
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With heart-felt gratitude I would like to acknowledge
the years of collaboration, encouragement, and support
given by my Co-Investigator and life-mate,

Jim Manley.

I am thankful for all my professors from my B.A. studies to this doctorate
who inspired my quest to learn,
culminating with my committee members,

David Gabbard, Tom Steffen, Keith Thiede, and particularly, Julie Wenner.

There is a host of family and friends
who have supported me and this endeavor over the last seven years.

Sandra Geisinger has been both a friend and coach.

May God return what I can never repay.

And finally,
allegiance is due to my heavenly Father,
to is marvelous Son, Jesus,
and to my ever present help, the Holy Spirit.

Ultimately, this is Your work.
ABSTRACT

This research documents the experience of 12 local leaders implementing an oral curriculum over 13 months in Karnataka, India. These leaders were Change Agents interested in influencing a community with new information. They created audio materials referred to as “content” in their group’s mother tongue: in a Kannada-Telegu mix for the Madiga group (a Scheduled Caste); in Vaagri Booli for the Hakkipikki group (a Scheduled Tribe); and in Kannada for the Kannadiga group. The first two languages are unwritten. The Kannada language is the official language of Karnataka state. The oral curriculum followed the Spoken Worldwide® model. Each team of local leaders designed their content by combining a topic, a local proverb, and an informative resource in story form. Next, the individual leaders facilitated discussion groups in their community centered on the content. Eighteen men were interviewed; this included six community discussion group members.

The Connected Learning Framework was the conceptual lens for this research. It consists of four constructs—relationship, relevance, oral modes of communication, and mutual respect. Relationships played a primary role because the learners preferred to work with individuals they knew, or with individuals who were approved by the community’s leaders. Content that centered on what was relevant to community members was well-received by the listeners. The leaders used modes of communication that were familiar to community members by presenting content in the mother tongue and including local proverbs. By facilitating discussion after presenting the content, the
leaders demonstrated mutual respect ensuring a multidirectional flow of information. This informed how the leaders created subsequent content.

This research found that introducing new ideas, specifically Christian Scripture as a source of wisdom, was received positively by almost all audiences. In addition, the Team Leaders who had more experience using oral modes of communication, specifically telling Bible stories, and facilitating discussion were more consistent in implementing the Spoken process and principles and modeled the process during the content creation sessions with their Local Leaders or in presenting the content in their Leader’s gatherings. These leaders who had more experience with Connect Learning strategies were able to navigate further in the oral learning paradigm.

*Key words:* Orality; oral learner; adult education; curriculum; connected learner; oral preference learner.
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CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

The introduction is divided into five sections. First, I describe problems I observed when I lived outside the USA between community development projects initiated and actual results. This led to my teaching oral communication strategies to both literate and nonliterate adults around the world. Next, I explain how this led to opportunities for inquiry and questions fundamental to this research. In the third section, I share the significance of this research. In the fourth section, I define important terms and abbreviations. I conclude with limitations and delimitations.

The Problem

During my 17 years in Ecuador, followed by 12 years directing leadership trainings for Christian leaders worldwide, I observed many projects initiated by highly literate outsiders attempting to introduce new ideas into oral communities. By oral communities I mean groups who rely primarily on spoken communication rather than written words. There are multiple reasons groups prefer oral communication. It may be because they speak an unwritten mother tongue (MT), or because most members had no opportunity to learn to read, or because they prefer the social interaction even though they learned to read in school. Over the years, I observed how highly literate outsiders, acting as Change Agents (CAs) introducing new ideas to benefit the community, often instituted projects that failed, or certainly developed in ways contrary to the CA’s expectations.
Here are three such examples: In Ecuador, two Peace Corps workers taught leather tanning skills in a small Quichua community to those who expressed interest. Three families learned to make leather items from discarded cow hides. Unfortunately, as these families gained income from the sales, the community responded by cutting down their coconut trees. In Thailand, I visited a Lisu-speaking community in a mountainous, hard-to-reach location. Almost every home had a small outhouse but only one was used as a latrine. All the others had become narrow, stand-alone storage closets. A few years ago, an African colleague began teaching rural, Malawian pastors about leadership. He discovered they were suffering under drought conditions so during his second seminar, he brought a specialist to teach them how to make fertilizer from local materials. When the pastors adopted the new farming methods their crops yielded six to ten times more corn at harvest. Unfortunately, in some areas the villagers responded by accusing the pastors of practicing witchcraft.

I observed some common characteristics in the scenarios that failed. First, the CAs initiating the new ideas were highly educated outsiders. Few CAs were fluent in the community’s language; they worked through the Language of Wider Communication (LWC)—Spanish, Thai, and French, respectively. The CAs relied on literate, bilingual, community members to transfer their ideas. Communication within the CA’s target group took place almost exclusively in an unwritten MT; it was oral/aural and embedded in social dynamics distinctive to the group’s culture. These experiences initiated my search to understand why potentially beneficial ideas from outsiders so often fail.

I also observed some successes. One example was missionary who increased the available protein in jungle villages by providing a better breed of chickens. Within a few
years, most villagers had a good supply of larger, healthier chickens. Another positive project was initiated by Hospital Voz Andes, a small mission-run hospital in Shell, Ecuador. A nurse practitioner began training health promoters from the jungle villages. Previously, the Indigenous responded to ill health in two distinctive ways: As evidence of witchcraft or as a sign of imminent death. After a decade of educating health promoters, the Indigenous became acquainted with a third option, healing through western medicine.

A characteristic these CAs shared was a long-term relationship with the village communities. The CAs were not fluent in the Indigenous languages (they worked with five distinct groups in a 33,000 square mile area), but they learned basic greetings and had spent time developing relationships in the communities.

After 17 years in Ecuador partnering with my jungle-pilot husband and raising four children, I returned to college studies stateside with the goal of becoming a literacy specialist. I wanted to help the people in an oral community access their newly translated Bible. During my three years of study toward an M.A. in linguistics, I saw that literacy in the LWC was always beneficial. However, literacy in an unwritten MT was of little value because there were so few books to read in the MT. To quote Sarah Gudschinsky (1973), “How many of you would want to swim if the sum total of water available to you was in your bathtub?” (p. 10) I experienced an epiphany: Why teach literacy? Why not translate the Bible orally, using the communication strategies that are familiar and daily utilized by the community? I completed the degree, but shifted my energies to learning everything I could about oral learning strategies.

The next step of my journey was discovering social learning through Bible storytelling and discussion sessions. Bible storytelling and discussion went from
something you do in Sunday school with children’ to a broad number of applications. Highly literate North Americans were finding it useful for small group studies in homes for evangelism, and for counseling. The method was being employed successfully for church planting and training nonliterate Christian leaders, so I began conducting Bible story and discussion trainings around the world. I observed both nonliterate and highly literate participants being enriched by the oral-social dynamic of facilitated discussion centered around a Bible story. It made the Bible setting alive, so people were experiencing it personally. Spiritual insights were diverse and relevant. Participants were amazed how easy it was to remember large amounts of Scripture in story form. If the group met for an extended period of time, both critical and creative thinking were developing in the participants.

In 2009 I encountered a group called Spoken Worldwide®. This organization was dedicated to “empowering cultures both spiritually and physically” in environments “where written words cannot go” (Spoken Worldwide®, 2022). The Spoken team developed a method tailored specifically for oral communities. The Spoken method trains Indigenous leaders to determine their community’s issues and design “content” to act as a catalyst for transforming their community. The content creation process will be described later. The content focuses on a local problem, adds a relevant local proverb, and finishes with either a Bible story or information pertinent to the chosen problem. This is recorded in audio format. Next, each Indigenous leader plays the audio content several times and facilitates discussion among small groups in their community. The content and the discussion are always in the community’s MT so everyone can participate. The content is also short enough to easily remember.
Opportunity and Questions

I investigated the Spoken process because it demonstrated respect for the oral community’s language and communication style by employing oral strategies rather than mandating literacy and depending on literate strategies. The oral approach validated the group’s culture and familiar communication practices. The Spoken process included storytelling and discussion but went farther by integrating local, Indigenous leaders in creating the curriculum. I wanted to understand the principles employed in the Spoken process and learn how the community leaders experienced the process. In 2016 I was trained as a volunteer coach for Spoken Worldwide.

Opportunity

In 2018 I had an opportunity to introduce the Spoken process in India. I had established a relationship with two ministries in Karnataka state by previously training their Christian leaders to use a Bible storytelling and discussion method. The Director of one group employed storytelling and discussion extensively. He modeled story and discussion and expository teaching in his monthly leaders’ training meetings. (Due to increasing anti-Christian sentiment in India at the time of this research, I cannot identify the Director or disclose the name of his ministry.) The Director had outreaches underway in several communities of people who spoke an unwritten MT, some of which had little or no Christian witness. The Director’s goal was to establish a self-sustaining, self-governing, MT-speaking church in each language group. In 2018 the Director invited me to train leaders in the Spoken process. Eight language groups gathered. After the training, five groups continued to create content, but only three of the five met consistently.
This research explored the experiences of the Local Leaders (LLs) in the three groups that actively implemented the Spoken method for 13 months following the 2018 training. Two teams were from communities who speak an unwritten MT. The third group was made up of Kannada speakers. Kannada is the official language of Karnataka state with 43.7 million speakers (“2011 Census of India,” 2021). The leaders of the Kannada group were attempting to influence gang members. The Kannada group expanded the focus of my research to how Spoken impacted adults who read the LWC and constitute part of the dominant society. Initially, I assumed all the CAs were working cross-culturally, but when I arrived in India to do the interviews I discovered all three Team Leaders (TLs) were insiders because they each spoke the language of the primary group they were attempting to reach.

This research explores how these LLs experienced the process of creating Spoken content and sharing the content both in their community and beyond their communities.

Questions

I asked the following question in this research: How did the members of three Local Leader Teams working among groups of oral preference learners experience the first year implementing the Spoken process of introducing Scripture in their communities?

The following sub-questions were explored:

1. How was the Spoken process implemented?
2. What challenges and benefits were experienced?
3. What role did mutual respect, relevant topics, interacting with known individuals and oral modes of communication play in implementing the Spoken process?
Significance

In recent history, difficulties experienced introducing new health practices have occurred in the HIV-AIDS epidemic and in the Ebola crisis of 2014 and 2016. In both scenarios, earlier acceptance of new health practices presented by highly literate CAs could have saved many more lives. Progress has been made during the decades of work to diminish the spread of HIV-AIDS. There’s also been an increase the knowledge of how to handle Ebola, but resistance to information from CAs continues to negatively impact many oral communities.

The three examples I described initially were not life-threatening scenarios, but adoption of the CAs’ new ideas could have benefited everyone in those communities. The entire Quichua village could have gained an additional source of income by learning to tan discarded hides and marketing the products. The health of the Lisu community in Thailand may have improved by using latrines. If the Malawian villagers were willing to learn the new ways to produce fertilizer from locally available materials, increased crop yields could have raised the standard of living of several groups. Unfortunately, these new ideas were rejected by most of the oral community.

Frequently, CAs are working across cultures. Communication challenges increase significantly when there are language and cultural differences. When working in communities with an unwritten MT, highly literate CAs may be negatively biased concerning the efficacy of local, oral communication strategies and overly impressed with their scientific knowledge. This research explores a method that validates the communication practices of oral communities and examines principles involved in oral communication. The findings may improve CAs’ ability to adapt to and adopt oral ways
of communication. Where there is clear communication and trust between the CA and the oral community, the acceptance and implementation of new ideas is likely to be more closely aligned with the CA’s vision. In addition, highly literate CAs benefit from the relational forms of learning they experience when working in oral communities. This could inform, expand, and possibly transform decontextualized education practices in the west.

The current COVID crisis highlights the fact that fractured trust between groups in our society impacts the ability of authorities to convince many groups, including the highly literate, to follow recommended guidelines. By experiencing how oral communities prioritize building relationships and mutual collaboration, CAs may also gain understanding of how to build bridges of trust leading to more effective communication in our society. Better communication and increased trust could lead to greater willingness of target audience(s) to consider new sources of information.

**Definitions**

**Change Agent (CA):** A leader who wants to influence others or a group by introducing new ideas or new ways. They are committed to developing relationships of influence.

**Connected Learner:** This term, introduced by Lynn Thigpen (2016), describes adults with “a preference for observing and learning from trusted people in a process similar to socialization” (Abstract, para. 2). The emphasis goes beyond the oral modality. These learners are highly connected to their context and culture. They rely on experienced-based wisdom. They may or may not read, but they would rather learn in a
social context from those they know and trust. This term encompasses both oral learners and oral preference learners (See definitions below).

**Dialogue and discussion:** This is teaching via the Socratic method in contrast to lecture. This method prioritizes discovery learning by comparing new information with lived experience. It employs the use of logic and persuasion to both learn from and influence participants in a social setting. When there is long-term implementation, it fosters respectful debate and develops critical thinking. It is distinct from less interactive methods of instruction such as teaching by lecture, preaching, and asking questions with an expectation of prescribed/known answers.

**Frame of reference:** Referring to “the culture, language life situation, social class, or similar all-embracing setting or context within which one operates” (Kraft, 2000, p. 15). Also referred to as worldview.

**Insider:** Recognized as being a member of the community or group. In groups that have an unwritten mother tongue, fluent usage of the mother tongue keys insider identity. Common experience, such as present or past participation in an activity, may cue identification. Examples: Participation in gang activities; consistently attending the Christian gatherings. Any individual may have many circles of identity, but for smaller communities the insider-outsider dynamics are stronger than what is experienced in the urban setting (See outsider.).

**Mother tongue (MT):** The first language used by the child in her home. It is normally spoken by the child’s mother and in most homes, it is the child’s primary language before attending school.
**Oral learners**: Those who learn best and whose lives are most likely to be transformed when instruction comes in oral forms (Lovejoy, 2008). They prefer to learn through non-textual modes including dialog, observation, teaching connected to real life, via artistically expressive forms (stories, proverbs, songs, and drama), and through participatory experience such as rituals and interactive events (Lovejoy, 2012; Moon, 2012). Their worldview is socially and event-oriented (Box, 2014; Moon 2012).

**Oral communicator**: Someone who relies primarily on spoken and communication forms other than print. Grant Lovejoy says what distinguishes orality “is reliance on spoken communication” (2012, p. 12, emphasis in original). While there are degrees of oral communicators, but relying on spoken communication is a key characteristic. Harry Box calls this a social, event-orientation. Oral communicators have been described in a variety of ways. Ong (1982) described the state of never been exposed to print as primary orality, and secondary orality as a situation where learners can read but rely on the technology of television, radio or the Internet access using a minimal amount of reading for information. Primary orality is uncommon but secondary orality is widespread and increasing (Lovejoy, 2012). Of course, all nonliterates are oral communicators; this includes many whose mother tongue has never been written. Tex Sample calls those who read in limited contexts because their primary learning and socialization is done orally, traditional learners (1994). Many who read are also oral communicators because they rely primarily on spoken modalities, whether in person or through technology, to communicate.

**Oral community**: When communities share an unwritten mother tongue, all communication in that language will be oral. There may be many bilingual literate
members within the group, however, when the mother tongue is the primary vehicle of communication used among community members, the community will be referred to as an oral community.

**Oral communication**: Any form of unwritten communication that is regularly practiced in a community. It may be shared verbally through proverbs, stories, songs, discussions, and interactions. It may include activities such as dance, drumming, observing, gesturing, playing, or fighting. It may involve symbolic artifacts such as totem poles or other objects crafted with special meanings. It will frequently be a mix of any of the above. Communication occurs between individuals and in group activities such as performances, rituals, observances, and celebrations of all kinds. Social interaction is normative.

**Oral preference learner**: Someone who is able to read but prefers to learn orally and often does so in a social context. For example, they do not read books, they go to movies. They access their news through people—by radio, TV, or podcasts. They would rather watch a YouTube demonstration than read a cookbook. They often have Siri/Alexa send written texts they have dictated. They can read, but do so infrequently. Oral preference learners are also referred to as Connected Learners.

**Outsider**: Someone who is recognized as not being part of the group. In groups that have an unwritten mother tongue, inability to communicate in the mother tongue immediately keys outsider identity. When the group uses the state language, other group distinctives cue identity. (Language will cue identity when the group is faced [threatened] with a more dominant language. Example: Use of Kannadiga cues insider identity when
there is a mixed group of Kannada and Hindi speakers and Hindi speakers in India where Hindi speakers are a majority (See insider).

**Preaching:** A unidirectional manner of speaking used to encourage, admonish, teach and/or inform others without an expectation of dialogue or verbal interaction from the recipients during the communication process.

**Scheduled Caste (SC):** Groups identified in the Constitution of India for affirmative action policies. Historically, Scheduled Caste groups were excluded from the Hindu four-caste varna system and treated as pariahs. The groups have also been referred to as “Untouchables.” Since the early 1900’s many of these groups have self-identified as *Dalits*..

**Scheduled Tribes (ST):** Specific groups identified in the Constitution of India for affirmative action policies. Generally, Scheduled Tribes refers to indigenous groups in India who lived in hilly and/or forested areas that were more geographically and socially isolated from the caste-structured Indian society. Most speak a distinct language and have distinctive religious practices. Traditionally, many participated in hunting-gathering-foraging and then bartered some of their products in the larger society until they were disenfranchised from their land by the government or government supported entities.

**Teaching:** Instructing primarily by lecture. When questions are employed, they may be rhetorical or the answers are data the teacher already knows, rather than an honest inquiry about the observations, creative, or analytical thinking on the part of the students/recipient. Students habituated in this kind of instruction generate prescribed answers that are likely to be on a future test.
**Scripture:** When capitalized refers to the combined Old and New Testaments of the Christian Bible. When not capitalized, it refers to the sacred writings of all religions.

**Receptor (R):** One or more individuals who relate to the Change Agent on a regular or semi-regular basis and may be influenced by the Change Agent.

**Target Audience (TA):** A group of Receptors the Change Agent is attempting to influence.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The trustworthiness and validity of this research are limited in the following ways. First, we began the research with some erroneous assumptions. Before we arrived, thought the three TLs were cultural outsiders and the LLs would be insiders. However, all the TLs were seen as insiders by their LLs. Nevertheless, both Kraft (2000) and Steffen (2015) provided advice about cross-cultural communication that was applicable to the all-insider dynamic.

Second, five of the leaders who participated on the Local Leader Teams (LLTs) in 2019 were not able to participate due to illness or work constraints, therefore not all participating members’ insights were gathered. In addition, only six discussion group members were interviewed. While their views were secondary, this low number limited a more holistic understanding of the impact within the three respective communities during the first year of implementation.

Third, cross cultural factors may have impacted the communication process in unrecognized ways. All interviews, except those with the ministry Director, were done with an interpreter translating between Kannada and English. The interviewees were all educated in Kannada and appeared to be fluent, nevertheless, there is a degree of
uncertainty present when communicating across languages and cultures that could have impacted understanding. In addition, the participants may have not been completely frank in their reporting out of a desire to save face personally or to protect the image of their team or their team leader. Their comments may have included bias because of desiring to give a good report to the researchers who were foreigners.

And finally, the research was sent to the Director, the Program Director, and the interpreter, but they did not respond with changes or comments. Due to language limitations, this research could not be reviewed by the other members of the LLTs.

This study is delimited in four ways. First, the research focuses on the experiences of three distinct teams during a 13-month period. Each team was composed six or more LLs who participated in the Spoken process of content creation and sharing designed for oral and oral-preference communities during a 13-month period. Six discussion group members were also interviewed, but this study does not include a full analysis of their perspectives nor any other community members’ perspectives.

In addition, the study evaluates how the Spoken process was implemented after the participants received four days of training two months prior in Mysuru (June 22 through 26, 2018) and Bengaluru (June 29 through July 02, 2018). Due to translation constraints in the trainings, and the absence of follow-up personnel to advise the LLTs, these results do not reflect Spoken Worldwide®’s standard program.

Third, this research employs the Connected Learning Framework as a conceptual lens. The Connected Learning Framework is composed of four constructs: mutual respect, interacting with known individuals, relevance, and oral modes of communication. (See Chapter Four for more detailed descriptions of each construct.)
There may be other cross-cultural dynamics, communication, and education principles that surfaced in the data gathering phase. These are incidental to the focus of the study. This study does not include a comprehensive identification and evaluation of other factors external to these four constructs.

Finally, the analysis and discussion for this research is based on the data from interviews related to three case studies obtained from October 04 to November 02, 2019, and is rooted in the lived experiences shared by the participants. The present-day dynamics of these groups may be different.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Many studies describe oral cultures, but little is written about the possible communication, education, and power dynamics that should be considered by highly literate Change Agents (CAs) introducing new ideas to an oral community. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section examines the relationship between orality and literacy. The second section explores how these orientations may represent opposing values and unexamined biases. The third section focuses on implications for designing training and includes a chapter summary.

Orality and Literacy

This section focuses on the dynamics related to written and spoken communication. Both are intricately related yet undeniably complex. There are three units. In the first, I examine general distinctions by contrasting characteristics of spoken and written communication. In the second unit, I describe the diversity of oral communities and how prioritizing oral communication shapes these societies. Finally, I explicate scholars’ views about characteristics of orality and oral communities.

Comparing Spoken and Written Communication

The same words are used in oral and written speech, so how are they different? The differences are related to how these communication skills are acquired, how and when each form of communication is used, and perceptions about the value of each form in specific contexts.
Oral speech is foundational for all verbal communication. It is primary. Written speech is always secondary, reliant on and connected to the oral (Havelock, 1963; Ong, 1982; Saussure, 1960). According to Saussure (1959), “Writing is a complement to oral speech. It is not a direct transformation” but a highly modified similitude (p. 24).

Oral communication is acquired informally. Noam Chomsky (2000) uses the breadth of grammar evident in a typical three-year old’s speech as an example of how the human mind is innately geared to learn language. Speech acquisition begins through social interactions with family and is practiced in expanding contexts. Learning occurs informally. The most comprehensive and dramatic gains in abilities are in the child’s formative years. While skill levels vary, it is rare for an individual to be unable to communicate orally. In contrast, literacy skills take years of study. This often begins at age five or six with professional instruction in formal institutions of education where students daily spend hours learning and applying explicit rules. Mastery is difficult. Some adults never have the opportunity to become literate. Others return to an oral learning preference after their schooling due to poor acquisition or lack of practice in their daily environment.

Communication through speech has a strong oral-aural component, whereas reading has a strong visual component. Speech is dependent on the memory of those who were present during the speech act, so it is more ephemeral than the written word. Printed words remain on paper. This permanence extends the influence of writing far beyond the spoken word. One person’s ideas, through books, can be in a thousand places at once and continue “speaking” long after the author has died. Discoveries can be built upon by
others. Technology in the previous century has just begun to extend some of this permanence and reach to speech.

Spoken communication is socially centered; it takes two to talk! Communication expert Albert Mehrabian (1980) reports that in face-to-face communication 93 percent of the information pertaining to feelings and attitudes is communicated through facial expressions and paralinguistic forms such as tone, pitch, rate, and quality of voice. Intuitive communication beyond the words is always taking place (Kraft, 2000; Mehrabian, 1980).

Meghan Fidler (2012) notes how participants in a speech event are impacted by sensory inputs such as the smell, the proximity of the other persons, their dress, accompanying responses or reactions of those around them. Much of this information is transmitted implicitly and registers in the receptor intuitively. In this respect, spoken communication demands an immediate response (Haugen, 1966); even when there is no verbal reply, a response occurs and is “read” via nonlinguistic modes of communication such as facial expression and body posture. The social, experiential dynamic has an immediate impact on those involved.

In contrast, reading and writing are frequently done in solitude. The author’s presence does not impact the reader; she may be denoted or completely unknown to the reader (Fidler, 2012; Ong, 1982). The author’s feelings about a subject may be completely hidden to the reader. Neither is the author directly impacted by the audience. Punctuation serves to regain some of the information lost through writing, but the written medium cannot replace the volume of inferential and affective information communicated in face-to-face interactions. Additionally, because written communication
is separated from immediate interaction, it may be more conducive to reflection (Havelock, 1986; Ong, 1969).

The more adept a person becomes mastering the technology of print, the more time she is likely to spend reading alone, in silence. Ong (1982) noted, “Oral communication unites people in groups. Writing and reading are solitary activities that throw the psyche back on itself” (p. 68). The more highly oral communication is valued and utilized by a group, the greater importance the local community has for the oral community member. In contrast, the exposure to a broad variety of content influences the reader to identify with ideas of authors unknown to the nonliterate community members she lives among. In addition, the written material is in the language of another culture, usually the dominant culture. Written communication that does not use the mother tongue (MT) portends to draw the reader away, rather than toward, the social center of her home community.

Spoken discourse is more predictable, flows more freely than written, and often contains more affective verbs. Written communication is less predictable, employs an elaborated code and often includes complex information (Fidler, 2012). Written materials also tend to have more complex vocabulary (Fidler, 2012; Ong, 1982). High levels of information and dense content are not a problem with written communication because the information can be reviewed at any time by the reader.

Linguists have observed that unwritten languages adapt rapidly to changes initiated by the speakers (Cope & Kalantzis, 2006). In comparison, written languages change slowly due to mechanisms of standardization such as educational institutions (Haugen, 1966) and publishing editors.
Oral communication, due to its temporary nature, presents specific challenges in how to store and retrieve important information, particularly for communities without a written language. It is limited to group memory and practices (Fentress & Wickman, 1992). The permanence of writing presents different challenges. The problem is not storing content but how to manage the incredible volume of content for access and retrieval. We will return to the implications of these differences below.

To summarize, spoken communication is primary, learned innately, informally, and initially. It is socially centered and includes information “beyond the words” communicated implicitly and understood both rationally and intuitively. Spoken discourse usually flows freely, is more predictable and demands an immediate response. Storing and retrieving the spoken word is limited to the listeners’ memory.

In contrast, literacy is always secondary, dependent on the spoken word, and more difficult to master. Written communication, which is often dense, content heavy, and complex, loses most of the social and affective information that is part of spoken speech. Writing exposes the reader to ideas and influences beyond their local community and influences audiences through time and space. Writing also allows more opportunity for scrutiny and reflection. Communities relying on written communication must organize voluminous material in order to access it.

These differences between spoken and written communication impact the interactions between groups with an unwritten MT and high literates working among them. The CA’s familiarity with and dependence on written forms can create unforeseen barriers to her ability to communicate effectively with the people of oral communities.
who use oral strategies. Oral strategies may appear to the CA as unsophisticated, inadequate, or inappropriate (Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2012).

Next, we will look at the extensiveness of oral communities as demonstrated by existing language diversity and the role of MT as a vehicle of cultural identity.

The Extent of Oral Communities

*Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-fifth edition* (Eberhard et al., 2022) reports there are 7,097 languages in the world. Only 899 languages have more than 100,000 speakers (Crystal, 1997). This means small populations represent approximately eighty percent of the existing language diversity.

Language is a primary vehicle for cultural identity. Each language encompasses unique ways of thinking and being which represent dramatically diverse experiments in being human (Cope & Kalantzis, 2006). According to Kraft (1996):

Society’s special way of looking at and interpreting reality (worldview), is built into the language. In serving the worldview, each language provides a framework for its people to understand what they are observing and perceiving. It gives them categories in which to organize and classify their everyday experiences. (p. 247)

Language is also the primary means of enculturation and socialization impressed on each community member since infancy. So, language embodies unconscious worldview assumptions about life. Kraft (2000) provides some examples of how different languages prioritize important concepts. The Navajo language is verb oriented focusing on movement, whereas English is noun oriented. The first words Navajo children learn are verbs. When translating the sentence, “God is our Father,” the Navajo equivalent in meaning would be something like “God acts like a father toward me.”

Eskimo languages have at least 23 words for snow. Other languages have no word for snow. Some cultures have completely different languages for men and women. In
contrast, male and female speech in English is limited to specific expressions. For example, a man would not respond by saying, “Oh, that is darling!” (Kraft, 2000, p. 243). The fact that there are over 6,000 small, diverse language groups indicates the importance groups place on maintaining their distinctive identities.

According to Ethnologue (Eberhard et al., 2022), over half of the languages of the world have a writing system but it is unknown how many of these language groups actively use the writing system that was developed. It is probable that few of the approximately six thousand languages with less than one thousand speakers in their group have enough written literature to support vibrant MT literacy within their community. Of the six thousand, certainly half, and likely most, primarily rely on oral communication for in-group relationships.

Bilingualism is also extensive. About half of the world’s population is bilingual (Grossjean, 1982). Ninety-six percent of those who are bilingual speak one of the top 20 written languages (Cope & Kalantzis, 2006). Bilingualism plays an important role. It allows the community to benefit by extending trade and exchanging ideas. Unfortunately, there is little information about the breadth of understanding bilingual individuals possess of their second language. Haugen (1966) contends that bilingualism often operates in the domain of “semi communication” where partial comprehension occurs to the extent needed for successful interaction (p. 927). What may be overlooked by those who prefer to communicate in a dominant, written language is the fact that bilingualism is frequently limited to context. One language may be used for performing arts and cultural matters, another learned in school for business and government interactions, and the MT for
personal and community matters. For many groups the MT is the only appropriate
language for communication with the ancestors.

Bilingualism is also often confused with being bicultural. According to Hofstede
et al. (2010), to fully identify with a second culture, the languages of both cultures need
to be acquired in childhood. Areas of identity related to tastes, private relations, religious
preferences, remain linked to one’s culture. Some groups allow members flexibility to
operate with more than one identity according to different environments such as home,
business or church. Hofstede et al. (2010) contend this also depends on culture:

Individualistic environments such as modern cities, academia, and modern
business allow people to have several identities and to easily change their identity
portfolios. In collectivistic societies, in which most of the world’s population still
lives, one conceives of oneself much more as belonging to a community, whether
this be ethnic, regional, or national, and one’s sense of identity derives mainly
from that group affiliation. (p. 23)

Communities with an unwritten MT are likely to be collectivistic. To address
issues relevant to the entire community, religion, or matters of the heart, communication
in the community’s MT will be understood with the greatest clarity.

According to Anderson and Harrison (2015), most cultures in the world remain
entirely oral. Despite attempts by nations to provide education, a significant percentage of
adults—even speakers of dominant languages—still prefer to learn orally after leaving
the school environment. Grant Lovejoy (2012) substantiates this through multiple,
internationally recognized literacy assessments done in Europe and North America over
the last 15 years revealing that almost 50 percent of the participating adults demonstrated
“basic” or “below basic” literacy skills (p. 130). To emphasize the point, in first world
countries where ten or more years of education is mandatory and paid for by the state,
half of the population demonstrated only basic literacy skills. This means half of the
population in Europe and North America retain a strong oral preference for learning and communicating.

The six thousand groups who communicate daily in a MT that has never been written, by definition, learn orally whenever learning takes place in their language. When a community’s activities and interactions are primarily oral and rely on written communication infrequently, we refer to them as an oral learning community. There may be many literate individuals within the group, but the group retains a strong preference for oral communication.

To recap, most language diversity in the world is represented by small, collectivistic communities maintaining identity through language. Many oral communities rely primarily on oral strategies for their intergroup communication. Even with widespread bilingualism and education in the major world languages, the MT remains the best vehicle for communicating about issues concerning the entire community, religion, or matters of the heart.

In the final unit I will discuss scholars’ views about orality. There are three parts. First, I explain two conflicting theories with respect to orality. Next, I use Walter Ong’s characteristics of orality as a descriptive framework to compare where scholars agree and disagree. In the third part, I show where there is consensus and summarize scholars’ perspectives.

Characteristics of Orality

Orality is a complex topic. Ruth Finnegan (2007), who has written extensively about orality in Africa, comments that orality studies today touch on a multitude of genres including linguistics, performing arts, anthropology, narrative, media studies,
political science, to name just a few! In this first part, we will examine two prominent theories about the role of orality in society.

The Great Divide and the Continuity Theories

The Great Divide Theory posits alphabetic writing as a determining factor in the spread of literacy causing an evolution in human cognition, the rise of Western civilization, and scientific practices. While many scholars contest this view as deterministic, areas where scholars agree with Ong (1982) provide insight regarding oral communities.

Ethnocentric dichotomies characterized social thought during the period of European expansion dividing societies into the we-they categories often described in terms of ‘civilized vs. savage,’ ‘primitive vs. advanced, ‘concrete vs. scientific,’ or ‘oral vs. literate.’ The Great Divide theory reflects this mindset among mid twentieth century scholars expressed in works such as The Savage Mind by Claude Lévi-Strauss (1966), The Gutenberg Galaxy by Marshall McLuhan (1962), and Preface to Plato by Eric Alfred Havelock (1963). These scholars claimed that literacy led to more evolved cognition. They also maintained literate and oral societies hold radically different worldviews. Social and scientific advancements of the Western world were linked to the breakthrough of alphabetic writing in Greece. Walter Ong (1982), a student of McLuhan, reflects this position,

Literacy, as will be seen, is absolutely necessary for the development not only of science but also of history, philosophy, explicative understanding of literature and of any art, and indeed for the explanation of language (including oral speech) itself. (p. 14)

Jack Goody (1977) agrees that new modes of communication were instrumental in changing cognition. The modes were Babylonian writing, followed by easy-to-read
Greek alphabetic writing, and the invention of the printing press. But Goody disagrees with the idea that writing produced extremely opposite worldview orientations in oral and literate societies. He says such binary descriptions are misleading because oral societies also practice characteristics that are attributed to literate societies, such as thinking abstractly, reflectively, and creatively. And conversely, literate groups also demonstrate concrete, non-reflective and formulaic thinking—the same thinking typified by Great Divide theorists as characteristics of oral societies.

Scholars holding to the Continuity Theory claim there are no generalizable consequences of literacy. Continuity scholars see orality and literacy coexisting, co-evolving, and intimately interacting with one another (Cole & Nikolopoulos, 1992; Finnegan, 2007). They insist the interplay of orality and literacy is profoundly affected by context (Finnegan, 2007; Scribner & Cole, 1981).

Ruth Finnegan (2007) studied both highly literate and non-literate Limba narrators. She saw no significant difference in their abilities and performances. While acknowledging literacy may be a necessary precondition for some social advancements, she disagrees that it could ever be the singular cause (1988). Finnegan recognizes an ongoing dynamic between all communication modes which include both oral and literate forms but also encompassing other artistic expressions such as drumming and dance (2007). There is a continual interaction between oral and literate functions in individuals and communities; they coexist, coevolve, and intimately interact with one another (Cole & Nikolopoulos, 1992).

In the next part we will utilize the frameworks of ten characteristics of orality as described by Walter Ong (1982) in Orality and Literacy. While many of his original
conclusions are disputed, his analysis provides a convenient framework to explore the dynamics between societies that have a strong oral preference with those that prioritize reading and writing. We will first analyze the five more controversial characteristics.

Five Contested Characteristics of Orality

Ong recognizes that literacy is built on orality and the relationship between these modes of communication was interrelated and complex (Soukup, 2007). In describing oral practices, he relied primarily on the written research of other scholars. Ong (1982) calls a society that has had no exposure to print a “primary oral culture,” and then comments that this “hardly exists” today but that many cultures, even modern cultures, “preserve much of the mind-set of primary orality” (p. 11). Ong contrasts values and practices of a primary oral group with the values and practices of a literate group resembling upper academia.

Ong describes ten characteristics of orality. He divides the characteristics in two groups. One group of nine he termed the “psychodynamics of orality”—these are the thoughts and expressions used by an oral culture to transmit their traditions, values, identity, and way of life (1982, p. 31). Ong’s nine psychodynamics of orality are the following: 1) additive rather than subordinative (p.36), 2) aggregative rather than analytic (p. 38), 3) close to the human-life world (p. 42), 4) agonistically toned (p. 43), 5) situational rather than abstract (p. 48), 6) redundant or ‘copious’ (p. 39), 7) conservative and traditionalist (p. 40), 8) empathetic and participatory rather than objectively distanced (p. 45), and 9) homeostatic (p. 46). Ong presented one fundamental concept—the power of the spoken word—as a characteristic of orality. To simplify our discussion, from here
on we will refer to the nine psychodynamics and the characteristic regarding the spoken word all as characteristics of orality.

Ong’s research was done primarily through secondary sources. He did little direct field research. In the ensuing decades after *Orality and Literacy* was published, most field researchers disagreed conclusively with his analysis of the first two characteristics.

The first characteristic, “additive rather than subordinative,” refers to the grammatical structure of using “and” to link thoughts. This is a common construction of speech in a casual conversation. Ong notes that modern, written texts use this structure infrequently; sentences containing subordinate clauses are most common. He also gives the example of the repeating phrases of the creation account in Genesis 1:1-5 to describe how oral languages use simpler, “additive rather than subordinative” language structures (1982, p. 36).

According to Harrison (2015), Ong interprets the Genesis passage erroneously by using the Latin rather than the original Hebrew wording. It is also well established that widespread modern languages, like English and Mandarin, continue to simplify as they expand. Linguists note that most spoken languages are *more complex* and diverse than written languages (Chomsky, 2000; Haugen, 1966).

The idea encompasses more than grammar, it also includes formulaic structures, mnemonic patterns, balanced rhythmic patterns, repetitions, antithesis, and alliterations employed to enhance recall. There is evidence of this in studies of classic oral arts by Lord (1986) and Parry (1971). Ong believed oral societies were both characterized and constrained by frequent use of these structures which were necessary to aid retention.
This claim has been contradicted in field investigators among present day oral communities (Chetrit, 2013; Finnegan, 2007; Goody, 2010). Chetrit found the mental processes, patterns and structures used by illiterate women in Morocco similar to those of literate persons. According to Finnegan (2007) oral performance is practiced and sharpened in the same way that written poetry is crafted. Both oral and written art forms use mnemonic and balanced rhythmic patterns. She considers context the primary determination, rather than the mode of communication.

Ong’s second dynamic, “aggregative rather than analytic,” is also related to this formulaic thinking necessary to fix content to memory. Ong believes oral societies accept and employ familiar phrases and epithetic formulas without critiquing them. Their formulary expressions are efficient, memory holders. Ong (1982, p. 39) states: “…analysis—is a high-risk procedure. As Lévi-Strauss has well put it in a summary statement ‘the savage [i.e., oral] mind totalizes’ (1966, p. 245).”

Finnegan (2007), through extensive fieldwork among the largely oral society of Limba-speakers, concludes there is little difference between literate and nonliterate groups. She provides many examples of Limba people being preoccupied with their language and having frequent, extensive, philosophical discussions that demonstrated the same abilities literates have of manipulating abstract concepts.

Scribner and Cole (1981), also working in Africa, claim that the setting is a more determining factor than whether one is oral or literate. They find analytical thinking more closely linked to whether individuals live in a city or village, rather than having or lacking literacy skills. Finnegan also notes how deep reflection is an important part of oral artists’ creative process. There is agreement by all three scholars regarding the
tendency of oral communities to focus on the entire experience of a formal presentation, where written forms are more conducive to dissecting and analyzing particulars in the writing mode.

The next three characteristics are also criticized not so much because these do not exist in oral societies, but for positing the differences as *dichotomous and tied directly to literacy*. These characteristics are: “close to the human life world,” “agonistically toned” and “situational rather than abstract” thinking (Ong, 1982, pp. 42, 43, and 48).

In describing close to the human-life world, Ong illustrates the literate constructs of a list, a table, and a how-to manual as being object focused. He contrasts this with communication in oral societies as being highly relational. For example, in an oral group there is no need for a list because information is never stored independently but embedded in narrative. Also, trades are always learned in a relationship; cooking is learned watching others cook; socialization is a core component even as instruction takes place through observation.

Agonistically toned means life is seen as a violent, physical struggle. Ong provides two examples of agonistically toned communication. They are combative, public name calling and the prevalence of violent, physical struggles in classical oral epics. He notes how highly educated individuals view vituperation as “flatulent, insincere, and comically pretentious.” (p. 45). Ong (1969) also contrasts the graphic, violent battles so common in epic tales with the modern novel that tends to focus more on what is happening in the mind and emotions of the characters.

Continuity scholars contend these differences are more related to the culture of education than evolved cognition (DeVries, 2000; Finnegan, 2007; Scribner & Cole
Some education scholars note one of the failures of modern education is that schooling is far removed from the life world of many students (Dewey, 2013; Lave & Wenger, 1991) especially the students whose home culture is distinctive from the dominant culture (Agnihotri, 2013; Lo Bianco, 2014; Mohanty & Panda, 2016). These scholars contend effective schooling should be more closely linked to the “life world” of the students (Kidwai, 2009; Lo Bianco, 2014; Mallikarjun, 2001).

Another criticism about agonistically toned stories being an oral characteristic is the observation that there is no dearth of violent stories in physical settings in modern cultures. The *Random House unabridged dictionary* (Random House, 2019) lists “striving to overcome in an argument” as the second definition for agonistic. This dynamic is common in academic debates and representative of academic groups even though the physical element is missing.

And finally, Ong states that oral cultures “use concepts in situational and operational frames of references that are minimally abstract” (Ong, 1982, p. 48). For this characteristic, he draws examples from A.R. Luria’s work among Russian peasants done in 1923. The nonliterate Luria interviewed had difficulty relating to syllogistic or inferential reasoning, abstract classification, and saw no purpose in forming definitions for known objects. They preferred situational and operational logic.

Scribner and Cole (1981) in their field research among the Vai of Sierra Leone found the ability to apply abstract thinking was related to context rather than literacy. Students tested well in secondary school but competency to employ syllogistic logic deteriorated to a level near those who had no schooling in most all students within three years of leaving the school environment.
In summary, two of Ong’s characteristics of orality 1) that it is simpler grammatically, and 2) is highly dependent on formulaic elements for memory’s sake, are not supported by scholars who have done extensive fieldwork. The characteristics of being close to the life world, portraying life as a struggle, and favors situational and operational logic are recognized as common in oral communities, but scholars note they are not limited to oral groups. Highly literate groups also demonstrate these characteristics. In addition, oral groups demonstrate characteristics at the opposite end of the spectrum attributed to literacy, such as abstract logic, subtle, introspective presentations, and discussions involving abstract concepts.

In the third part, we will look at the remaining five Ong characteristics of orality where scholars share greater agreement. These include the following: 1) the power of the spoken word, 2) redundancy, 3) a conservative or traditional orientation, 4) empathetic and participatory rather than objectively distanced, 5) homeostasis. We will finish the third part by summarizing the unit, Characteristics of Orality.

**Agreement on Five Characteristics of Oral Communities**

The first area where there is consensus is that highly oral communities maintain a deep respect for the spoken word. The spoken word is seen as dynamic and powerful (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 1970, 2007; Klem, 1982; Ong, 1982). The spoken word originates from a living source and the significance of the individual within the community who speaks, imbues those words with relevant potency (Thompson, 2015).

Oral people believe names also convey power (Ong, 1982) and share them discriminately (Box, 2014). In oral cultures, words have the potential for magical powers (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982). Robin Horton (1967) describes how seriously African oral
cultures take the spoken word. “There is a very general African assumption about the power of words, uttered under appropriate circumstances, to bring into being the events or states they stand for” (p. 157). Oral communities carry a reverence for the spoken word that may be misunderstood or overlooked by the highly educated.

In highly literate cultures, some verbal acts are taken very seriously. One example is when a minister declares a couple, “husband and wife.” But over the centuries, a significant change has taken place. Oral agreements, even when witnessed by many people, must now be written to be considered legally binding by governing institutions. For example, the verbal act of being declared married by an authorized official does not hold up in court if the paperwork was not correctly submitted!

According to Meghan Fidler (2012), social linguists report a significant bias between speech and writing by those who are literate. Source material given verbally is more likely to be perceived as myth or opinion whereas written material is more likely to be considered as history or truth. An example would be a CA viewing his own past as authentic history while treating the oral community’s past as myth or unreliable opinion because it is spoken and not written.

Ong explains the importance of redundancy in oral communities. The temporality of oral utterances requires repetition to keep both the speaker and listener focused on the topic. As described earlier, it is often closer to natural thought than the written word. Repetition is even more important with large audiences where individuals may miss a word or part of the presentation. When done artfully, it also allows the speaker time to mentally prepare for what they will say next without an awkward pause.
Ong (1982) states, “Oral cultures encourage fluency, fulsomeness, volubility. Rhetoricians called this ‘copia’ and it was encouraged for centuries as writing grew to a central place in modern society” (p. 40). He contrasts this with the literate’s preference for brevity. Academic instruction prioritizes writing information in ways recognizably distinct from oral speech. “Good writing” should be more succinct, vary syntax, and use wider vocabulary than casual speech. Because the author is removed from an immediate response of her audience, she can craft complex material without fear of confusing the audience. She knows the reader can visually loop back and review missed or misunderstood parts at any time. Finnegan (2007) does not contest the importance of redundancy but claims that similarly intricate crafting is also a part of the artistic creation taking place in the oral arts.

The third widely acknowledge characteristic of orality is being conservative and traditionalist. Oral societies dedicate considerable time and energy to information management and storage. Traditions are a key element in retaining a group’s information and identity. Ong feels this creates incentives to avoid exploring new ideas and particularly to avoid the burden of having to store them. He acknowledges oral societies demonstrate dynamism and change, but change is likely to be linked to tradition, like adding new elements to an old story, or a new shrine to an existing cosmology (Goody, 1977). Changes of this nature cleave to traditional formulas and “are presented as fitting the traditions of the ancestors” (Ong, 1982, p. 41). Finnegan (2007) reports observing this important connection to tradition among Limba storytellers in Sierra Leone:

The Limba, therefore, recognized the dual nature of literary art: continual creation and re-creation by individuals while at the same time exploiting conventional styles and themes. …As one storyteller summed it up, he was taught ‘by the dead and by my own heart’ (p. 47).
Another way oral communities are conservative and traditional is the way they value elders for their knowledge (Finnegan, 1988; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015). The elders are seen as “irreplaceable storehouses of information about the past” (Goody, 1992, p. 16) and living repositories of wisdom and knowledge (Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2014). They are esteemed both for what they know and for how they live their lives. Elders in an oral community are looking beyond the immediate benefits of a new idea and accessing how change will impact the entire community.

Respect for tradition and high honor given to elders makes oral communities likely to be conservative and traditional in comparison to highly literate groups. In contrast, the academic environment prioritizes critical thinking, so scrutinizing traditions is expected. In the academic setting, this practice neither damages interpersonal relationships nor causes dishonor. Literates from modern social settings are also more accustomed to innovations. Innovation is valued as a potential way to solve problems, increase convenience, or expand access. Jack Mezirow (1991) who studied adults returning to college to enter the workforce observes, “Living in the modern world inherently involves the weakening of traditional authority structures and a marked acceleration of change in the lives of adults” (p. 34).

According to Ong the most reliable and trusted technique for knowing and learning in an oral culture is to share a “close, empathetic, communal identification” with others who know (1982, p. 45). Scholars agree oral groups are characterized as being empathetic and participatory. In oral communities learning takes place in a web of relationships extending socially beyond the tasks being mastered (Thompson, 2015).
Everyone holds a place of value related to their knowledge, experience, and the observed testimony of his or her life.

Continuity Theory scholars, however, disagree with Ong’s portrayal of the oral artist as lacking subjectivity due to being “encased in the communal reaction, the ‘communal soul’” (1982, p. 45). Ong emphasizes the dependency on relationship and interaction as unnecessary in typographic (text-dependent) cultures because the author is unknown to the learner and many forms of learning can be acquired independently. Therefore, independence can be encouraged in literate societies in many ways that would be destabilizing in an oral society. Once again, context plays a role. Most oral communities are small, entailing less than one thousand people. In contrast, the highly literate group is part of a larger, more complex society supporting institutions requiring greater specialization where individualism may flourish.

The last characteristic where there is agreement is the homeostatic tendency—living “very much in the present which keeps itself in equilibrium or homeostasis by sloughing off memories which no longer have present relevance” (Ong, 1982, p. 46). Ong provides two examples. The first is the lack of dictionaries to record the historical progression of word meaning changes. In an oral group, the current, lived meaning is the only meaning a word retains.

The second example is related to maintaining genealogies. Several oral communities contended their verbal genealogical records were more accurate than the written records, but studies revealed discrepancies. The sloughed genealogical information changed gradually in areas no longer considered relevant to the present of the oral communities.
Literate societies have more material to establish historical records in comparison to an oral community. Literates are also confronted with more existing and conflicting perspectives preserved in the written records over time. However, it could be argued that dominant groups in literate societies are involved in a similar homeostatic activity when they write and teach history reflecting their reality while ignoring or silencing conflicting perspectives.

To summarize, the Great Divide theory dichotomizes oral and literate societies, claiming literacy as key to evolving human cognition, the advancement of science and Western nations. Continuity theorists claim this idea is too simplistic. They contend the relationship between orality and literacy is understood best by examining communication practices occurring in specific cultural contexts.

Scholars concur about five of Ong’s ten characteristics of orality. First, oral communities regard the spoken word as dynamic and powerful. In addition, redundancy is important in the oral context; there is a conservative and traditional orientation; empathetic and participatory interaction is normative fostering a strong sense of community; and fifth, there is a focus on present lived experience (homeostasis). In contrast, literate groups—particularly the highly literate—value the written word as more accurate and essential to make contracts legally binding. The written mode of communication favors compact, complex delivery and is frequently accessed alone, in silence. It is better suited for critically scrutinizing detail and a complex train of thought can be permanently captured through writing. Academic groups are more liberal, innovative, and inclined to challenge traditions than groups made up of oral communicators.
The next section explores two learning contexts: oral, community-centered learning, and literate, academic-centered learning.

**Learning as Socialization in an Oral or an Academic Community**

This section addresses some of the social dynamics between orality and literacy and how the learning environment affects the way people learn and the perceptions of others. It is divided into four units. First, I review historical attitude regarding literacy and the nonliterate. Second, I demonstrate extensiveness of an oral learning preference today. Next, I describe differences fostered by oral and literate learning orientations. Fourth, I investigate the perceptions of non-literates living in a literate world.

Hofstede et al. (2010) note education is a powerful source of cultural learning and that “much of people’s social activity is spent maintaining symbolic group ties” (p. 17). We can expect the approximately two decades spent by literates in institutions of formal education will have an effect that differs from the same time oral learners spend learning in their community with little need for the written word. In the first part, we will examine how literacy developed in societies and how that influences dynamics between literate and oral groups in the 21st century.

**Historical Attitudes of the Literate Elite**

Literacy appeared around 3,500 B.C. in Mesopotamia, then arriving in India, China, and Mesoamerica—all agrarian societies. The first records were lists, first in clay tablets and later in stone. Many were related to buying and selling. Cope and Kalantzis (2006) describe these early writings as a tool of control reserved for the elite. They were …a mechanism for maintaining inventories of ownership and wealth, an instrument of state bureaucracy for siphoning off surpluses, a font of religious power that maintains the social order—all instruments for the institutionalization
and maintenance of inequality that mark the end of the relatively egalitarian 
lifeways of first peoples. (p. 28)

Durant (1954), a historian, indicates religion was the primary purpose for the 
earliest writings. Priests wrote to enhance the power of their incantations. The word for 
poetry in Latin meant both verse and charm. The English, German, and Greek terms for 
tale, story and song were related magic spells. He contends sacred usage came first and 
later diverged into the secular roles of poet, orator, and historian. Whether primary 
purposes were financial or religious, what is clear is that this tool was used by those who 
exercised power and were in positions of privilege.

Around 3,200 B.C., the Sumerians developed a more elaborate, abstract writing 
system using symbols to represent sounds. Written communication, previously limited to 
objects, moved incrementally closer to spoken speech. But without vowels or spacing 
between individual words and sentences, the reader still needed to understand the context 
to be able decipher a text. Hebrew writing is an example of a script made up of only 
consonants. By 2,600 B.C. vowels appear. Anyone familiar with the sound-symbol 
relationship could now read without prior knowledge of context. This allowed literacy to 
move beyond commerce, taxation, and religion to include political, literary, and scholarly 
documents (Mark, 2011). Phoenician traders spread literacy across the Mediterranean, 
thus the term “phonetic.” Greeks began referring to it by the names of the first two 
Semitic letters, Alpha and Beta, or the alphabet.

Despite a millennium of alphabetic writing, education among the Greeks was 
primarily oral and exclusive to elite men. In fourth and fifth century BCE, three Greek 
philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, expounded ideas that continue to influence 
Western thinking. Socrates modeled dialectical discourse, and while familiar with
writing, felt writing was inappropriate for instruction due to the lack of verbal interchange. Plato, his student, wrote some of Socrates’ discourses. In *The Republic*, Plato posited society as best ruled by an elite of educated men. He disdained poets as manipulators of feelings, denigrating them to the lowest places in society! Plato followed Socrates’ example by teaching through reasoning and dialog. Aristotle, Plato’s student, contended that poetry, when created artistically, was useful to learn about mankind and to purge the emotions. His compilation of lectures, *Poetics*, is a systematic study on great works of verbal art. He believed poetry, as created by the great tragedians such as Homer, was not unconscious inspiration, but deliberate imitation of an action and of life (Nulle, 1968).

Aristotle was also the founder of the first scientific institute which classified human knowledge into disciplines still used in academic institutions today. His literary criticism influenced western civilization for centuries (Halliwell, 1984; Nulle, 1968). Aristotle developed a formal system for reasoning where validity was determined by structure. An example is the syllogism. He is considered by many as the father of modern science. Several of these Greek ideals prevail in modern western academia: Only the educated can be able rulers, rational logic is higher than other forms of knowing, and knowledge should be obtained through specific academic disciplines.

In first-century Rome, despite centuries of use by the elite in both Greek and Roman society, literacy was still not widely used by the populace (Harris, 1989). Roman literacy was also predominantly male and limited to the senatorial class. In part, this was because writing was expensive. Paper for a one-page letter was $30-35 in today’s value (Johnson, 2016, pp. 32-33). Literacy was also more prevalent in urban settings.
According to Lee Johnson (2016), there was a significant trade in having curses, negative or positive, inscribed on lead or clay tablets at this time; amulets were worn by people from every social stratum. Johnson contends the widespread use of amulets and curse tables indicates that the written word was considered more potent than the spoken word, especially among nonliterate communities. There was a tendency to “endow illegible marking with the power to provoke results that the spoken requests could not produce” (2016, p. 33). Johnson posits the Apostle Paul magnified his authority by communicating in writing to the Christian churches. The length of the epistles made them costly. Additionally, their inaccessibility to the nonliterate believers and the associated power of the written word increased the spiritual power of Paul’s message.

This sense that the written word is more powerful than the spoken word has occurred in other instances where nonliterate communities encounter others “speaking” from the written page. Gledhill et al. (1995) give historical examples of the Cherokee and other Native American populations expressing awe when encountering Europeans reading from a page of print.

Centuries later, education became increasingly tied to the written word. Medieval scholarship was primarily in Latin, a language accessible by reading since no one spoke Latin as a MT (Stock, 1983). Scribes could serve upper class literacy needs but by the 13th century most administrators were literate. Those who were educated, once again limited to men from the upper classes, considered literacy identical with rationality. The Latin term “idiota,” was used for anyone unskilled in Latin (Stock, 1983). However, academic mastery was still proven through oral exams. Oral performance and preaching
were also valued for influencing the illiterate masses, but the educated recognized literacy as an ideologically superior form of communication.

Gradually, the legal, governmental, and educational institutions became increasingly embedded in literate practices. Written forms started replacing longstanding oral institutions such as important agreements being made in public locations and among counsels of elders. Lévi-Strauss (1966) noted the relationship between writing and power.

The one phenomenon which has invariably accompanied it [writing] is the formation of cities and empires: the integration into a political system, that is to say, of a considerable number of individuals, and the distribution of those individuals into hierarchy of cast in classes. Such is, at any rate, the type of development which we find, from Egypt right across to China, at the moment when writing makes its debits: it seems to favor rather the exploitation than the enlightenment of mankind…If my hypothesis is correct, the primary function of writing, as a means of communication, is to facilitate the enslavement of other human beings. (p. 292)

Another effect of literacy was diminishing the authority of the spoken word. Vernacular languages were considered vulgar (Stock, 1983). By the end of the medieval period, written contracts were considered legal where previously a promise in the presence of others sufficed. Those who could read and write were advantaged politically (Harris, 1989). This meant vernaculars, almost always unwritten, were considered inferior modes for academic learning. By association, most unwritten, MT cultures were also considered inferior to the culture of the educated elite.

Political instability also influenced the relationship between literate languages and unwritten vernaculars. According to Haugen (1966) since the Renaissance “‘language’ was associated with the rise of a nation to conscious unity and identity” so the nation state became inextricably linked with language (p. 925). This continues to impact subordinated languages and the cultural groups that speak these unwritten vernaculars.
Previously, communities could function with minimal interference from the ruling group—as long as they paid taxes! But the formation of the nation state required a new loyalty—language loyalty. The national language was almost universally the MT of the ruling class; had a written literature along with standardized written and spoken forms; and held high prestige. Other languages were debased, often referred to as ‘informal,’ ‘rural,’ ‘dialect’ or ‘lower class speech.’ This occurred even when the subordinated language had a well-developed body of written literature. Most subordinated languages became “under-developed” as they were increasingly restricted to limited settings such as the home, neighborhood, and casual affairs (Haugen, 1966).

In the mid-15th century, the accessibility of literacy via the invention of the printing press, along with the fervor of the Protestant revolution to make the Bible available to the common man, caused significant changes. According to Eisenstein (1983), within fifty years there were 1,500 printing establishments and over eight million books in print in Europe. Books became affordable. Protestant groups and churches began literacy classes for all congregants including women and children. Literacy was no longer limited to elite men.

Over succeeding centuries, education became the primary tool of the state to inculcate national identity. Previous loyalties and privileges related to a clan or region marked by language were now extended through the invention of printing, the rise of industry, and especially through educational institutions, to all members of the state. But mastery of the state language, representing the culture of the elite, was essential to partake of these privileges. The state language was employed across multiple ethnic and cultural barriers as the LWC. This increased language uniformity. Many nations use, and
continue to use, literacy as an instrument of citizenship. Cope and Kalantzis (2006) call
this a form of “linguistic assimilation” causing further disenfranchisement to minority
cultures (p. 27). According to Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1994), teaching literate,
imperial/national forms damages most ancestral and primarily oral languages and their
cultures. On the other hand, widespread bilingualism is an indication of how oral
communities tenaciously maintain their identity amid these pressures.

Twentieth century studies brought new perspectives on the implications of orality
and literacy and reinforced values held by literate elites from ancient times. In the early
1900’s Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934), a Russian psychologist, influenced by Luria’s work
with Soviet peasants also studied how children learn. He believed “the literate societies
represented a later point in social evolution than the nonliterate society, and therefore,
should have evolved higher psychological functions” (Quoted in Driscoll, 2005, p. 249).

Many Great Divide scholars came to similar conclusions. Eric Havelock (1963) in
his work, Preface to Plato (1963), contends Greek alphabetic literacy played a pivotal
role in the development of western thought and civilization. Internalizing writing fostered
a new style of thinking—critical thinking—leading to objective argumentation. In The
Muse Learns to Write, Havelock (1986) described the oral poet as limited in creative and
abstract thinking due to his oral orientation. Jack Goody and Ian Watt (1968), posited
orality as always personal, immediately experienced, and therefore more deeply
socialized.

In comparison, writing was less connected with any particular person, place, and
time which allowed it to be more general and abstract. According to Goody, writing
eventually led to new ways of organizing and reorganizing information and reflection,
promoting more abstract thinking and a higher degree of interior order of existence. These Great Divide theorists changed former pejorative terms of “illiterate” and “uneducated” to the more positive phrases “oral” or “orality.” Nevertheless, much of their analysis contains the same bias held through the ages by the educated elite regarding those who are not literate—a connotation that those who have a strong preference for oral learning styles are less developed individuals (Foley, 1986). This historical perspective exposes how academic institutions may encourage an implicit prejudice of literate superiority that is likely to limit highly literate CAs from seeking, recognizing, and utilizing valid modes of familiar oral communication practices in oral communities.

In the next unit we examine how pervasive an oral learning preference is even among adults in literate, first-world countries.

The Extensiveness of an Oral-Social Learning Preference

This unit has five parts. In the first I describe oral learners. Next, I demonstrate the extensiveness of an oral learning preference. Third, I explicate how literacy is often a prerequisite for sharing knowledge. And finally, I show how oral learners are better described by term, Connected Learners.

Defining Oral Learners

Oral learners are those who retain a high reliance on spoken rather than written communication (Lovejoy, 2012; Moon, 2012, 2013a). They are not limited to unwritten MT speaking communities. Many people who speak the LWC are also oral learners. It is useful to describe oral learners by dividing them into two groups. The first group is made up of those who do not read. Some never had the opportunity to learn to read, as is the
situation for many women and for the abject poor. This group also includes all the mono-
lingual speakers of unwritten languages.

The second group can read, but after leaving school they rarely access a text for
learning for a variety of reasons. These oral learners may not read well due to
unaddressed learning disabilities, erratic, or few years of schooling, or because they
received poor instruction. After leaving school, they may not have access to written
material due to poverty, geographic isolation, or choice. This group also includes those
who learned to read in school but returned to jobs and/or communities where reading was
not valued so their skills atrophied. Nasution found over half of the literates who returned
to nonliterate communities relapsed to illiterate status within two years (in Klem, 1982).
Sample (1994) noted there are many communities in the United States where literacy was
used in a very limited manner, usually at work, but faith, traditions and most all other
communication was transmitted orally and socially. He called this “traditional orality.”
Traditionally oral groups think in stories and relationships; rely on memorization; prefer
learning through mentoring or apprenticeship; focus on the concrete and practical life;
use empathetic and relational morality; gather frequently; and tend to work through
resistance and subversion.

There is an interesting subset of literate learners who also gravitate toward the
oral side of the spectrum called “secondary oral learners.” Secondary oral learners are
those who rely on technology where they can access primarily oral and visual forms of
communication (Lovejoy, 2012; Moon, 2012; Ong, 1982). With the increased access to
audio and visual instruction through the Internet, there is a noted shift toward orality
among younger generations including those who are college-educated (Lovejoy, 2012;
Moon, 2012). Those secondary oral learners who practice minimal literacy skills are also oral learners.

**Literacy Statistics and the Extent of an Oral Learning Preference**

So, what do we mean by literacy? Traditionally, literacy has meant the ability to read and write. Modern definitions often include the ability to use numbers, technology, and symbols systems of the dominant culture (Literacy, 2022). Since 1946 the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has fostered global literacy. In 2005, a panel of experts published this definition:

> Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning in enabling individuals to achieve his or her goals, develop his or her knowledge and potential, and participate fully in community and wider society. (UNESCO, 2005, p. 21)

But determining the extensiveness of literacy in the world is difficult. Despite UNESCO’s attempt to bring clarity to the task, one problem is the wide range of definitions of what it means to be literate or illiterate by those who gather census data. For example, in Malawi anyone who has not attended school is considered illiterate even if they know how to read and write. In contrast, in Belize anyone not completing seven years of schooling is considered illiterate.

Another problem is how literacy statistics are gathered. Very few literacy surveys actually test for literacy. The 2004 UNESCO reports Bolivia, Ecuador and Burkina Faso counted as literate all those who give a simple “yes/no” response to the question whether they are literate. In Malaysia, anyone over the age of ten who has ever attended school is counted as literate (Lovejoy, 2008). Literacy statistics rarely account for reversion (Klem, 1982). These wide discrepancies are likely to inflate statistics about literacy.
There have been extensive surveys using actual tests in the United States and Europe. The literacy tests taken in 1993 and later in 2003 by the United States Department Education showed little change in that 13-year span. About 15% of the population of the USA is illiterate and another 30% is at the basic level. Appendix A includes three graphs. Two compare the scores for both years; the third highlights the scores for literacy from the prose tests. Basic literacy is also termed “functional illiteracy,” meaning this group, although able to read, does not have enough reading competency to work in a job that requires literacy skills. The International Adult Literacy Survey, also made up of actual reading and math tests (not self-reporting literacy), showed similar results in many other European countries. Adults who are not functionally literate retain a strong oral preference for learning regardless of the number of years of schooling. Just over half, around 55%, in the United States are functionally literate and those who are highly literate represent only 14% of the population. Grant Lovejoy (2012) estimates that eighty percent of the world population have a strong oral learning preference. This means most of the world learns best using familiar oral strategies.

**Literacy, the Prerequisite for Learning**

Even though almost half of the US population and a majority of the world population demonstrate a preference for learning orally, oral learners are rarely included when training is designed. Training is predominantly designed by those who are highly educated and are likely to create materials in the way they have been taught during their extensive years of schooling in an academic setting. It is not uncommon for literate CAs to be completely unaware of the ways communities employ a variety of oral
communication strategies they have effectively used to teach their culture, skills, and practices over centuries.

Many UNESCO educational reports (UNESCO, 2005; UNESCO, 2013; UNESCO, 2014) consider global literacy as the first step in basic adult education. According to Thompson (2015), there is little consensus on how to teach nonliterate adult learners apart from literacy. UNESCO continues equipping teachers to begin training adults to master literacy skills, before considering teaching other topics (Thompson, 2015). Demanding literacy acquisition before other instruction presents an impossible hurdle for those who are monolingual and not fluent in the dominant language of education; adults who have never been to school; and for the large number who are counted “literate” but have poor literacy skills. Critical topics are often left unaddressed until literacy is acquired, or poorly addressed through literate modes that communicate to only a minority of the community members.

Literacy programs have also been used by a dominant group to reject and subordinate other cultures. Klem (1982) describes a predominant attitude held by Christian mission groups during a century of activity as seeing African cultures too evil to be redeemed! They prioritized education in order to extract the children and culturally indoctrinate them through years of schooling. Western education, designed for a cash economy and larger national and international communities conflicted with the small-scale, oral societies and their strong group identification. Klem (1982) recognized community identity as the central issue:

…it is more constructive to view the perseverance of oral communicational system not as a retreat from literacy or resistance to literacy, but as an indication of the vitality of an indigenous communicational system that lies at the heart of African culture. Which communicational system a society employs is very much a
matter of cultural identity, a matter of choosing which communicational community one wants to belong to (p. 160).

A common misconception remained among adults that they could not become a Christian if they could not read. Klem (1977, 1982) contended there would be a greater likelihood of acceptance of the Christian message if it was delivered in an indigenous manner using local media, such as ceremony, and local style, which included expression through local African oral art.

**Oral Learners Are Connected Learners**

Ong’s classic, *Orality and Literacy*, created a major impact due to his extensive description of orality and his appreciation for oral cultures. The term “orality” was a positive framing of what many scholars were previously describing as “primitive,” “native,” and “savage” (Lévy-Bruhl, 1923; Levi-Strauss, 1966; Lord, 1986). Oral communication is primary and therefore operating in every society. But when highly oral groups interact with highly literate groups it always involves a social hierarchy where the literates are dominant.

I chose to begin with the terms orality and oral learners because they are familiar in academic literature but Lynn Thigpen’s definitions with respect to primary and secondary orality are more realistic than Ong’s. Thigpen (2016) defines primary orality as “an identity in which indigenous knowledge is learned through holistic and relational (or connected) means,” and secondary orality as “a preference in which global knowledge is learned through holistic and integrated connections, with a preference for oral, visual and digital communication.” (p. 194)

She observes that adults with limited formal education learn socially not just orally, so she believes that “connected-learning” best describes their oral, visual, social,
and holistic approach which is centered in relationships with others (p. 7). I, too, recognize that the social aspect is of primary importance for these learners, therefore, for the remainder of this research I will refer to those with a strong preference for learning in non-textual modalities using the terms “oral learners,” “oral preference learners,” and “Connected Learners,” synonymously.

To review this part, oral learners retain a high reliance on spoken rather than written communication; they can also be called Connected Learners. Literacy statistics are misleading because they count as literate a large percentage who remain oral preference learners. Unfortunately, there has been little research regarding the way social learners learn most effectively. Since training and education is designed by the highly literate and literacy is often assumed or prioritized, most of the population in oral communities may be marginalized or important matters not addressed. Oral communities may reject the message that the CA presents, not because of content, but because literate style and modes of delivery are perceived as foreign. In addition, the large number of social learners who make up all societies continue to seek oral modalities such as radio, TV and YouTube and direct social action to access learning. This is important information for the literate communicator who desires to maximize his or her impact on adult learners.

In this third unit we will examine some differences that arise when different modalities, oral or written are used for communication and instruction.

Oral Preference and Text Preference Learning Orientations

Another term for literate preference learning is text preference learning. What differences can we expect to find between oral preference learners and text preference
learners? Jay Moon (2012) makes several comparisons. In the categories of dialogue, oral art and participation, the oral preference learner is more likely to participate in groups where he can discuss or interact with the presenter and others. He appreciates oral art forms that may include stories, songs, proverbs, dance, drama, music, or a combination of these. Participation can range from observing to full engagement of every person present. He is aware of, identifies with, and is impacted by those who are present. Social interaction and group identity are more important to him than meeting his personal needs. He usually learns with others and from others. He prefers to learn from community members he knows. He will judge the value of the instruction as much for the mentor’s character as for their expertise (Box, 2014; Thompson, 2014). He expects to reciprocate in the relationships (Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2014).

In contrast, the literate learner in an academic setting most frequently learns alone by reading texts and often communicates one-to-one answering questions from the teacher or text. When responding in writing, she has more time to reflect on what is presented and to compose a reply. Presentations are frequently lectures where she is expected to take notes, or in the case of artistic performances, she listens quietly. She is more likely to check validity through reasoning and comparing information from other literate sources (Moon, 2012). It is important that she knows how to defend her ideas individually substantiated by writings of subject experts she does not know. She proves her competence through written exams. When she “knows” something, often it is not because she retains the information in memory, but rather that she knows how to access the information.
In the categories of experience and holism, the one with an oral preference learns best when teaching is connected to real events and when it is relevant to the challenges occurring in their life. His holistic orientation means he will view matters in the totality of their context including all involved and prioritizing his community. He prefers to learn from individuals he knows or who have the approval of those recognized as wise in his community (Moon, 2012).

The highly literate more frequently views matters analytically and abstractly by examining, comparing, and classifying the particulars. Meaning is in the words, so definitions are important (Finnegan, 1970). Her academic learning rarely comes from anyone she knows personally. Little of what she learns in school is relevant to her daily life outside of academia, but she hopes it may enable her to master subsequent classes.

For the Connected Learner, when a story is presented, the story is the message. He accepts new stories depending on his relationship to the one telling the story and the presentation style (Klem, 1982). He intuitively applies narrative logic to evaluate the coherence and fidelity of the stories he hears; he compares them to his own experience. (Fisher, 2009)

For the literate learner, stories may occasionally be used as examples or illustrations of principles (Moon, 2012), but they are never the primary vehicle of life lessons. In fact, stories are somewhat suspect because their emotional appeal can sway the more reliable, logical approach to making decisions. She has been taught to look for rhetorical devices. She practices applying rules of technical and propositional logic that she learned in school (Fisher, 2009; Steffen, 2022).
With respect to mnemonics, the oral learner appreciates sound and thrives on repetition, whether it appears in songs, stories, familiar rhythms, or proverbs. He enjoys participating in rituals and using symbols (Moon, 2012). He often understands messages conveyed implicitly. Nonverbal communication is just as important as verbal. There are over 3,000 ideophones in African languages (Welmers, 1973). Experiencing the event in community is satisfying on multiple levels—physically, emotionally, intellectually, and/or spiritually. Rich sensorium input and repetition aid recall.

In comparison, the text-oriented learner appreciates oral arts and music as entertainment, but not as a significant mode for learning or communicating knowledge. When learning, she values brevity. She is comfortable tackling complex thoughts because she can always review the text if something is misunderstood. She is likely to be bored by repetition and with written speech when structured too closely to spoken speech. She is less preoccupied with storing what is learned in memory because categorizing the information enables her to retrieve a wide variety of written information for further scrutiny (Moon, 2012).

Oral preference learners have a strong event orientation (Box, 2014). Their appreciation for a variety of oral art forms and for participation makes learning experiential, relevant, more intuitive, and highly social. The need for each members’ expertise and participation requires harmonious relationships and greater interdependence. This results in a strong communal orientation (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2014). In the academic learning environment, the text-preference learner spends most of her time learning in isolation. Critical thinking skills are often practiced using abstract examples. Unknown subject experts are essential for verifying truth. This
results in a more individualistic orientation, dependency on literacy, and valuing abstract, logical thinking.

Those who live in oral communities are aware of literacy and its power. This fourth unit examines the nonliterate perspective.

**Nonliterate’s Perception of Living in a Literate Society**

Thompson (2015) sheds light on some of the perceptions of the adults living in oral cultures. She observes, “Nonliterate adults are aware they live in a literate world.” While they admire the knowledge and access to knowledge of literates (Cole & Nicolopoulous, 1992; Thompson, 2015) and recognize literacy can improve both social and financial standing, they also feel looked down upon by literates, many of whom equate illiteracy with manual labor (Rao, 1993). Nonliterate realize their ways of knowing and traditions are not respected; they are made to feel inferior socially and intellectually (Levine et al., 2012; Rao, 1993; Thompson, 2015). Illiteracy leaves them at a disadvantage when competing for jobs. Spratt (1992) observed that illiterate parents felt excluded from much of the discourse taking place in their children’s school. Thigpen (2016) discovered that nonliterate struggled with a “strong sense of worthlessness” and were frequently “stuck in a cycle of perpetual shame” because their inability to read (p. 118).

Researchers also discovered characteristics preferred by nonliterate adults. Adults living in oral cultures value their strong sense of community. They feel they are part of a more egalitarian society evidenced by their interdependence on one another (Ong 1982; Rao, 1993). Brand, an anthropologist, notes how this communal identity was demonstrated among the Bambara of Mali, “Women and men conceived of themselves as
indivisible parts of a larger whole, not as individuals, but as persons in connection with others” (2001, p. 4). Teaching and learning are embedded in community relationships where everyone is known and has a part (Thompson, 2014). They prefer oral modes of communication including oral virtuosity, verbal creativity, and eloquence (Scribner & Cole, 1981; Ong, 1982). Participatory ceremonies and celebrations combining multiple art forms such as story, song, dance, music, and poetry, fire the imagination enabling them to relive the story experience (Klem, 1982). Nonliterate adults also see themselves as more willing to control themselves for the harmony of the group (Draper, 2003) and as more tolerant of pain and discomfort than literates (Rao, 1993). Rao (1993), who researched interviewed 187 nonliterates in the urban setting of Delhi, noted however that they were keenly aware of their dependency on literates. They felt that literates had better memories and were more influential with the gods.

Nonliterate adults recognize the power of literacy for gaining knowledge and financial advancement, but they also feel they and their customs are disrespected by literates. They express a strong sense of identity with their community and culture and see their oral society as more interdependent, egalitarian, self-controlled, and enriching in expressive, oral communication.

**Implications and Summary**

In the first unit of this final section, I explain how the previous information can inform how learning is designed. Then I summarize the chapter in the second unit.

**Implications of How Learning Is Designed**

Communities with an unwritten MT use oral communicational strategies. Oral learning strategies prioritize the spoken word delivered in culturally distinctive mediums
such as ceremonies, events, or one-to-one instruction, and incorporated through multiple
genres like story, song, music, poetry, proverbs, drama, dance and/or art. Messages are
communicated both explicitly and implicitly including ideophones and nonverbal
discourse read intuitively by the participants. Participation is normative. Learning
involves socially interdependent relationship building where character is as important as
expertise. Oral communities are conservative, valuing traditions, and the role of elders.
Repetition and mnemonics aid recall. Learning is relevant, frequently related to the
harmony and wellbeing of the whole community.

Communities that prioritize literacy employ oral communication but prefer
written communicational strategies for instruction. This is normally done in the LWC in
formal institutions separated from daily adult life. Learners focus on reading, writing, and
other academically defined disciplines. Primacy is given to the historical perspective and
cultural values of the dominant group along with national identity. Text-preference
learners can also access voluminous ideas and perspectives beyond their community of
origin through books and the Internet. Reading, usually done in isolation, allows more
time for reflection. Literate material is better suited to convey dense, complex ideas, and
to in-depth investigation and comparison of particulars.

Academic institutions value analytical thinking: abstract, logical reasoning is
considered a higher cognitive process than intuitive and narrative approaches. By training
students to be critical thinkers, they encourage challenging traditions and creating
innovation. These institutions prepare technical specialists to address the problems facing
modern populaces and nation states. Literate learning strategies foster an individualistic
orientation that is objectively distanced from the author and material studied, but the
learner also becomes highly dependent on literacy to function. Through institutions of education, the attitudes of elite groups over the centuries have influenced many who are highly literate with a prejudice against groups who prefer oral communication. Oral communities are often perceived as primitive, underdeveloped, and less cognitively evolved (Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015).

Oral communities may reject messages presented in literate forms and formats not because of the content, but because they interpret the delivery as foreign. Considering this, the CA working in oral communities should avoid prioritizing literacy and depending on literate modes of communication. Instead, she should identify and adopt communication practices familiar to the oral group to ensure clear communication of her message. Respecting traditions and developing relationships with community elders are important steps to establish credibility. Learning the MT of the oral community is ideal. Where this is not possible, it is important she takes extended time to develop clear communication with bilingual interpreters. She should establish strong relationships with key group insiders who can function as essential guides to understanding the group’s culture and distinctive oral communication practices. On the other hand, there are circumstances where oral cultures esteem the written word as more powerful than the spoken word. The CA needs to understand when such a context would favor communicating using text.

Chapter Two Summary

Orality and literacy are linked and interrelated. Communication that occurs person to person is highly social, so information that is communicated affectively and intuitively is mostly lost in written modalities. In contrast, literate communications are often
accessed in solitude. But written communication is permanent. This allows greater opportunity for reflection, storage, retrieval, and dense, complex thought.

Five of Ong’s characteristics of orality that scholars concur operate in highly oral communities are the following: The dynamism of the spoken word; an appreciation for redundancy; a conservative and traditional orientation; empathetic and participatory interaction that fosters a strong sense of community; and a focus on present, lived experience.

Oral communities are worldwide. There are about six thousand diverse expressions of worldview each which identifies culturally through a distinct MT. Many of these communities are relatively small with a population of less than 1,000. There are usually members who are bilingual and educated in the LWC. Nevertheless, the MT is the best vehicle for communicating issues concerning the entire community, religion, or matters of the heart.

In addition to speakers of an unwritten MT, most adults worldwide still retain an oral learning preference. The high percentage of Connected Learners in modern, first-world countries should be noted by CAs working in the national language. Employing oral practices may increase effective communication and retention of instruction with these individuals.

The differences between the spoken and written communication, between the characteristics of orality and literacy, between oral-preference and text-preference educational environments can cause significant communication barriers for literates working among oral communities. An awareness of these differences, the historical connotations, and the recognition of the foundational nature of oral communication can
help CAs appreciate the importance of using oral strategies and the MT in oral communities.
CHAPTER THREE: THE INDIA CONTEXT

This research took place in the state of Karnataka located in southern India. It is difficult to describe a nation that encompasses so many contrasts. One idiom says, “Whatever you have heard about India is true—somewhere!” Unless the reader has personal experience in India and caste-based societies, I recommend reading the entire chapter to adequately understand the context. For those who are familiar with India, its linguistic diversity, and the ways in which it differs from American culture, the first section (Chapter Summary) and the last section (Representative Leader Profiles) may be sufficient information.

This chapter is divided into eight sections. Section One is the chapter summary. In the second section, I explicate cultural differences between India and the USA. In the third section, I describe contrasts within modern India. In the fourth section, I explain Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) in India. In the fifth section, I explore India’s complex language environment. In Section Six, I describe the Kannadiga team. In Section Seven, I explain evangelicals because this is a common bond among the interviewed leaders. Finally, in the last section, I present leader profiles representing the three cases in this study.

Chapter Summary

India is fascinatingly complex and diverse; contrasts abound! India, recognized as a global power, may soon pass China in population, but has one third the land mass (China and the USA are approximately equal in size). This research took place 12 miles
from the center of a megacity, Bengaluru, but basic water and electric services needed to be supplemented by our hotel. Self-governing communities and a backlogged justice system result in the coexistence of societies living in modern megacities and villages living in semi-feudal conditions less than twenty miles apart.

Major differences between the USA and India are explained utilizing Hofstede’s (1980) four dimensions of culture. He describes fundamental mindsets (worldviews) characteristic of nations using four dimensions: Individualism, Power Distance, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance. Over 40 years of research demonstrated that these dimensions remained consistent over time (Hofstede et al., 2010).

When comparing the USA and India, two of the four dimensions are similar—Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance. In the dimensions of Individualism and Power Distance, the two countries are at opposite ends of the spectrum. India, like most of the populations worldwide, is collectivistic, whereas the USA is individualistic. Societies that are collectivistic prioritize the needs of the group are over those of the individual and identity is connected to one’s group. Hofstede et al. (2010) place India lower than midline on the Individualism index (IDV). This manifests as prioritizing one’s caste and minimizing personal rights and needs. In comparison, the USA is listed as the highest nation on the IDV, fostering personal ambition and achievement. The second difference is seen on the Power Distance index (PDI) (Hofstede, 1980). India is high compared with the USA, which is slightly lower than midline in the PDI. This means there is greater tolerance in India for inequality in the society and greater fear of offending one’s superior. The western worker is more conversant with authority and more likely to be involved in decision-making. In the same work scenario, the Indian shows loyalty to their
superior through unquestioning obedience (Hofstede, 1980). The characteristics derived from opposing values—India with high PDI and low IDV and the USA with low PDI and high IDV, clarify some dynamics in the research proceedings and findings. For example, two of the team leaders were highly concerned with appearing to be compliant in implementing the method. As investigators, we were not so concerned with compliance as we wanted to understand their context and gain their insights about when the method might need to be modified. These differences in cultural perspectives were a factor in this research.

Historically, India is heritage of one of the oldest known civilizations. Multiple empires have risen and fallen. Some rulers instituted checks to minimize abuses of the peasantry, while others, culminating with the British, extracted resources with little regard for the impoverished masses. India’s history of rich rulers and masses of poor farmers is another explanation for the great inequalities that exist there. Hinduism, with its value of purity and aversion to polluting influences defined by sacred texts stratifies Indian society into a strict hierarchy of castes and outcastes. Four thousand proscribed castes determine immutable roles, including occupation and relative purity from birth. In the 21st century, two groups of outcasts, the “Untouchables” (now called Dalits), or Scheduled Caste (SC), and native groups called Scheduled Tribes (ST), continue to occupy the lowest positions of Indian society. The country’s Constitution, ratified in 1950, includes many elements of affirmative action designed to address historic injustices suffered by these groups. Implementation remains a significant challenge. Nevertheless, during the 70 years since independence from Britain, education and the democratic process have provided inroads of progress elevating many SCs and STs. Of the three
groups participating in this research, the Madiga are an SC and the Hakkipikki are a ST. The Kannadiga group is a mix. They function using the LWC, Kannada and include high caste, SC, and ST members.

Another aspect of India is its incredible linguistic diversity. The 2001 Census returned over 6,600 mother tongues (MTs). Bi/multilingualism is common in the urban setting. But being bilingual should not be confused with proficiency. Usually, it indicates the ability to communicate in one or two registers such as greetings, or vocabulary sufficient to trade. When working with groups with an unwritten MT, communicating in the MT is a powerful way to identify with the group’s culture and communicate one’s message. The importance of group identity tied to an unwritten MT may be a new concept for the western reader coming from the monolingual environment of the USA which has far less ethnic and religious diversity as a nation. Language is a key factor in this research because two of the groups speak an unwritten MT. The average leader spoke five languages. Even though most claimed they knew English, of the 18, only the Director could carry on a conversation in English.

In the next section, I will explicate similarities and differences between worldviews seen through the lens of Hofstede’s (1980) four dimensions of culture.

**Cultural Differences: Collectivism and Perceptions of Power**

Those who live in a foreign country for a year or more need no convincing that different countries have distinct worldviews; differences are more profound and more encompassing than the political, religious, or ideological differences that divide citizens within a nation. People often link certain characteristics to regions. For example, I miss the open-hearted warmth expressed by Latinos after living in Ecuador.
With over 40 years of research on international companies, Geert Hofstede (1980) and Hofstede et al. (2010) have quantitatively documented the validity of characterizing people within a nation as sharing common values. Hofstede (1980) defines culture at the national level as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another” (pp. 11 and 25). This includes both subjective elements such as values, ideas, and symbolic-meaningful systems, and objective elements such as artifacts such as tools, art, the shape of houses and temples, along with other material items.

In 1970, Hofstede surveyed 116,000 employees of International Business Machines (IBM), a company with offices in 40 nations, by operationalizing both values as desired and values as the desirable using four dimensions: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism, and Masculinity. It is significant that the value clusters used to describe the culture of these 40 nations remained consistent over decades. Cultures and Organizations (Hofstede et al., 2010), lists over four hundred confirming correlations from other independent studies. In addition, they compare results with six studies of groups not related to IBM. Each study spans six to 32 countries. Correlations were either identical or the same in three out of four dimensions. The authors note:

A striking fact of the various validations is that correlations do not tend to become weaker over time. The IBM national dimension scores (or at least their relative positions) have remained as valid in the year 2010 as they were around 1970 indicating that they describe relatively enduring aspects of these countries’ scores. (p. 39)

The four dimensions—Individualism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity—are indexed on a 100-point scale. The profile of a country’s culture can be understood by looking at where the score lands on each index. Table 3.1 shows how
India and the USA compare on the index. We will focus primarily on the two dimensions where the countries differ.

Table 3.1 Comparing Dimensions of Indian and USA Culture (Hofstede, 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Dimensions of Culture</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Individualism index (IDV) describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society” (Hofstede, 1980, p.213). It is often juxtaposed with collectivism. The USA has the highest IDV of all nations whereas India is just below the midline. High IDV nations emphasize use of the first-person pronoun, “I,” whereas this pronoun doesn’t exist in groups with a low IDV. In high IDV societies relationships are voluntary. Identity is more fluid and can flex with a broad range of associations and roles. In contrast, in collectivist societies friendships are predetermined by one’s family or group membership. There is a strong in-group cohesion with an emphasis on maintaining harmony and good relationships within one’s group (Hofstede et al., 2010). Collective societies assume that maintaining the group’s wellbeing is the best guarantee for the individual’s wellbeing (Hofstede, 1980). In collectivist cultures, the individual is not internally directed but is controlled primarily by the need to not lose face. “Face…is lost when the individual, either through his action or that of people closely related to him, fails to meet essential requirements placed upon him by virtue of the social position he occupies” (Ho, 1976, cited by Hofstede, 1980, p. 216). For example, when I ask for directions, as one coming from a high IDV culture, I don’t mind if the person responding tells me they do not know the location of my destination. In fact,
I am thankful for this straight-forward answer. But the individual responding from a low IDV culture (collectivistic) would respond positively *even if they did not know the location*. They answer this way to save face (meeting my requirement for information) and to respond positively giving me an answer close to my expectations. Some of the characteristics of orality are the same as low IDV cultural values. For example, members will prioritize harmonious intergroup relations in collectivist groups. These groups are likely to be more conservative and traditional. The opinion of the elders will be highly regarded. Working with known individuals will also be important, so relationships will underscore credibility.

Power Distance index (PDI) is a measure of inequality in society manifested in areas of prestige, wealth, and power. It measures the two-way relationship between superior and subordinates. “The power distance between a boss B and a subordinate S in a hierarchy is the difference between the extent to which B can determine the behavior of S and the extent to which S can determine the behavior of B.” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 99). High PDI cultures demonstrate a greater respect for authority and respect is shown through obedience to authority. In high PDI societies, power is a zero-sum entity; one can only gain power by taking it from someone else. In low PDI countries, power is more related to a person’s role; there is greater emphasis on collaboration, and less fear of approaching authority. India scored in the top five of the forty countries surveyed in the question regarding “employees afraid” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 101). In comparison, the USA

---

2 The first time this happened, I thought the respondent was rude and purposely gave me wrong directions. However, when this happened multiple times, I learned not to act on a single suggestion but to continue asking until three people gave me a consistent answer. Twice the driver I asked detoured from their route to personally lead me to the location. Once, it was the public bus driver, and not one passenger complained about the detour!
was below midline in this index (Table 3.1, p. 65). A senior executive who had a PhD from a prestigious American university adjusting back to Indian culture described it this way:

What is most important for me, and my department is not what I do or achieve for the company, but whether the Master’s (i.e., an owner of the firm) favor is bestowed on me…This I have achieved by saying “yes” to everything the Master says or does…[T]o contradict him is to look for another job…[I] left my freedom of thought in Boston (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 306).

The caste system is also a clear example of a high PDI. The effect of the high PDI orientation can be seen when Indian Christians and Muslims, religions that advocate a brotherhood of believers, acquiesce to caste practices.

The next two indices will be defined briefly because India and the USA score very closely with only a six-point difference on the indices. Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) measures the norm for (in)tolerance of ambiguity. Lower tolerance on a national level is indicated by tendencies of rigidity, dogmatism, intolerance of different opinions, traditionalism, racism, superstition, and ethnocentrism. Higher tolerance would be a norm for dependence on authority (Hofstede, 1980). Masculinity (MAS) measures the dynamic (or lack) of males taking an assertive role and females taking a nurturing role. The following statements conceptualize high masculine-value environments versus high feminine-value environments. High MAS is characterized by a greater focus on earnings and challenges; employees “live to work.” In contrast, high femininity, or low MAS, is demonstrated by greater concern with “life satisfaction” over “job satisfaction;” employees “work to live” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 285). Details of how MAS was developed is beyond the scope of this paper.
Hofstede also recognized significant correlations by pairing some of the four dimensions. India and the USA both lie in the quadrant of low UAI and high MAS which is characterized as “high risk takers.” People are commonly motivated by “personal, individual success, in the form of wealth, recognition, and ‘self-actualization’” (Hofstede, 1980, pp. 324 and 376). Interestingly, the entire low-UAI/high-MAS quadrant is filled with the Anglo countries and former U.K. or USA colonies. In contrast, all the Scandinavian countries are in the low UAI and low MAS quadrant. They are known for their emphasis on belongingness as well as achievement. Japan and Germany are in the opposing quadrant from India and the USA, (high UAI and low MAS), characterized by valuing both security and esteem (Hofstede et al., 2010).

The IBM survey reflected attitudes of the employees, most of whom came from the middle or upper classes in the countries surveyed. However, multiple other studies resulted in correlating the data and included workers from lower classes. Sometimes societies maintain unintegrated, “pariah” groups. In India, both the Dalits and many of the Scheduled Tribes fall into this category. Hofstede comments, “In the case of pariahs, the inequality is total.” (1980, p. 96) Hofstede et al. (2010) noted that lower classes within a nation moved even further in the direction of a higher PDI and lower IDV than their country norm.

To recap this section, I have shown how nations have distinctive cultures. The national environment creates mental programming that shapes common values and manifests them in ways distinctive from other nations. India is like the USA in the dimensions of Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance. India and the USA differ in the dimensions related to Independence and Power Distance. Indian culture is slightly below
midline IDV, whereas the USA is higher IDV than any of the other 40 nations. To a greater degree than Americans, Indians prioritize the good of the group over that of the individual. Saving face is a greater motivational factor than individual recognition or achievement. Also, India is distinctive from the USA in accepting inequalities in society as normative; this high PDI is reflected partially by India’s highly stratified society where the tribes and Dalit groups continue to suffer extensive marginalization and injustice. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the lower socioeconomic level of the tribal and Dalit groups is likely to demonstrate even greater high PDI and lower IDV than the middle-class Indian norms (Hofstede et al., 2010).

These contextual differences were important factors in this research. Although the interviews were conducted in English, differences in connotation and denotation between the two groups presented significant challenges to accurate communications. The two investigators were aware of many of these characteristics before the research began, and yet how they manifested during the interviews sometimes came as a surprise. Other elements emerged both in the interview process and during the subsequent months of evaluation, study, and further reflection.

The next section will describe general statistics about India and some dichotomies in everyday life in India that startled us as investigators. Some of these surprises necessitated changes to the research plan.

A Land of Contrasts

India boasts a population of 1.3 billion people (World Bank, 2021) and will surpass the population of China within this decade. One in seven of the world’s population lives in India, a country about one-third the size of the USA. The World
Factbook (India, 2021) states, “India’s economic growth following the launch of economic reforms in 1990, a massive youthful population, and a strategic geographic location have contributed to India’s emergence as a regional and global power” (para. 2). With its large English-speaking population, India became a major exporter of information technology services, business outsourcing services, and software workers over the last 15 years. In the economic boom between 2013-2021 the number of billionaires in India increased from 63 to 177 (Statista, 2021). According to Sundar (2014), the middle classes of about 300 million people (26% of the adults), “set the tone of political debate in the media—the consumer aspirations as well as the focus on governmental accountability.” In contrast, 421 million (37% of the adults) are not only marginalized politically but are so poor they barely have enough money for food. They weigh in, literally, with a Body Mass Index under 18.5—a level the World Health Organization defines as a state of famine (Sundar, 2014).

Modern and primitive conditions are not far apart. For example, our interviews took place just outside Bengaluru, a megacity known as India’s technology capital. The city abounds with modernity: Citizens drive cars and use cell phones; construction—from miles of new freeway mounted on pylons thirty feet above ground to massive building projects—is ever-present. But our hotel, just 12 miles north of the city center, located on a major transit artery to the international airport and within a mile of an air force base, maintained its own electric generator because of daily outages. The area had sewer portions openly exposed in some streets. There was no infrastructure for potable water, and no water pressure from the hotel’s water tank between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. When
traveling an additional 20 miles outbound from the hotel, we occasionally encountered areas without electricity and women gathering water from a common well.

The men predominantly dress western style, wearing pants and long-sleeved, button-down shirts. The women dress in colorful, flowing saris or Punjabis. The streets are crowded with men. When young women were out in public, they were in bands of three to ten, usually coming to and from school. The Co-Investigator (CoI) and I had been traveling in a 12-mile radius from the center of Bengaluru for five weeks before we saw a woman driving a car.

What may be missed by the tourist is the depth of history on the subcontinent. India is the heritage of the Indus Valley civilization, one of the world’s oldest. Written inscriptions of Ashoka consolidating his reign date back to the 3rd century BCE. Later, tribes from the north mixed with Dravidian inhabitants in the south. These cultures were eventually united by the Gupta dynasty between the 4th to 6th centuries AD, ushering in the Golden Age of science, art, and culture at least 100 years prior to the European medieval period. Over 700 years, Islam spread across the continent; Afghans also invaded, establishing the Delhi Sultanate. This was followed by 300 years rule of the Mughal Dynasty. Three empires ruled through regal capitals in the region of Karnataka where this research took place. By the 19th century, the British had become the major political power by defeating or subjugating multiple rulers of the subcontinent. In 1947, Gandhi and Nehru led the country to independence at which time two countries formed, India and Pakistan. Violence continued until the establishment of Bangladesh (East Pakistan) in 1971 (India, 2021).
In comparison to India, the USA is a very young nation. The Anglo history of the USA is short, spanning less than 500 years\(^3\). After only 150 years under British rule, the USA began a unique experience of democracy that has continued for 250 years. Here, we see India is new to self-rule with only 70 years as a democracy. Another contrast is the fact that there is relatively little linguistic diversity in the USA. For example, English is taught in all schools; where there is bilingualism it is transitionary to English. The almost universal use of English makes the USA more mono-cultural than India. India has 22 official languages not counting Hindi and English which are both widespread. Men and women are equally represented in public places in the USA, whereas women are largely relegated to the domain of home in India. Functioning infrastructure is normal in the USA. For example, every dwelling has potable water and electricity, and tax dollars fix the roads. Infrastructure is not the norm, even a few miles beyond the cities of India. For example, all three groups lived within 20 miles of our location near a megacity, nevertheless, transportation was a major problem. It took the leaders two to six hours one way to arrive at our apartment for the interview. This logistical reality meant the five days originally planned for interviewing with each group was reduced to two.

The next section will describe social and psychological conditions peculiar to living in India as SC or ST.

---

\(^3\) There are hundreds of years of written history of the Spanish influence in the south and west, but this is largely ignored. Most high school history courses ‘start’ with the arrival of Columbus. The history of the Indigenous peoples, of course predates this, but it is overlooked as irrelevant.
Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe

There is nothing equivalent to the concept of SC in the west. Although there are some similarities to slavery, being a Dalit or SC is more profoundly dehumanizing due to common interpretations of Hindu sacred texts. ST is historically similar to the American Indian tribes, but important distinctions will be explained. The following four units give the western reader some insights into the historical background and changes in modern India that define current conditions that impact being a SC and a ST. In the first unit, I describe some historical background related to the SC and ST groups. In unit two, I delineate the role of religion in SCs. In unit three, I address the ST situation. And in the last unit, I highlight the current status of SC and ST in this century.

From Land Revenue with Safeguards to Failed Land Reform

Customs related to land revenue collections can be traced to Akbar, the Mughal emperor who consolidated rule over much of the subcontinent during his reign from 1556 to 1605. Military officers were paid in land and sent part of their revenues to the emperor. To ensure widespread tax collection, Akbar appointed both civil administrators and local news writers who reported directly to him. These two avenues safeguarded peasants from overly abusive landowners (Ballhatchet, 2020). This became the de facto assessment of land revenue and tax collection for rulers in succeeding centuries, albeit, without the same safeguards (George, 2017). The notable change under British rule was the Zamindar system. The Zamindars not only collected the taxes, but they also became the titled landowners resulting in nearly 70 percent of the land of India being owned by the upper class. There were some exceptions of propertied mercantile classes. George (2017) observes,
Primarily India is an agriculture-based country, and agriculture has been the cornerstone of her economy for centuries. The barter system was prevalent in many Adivasi [tribal] domains…. Hence, to [a] large extent there was a subsistence economy, even among the rustic poor. (p. 5)

Even today, agricultural workers constitute 49% of the labor workforce (World Bank, 2021). Most still work the land with hand instruments; the heavy equipment is water buffalo.

Abuses due to the hegemony of land ownership by an oppressive upper class fueled hopes among the peasantry and tribal peoples alike for greater equity during India’s independence movement in the mid-20th century. During this time, the government officially adopted terms previously used by the British for these two groups. The Indian government upgraded the name of the landless, outcaste peasants from "Untouchables" to "Scheduled Castes" (SCs). The poorer or socially "backward" tribes were called "Scheduled Tribes" (STs). In 1951, the first amendment to India’s Constitution attempted land reform in multiple ways. One successful attempt was abolishing the Zamindars who were intermediary rent collectors. The other reforms—tenancy regulation, ceilings on landholdings, and consolidation of disparate landholdings—were implemented by the individual states haphazardly and in many areas not at all. Landowners had political clout and employed both evasion and coercion tactics. Sixty-five years later, according to George (2017), the poorest, landless peasants suffer conditions of even greater marginalization than before independence.

Due to obvious paucity of land or resources or employment today, they [the SCs] are the largest number of migrants from one state to another. Sizeable numbers among them are bonded labourers too. Their life condition is wretched and extremely inhuman. Women and children are subjected to atrocious harassment and torture, particularly in the migrated workplace. (p. 6)

This disenfranchisement is a significant challenge for modern India.
But landlessness goes far beyond socio-economic conditions. The subjugation of SCs cannot be adequately understood without also looking at Hindu belief and values. There are more than one billion Hindus in India making up 79.8% of the population (World Population Review, 2021). The Hindu religion is a powerful influence among the majority.

**Hindu Religion and the Role of Caste**

India has a modern society that competes both in the world market and politics, but what immediately surprises many secular westerners on arrival is the widespread preoccupation with spiritual concerns. Images of Hindu gods are everywhere. Three-story replicas of the monkey god, Hanuman, can be seen on many street corners. Monkeys and cows range freely in cities and towns alike because they represent the gods. Altars to the gods are not limited to church and home but are also visible in most businesses and restaurants. Offerings are made several times daily. Rarely does a week pass without at least one or more processions celebrating one of the 330 million Hindu gods and goddesses.

An aspect of Hindu religion particularly difficult for western readers to grasp is the concept of caste. Western societies have socio-economic divisions; gender and race issues that limit economic mobility for some or confer privileges to others, but a religious belief that ascribes both an individual’s profession for life and proscribes dominance or servitude *from birth* is a concept rarely experienced by 21st century westerners. In the next two parts, I will attempt to explicate ramifications of Indian society regarding the caste system.
Caste Divisions

In the Hindu religion, purity versus pollution is a primary worldview paradigm. The Hindu religion contends if a man lives a pure life by obeying the rules and performing the appropriate duties according to the sacred scriptures, they will reincarnate successively into higher states eventually manifesting as a god and uniting with the Divine, impersonal, all-encompassing creative force in the universe. This state is called Moksha by Hindus and Nirvana by Buddhists. To the contrary, a life lived impurely results in reincarnating into a lower state such as that of an Untouchable, a SC. Depending on the gravity of one’s actions, one can digress even further and return as an animal, an insect, or even become an inanimate object.

Hinduism has many ancient, sacred writings; one of these groups is called the Vedas. These describe creation, the state of the world, and give detailed regulations for living a pure life and the rituals necessary to bring cleansing after becoming impure. The Vedas divide men into four major castes. Each caste has an ancestral occupation with specific requirements and relationships to the other castes. The first three “upper” castes, in order of hierarchy, are the priests, the warriors, and the traders. Those who do manual labor make up a fourth, “lower” caste, called Shudras. Below the Shudras exists another group of outcasts called the “Untouchables.” The name untouchable came from the concept that an upper caste person would become impure if they touched them (Jalali, 1993; Pandey & Varkkey, 2017).

According to Sedwal and Kamat (2008), Untouchables were described as “less than human,” and for centuries they were outside the caste system (p. 3). They were relegated to dishonorable work such as manually cleaning outhouses, killing rats,
working leather, hauling away dead animals, and publicly announcing a death in the
community. They lived in a separate community, best described as a ghetto, could own
no property, nor go to school, draw from a village well or use village latrines. The British
labeled these groups “Scheduled Castes” but since the early 1900s they self-identify as
_Dalits_, which means broken (Roy, 2014). In this research I will use both terms:
Scheduled Caste (SC), which is how they are referred to most legal documents, and Dalit.

India is a country of castes. Caste is far more pervasive than these five divisions;
there are multitudes of divisions within these five. The Vedas list over 4,000 castes each
in a prescribed pecking order. Caste is a closed social stratification which means it is
impossible to change social position; it is fixed at birth (Pandey & Varkkey, 2017).
Identity and loyalty involve striving for greater rights for one’s caste but doing
everything in one’s power to maintain all lower castes in their subservient positions.

20th Century Dalit Activists

A champion of Dalit rights during the mid-twentieth century, Dr. B. R.
Ambedkar, contended in his classic 1936 treatise, _Annihilation of Caste_ (2014), that it
was impossible for Dalits to receive equality or justice in a society based on casteism as a
sacred institution. “Religion compels the Hindus to _treat isolation and segregation of
castes as a virtue_” (Ambedkar, 2014, p. 281, emphasis added). And,

There is no charity to the needy. Suffering as such calls for no response. There is
charity, but it begins with [one’s] caste and ends with [one’s] caste. There is

Ambedkar employed the metaphor of an apartment building with no doors or
staircases. He commented that the self-governing nature of each caste is executed
brutally:
Now a caste has an unquestioned right to excommunicate any man who is guilty of breaking the rules of the caste; and when it is realized that excommunication involves a complete cesser of social intercourse, it will be agreed that as a form of punishment there is really little to choose between excommunication and death. No wonder individual Hindus have not had the courage to assert their independence by breaking the barriers of caste. (P. 258)

Ambedkar openly challenged Gandhi’s support of the caste system. Gandhi, Brahmin born, gained “saint status” (which is what Mahatma means) by mobilizing the masses against British rule. Gandhi, a skilled propagandist, spoke against inequality, poverty, and advocated for rights for the disenfranchised. Roy (2014) notes, however, “at no point in his political career did he ever seriously criticise or confront an Indian industrialist or the landed aristocracy” (p. 90). In fact, Gandhi’s campaign was backed by Brahmin industrialists. For example, in his essay “Equal Distribution” written in 1940, Gandhi envisions the following:

The rich man will be left which possession of his wealth, of which he will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the remainder to be used for society. In this argument, honesty on the part of the trustee is assumed. (Gandhi, as cited by Roy, 2014, p. 90)

Gandhi’s advocacy was for self-rule of each group, meaning every division of caste in a village, would manage their internal affairs through their own group’s elected counsels. Ambedkar understood the result for the Dalits would be continual bondage in Indian society.

Ambedkar, Dalit-born, was unable to convince the masses of Dalits to abandon the Hindu religion or to annihilate caste. In the end, Gandhi ruled their hearts. The majority of the Dalits wholeheartedly joined the independence movement remaining Hindus. So, while India gained independence from Britain, most Dalits today continue in
subservience to the other castes who have no reason to pity their lot because the upper castes believe the Dalits’ misery is justifiable due to impure actions from a prior life.

Today, Dalits are still born into an identity of impurity, shame, and disgrace. Many are taught their only hope of change in a future life is to unquestioningly accept their position in this life. Bama says, “…this was the way it was meant to be for Dalits; that there was no possibility of change” (p. 89, as cited by Vasavi, 2006, p. 3769). Kancah Iliaiah, a modern Dalit rights activist reflects that as a child he was taught to “shake with fear” when interacting with higher castes, and to be a submissive, subordinate, and passive student. He says “childhood formations are important for a person – female and male – to become a full human being. But our childhoods were mutilated by constant abuse and by silence, and stunning silence at that” (as cited by Vasavi, 2006, p. 3767). In fact, to attempt to improve one’s lot as a SC could be construed as working against the karma—or just punishment due—from one’s previous life’s offenses.

In India an individual’s social position is set at birth. Unlike racial, gender and ethnic bias, “Caste is a social construction with no hereditary markings as in the case of race or ethnicity.” (Pandey & Varkkey, 2017, para. 3). Mahaderva describes the forms of segregation and separation forced on Dalits “the great grandfather of apartheid” (Danoor Mahaderva, 2001, as cited by Vasavi, 2006, p. 3776).

Caste identity is significant to this research because one of the three groups interviewed, the Madiga, is SC. Before discussing their current situation, it is important to share about another group with a similar socio-economic status, the Adivasi, historically referred to by the government as Scheduled Tribes (STs) (BYJUS, 2021).
Both terms are currently used in India, but the men interviewed in this research preferred to be called ST.

**Being Scheduled Tribe (ST) in India**

There is no agreed-upon definition among academics nor in the field of sociology regarding the term “tribe.” When the British assigned this designation to many of the people groups living outside the Hindu caste system the term had “strong evolutionist connotations” (Dasgupta, 2018, p. 3). The term “Scheduled Tribe” in India is a legal and constitutional category generally referring to specific groups recognized as primitive and backward (Dasgupta, 2018; Prakash, 2009). The following characteristics are frequently included: identity with a specific area of land, kinship relations, working with primitive tools, speaking a distinct language. The Scheduled Tribes constitute the lowest socio-economic status (Prakash, 2009). There are at least 705 tribes; India’s Constitution lists specific policies regarding over 500 of these groups in the 5th and 6th Schedules. Many of these groups now self-identify as ‘Adivasi’ which means original inhabitants (Prakash, 2009; Xaxa, 1999). I will employ the terms tribe and ST because the Hakkipikki who participated in this research refer to themselves as a tribe and not as Adivasi (Program Director, personal communication, July 12, 2021).

In the northeast and in two central states the tribal groups represent 65-95% of the population. Among these groups there is a persistent desire for autonomy evidenced by several guerilla armies. Some tribes of Himalayan western and central states have assimilated successfully into the Brahmin and warrior castes to the extent they no longer speak a separate language, cultural differences are minor, and many are rapidly adopting
Hindu names (Sociology Guide, 2022). Many of these groups are neither backward nor marginalized.

Most tribal groups, however, are minorities living in the forested or isolated hilly terrain separate from Hindu communities. Many are animists. Even those that adopt Hindu gods do not participate in the totality of the Hindu belief system (Majumdar, 1950). The Hakkipikki interviewees specifically stated their clan gods were distinct from the Hindu pantheon (even when they used similar statuary). In contrast to SCs, the STs choose their profession and are more likely to participate in hunting-gathering-trapping of forest resources and trading them, rather than farming. According to Bailey (Sociology Guide, 2022), Indian tribes have been more egalitarian unlike the hierarchical Hindu caste system, but tribes and castes are now morphing into a unique merged system (Sociology Guide, 2022). Land ownership was a foreign concept among most tribes; their religious traditions ascribe a sense of sacredness to nature (Chandra, 2019; Padel & Das, 2013). In addition, language remains a significant identity marker. Very few tribal languages have been written. The greater degree of isolation enabled many of these groups to maintain distinct cultural practices and greater economic autonomy than the SCs (Sedwal & Kamat, 2008).

In the 19th and 20th centuries, the British increasingly viewed tribal lands as sources of revenue. This included converting land to tea plantations or removing tribes to mine resources. Just as happened to the North American tribes, these people groups were forcibly relocated. In 1871, the British officially listed those who resisted them in the Northwest Frontier as “Criminal Tribes.” This was expanded to groups in Hyderabad and Mysore under the Criminal Tribes Act in 1921. Entire communities were stigmatized as
born criminals. In the hierarchy of Indian society, the tribes are considered even lower than SCs and carry an additional stigma of being “uncivilized” (Xaxa, 1999). Jones (1978) states, “tribal India is an internal colony exploited by the rest of the country” (p. 65). The history of the tribes is pertinent to this research because one of the participating groups is from the Hakkipikki tribe living in Karnataka state.

**Scheduled Castes and Schedule Tribes in the 21st Century**

The Indian Constitution, ratified in 1950, laid an ideological foundation for a more just society. Ambedkar was a principal writer (Rao, 2010, Roy, 2014) and chairman of the drafting committee. The Preamble guarantees “equality of status and of opportunity….justice, social, economic and political’, and promotes among all citizens “fraternity, assuring the dignity of the individual.” India’s Constitution contains affirmative action provisions for both SCs and STs. These included a specific number of seats in legislative bodies, reservations for enrollment in state schools, a percentage of positions in governmental jobs and posts, and economic provisions. In addition, according to Part III of the Constitution,

> no citizen shall be denied admission into any educational institution maintained by the State or receiving aid out of State funds on grounds only of religion, race, caste, language, or any of them. (Prakash, 2009, p. 96)

Moving from centuries of institutionalized oppression and disenfranchisement to “equality of status and opportunity” as stated in the Constitution’s preamble has been largely unrealized by either of these groups. According to the 2001 census, 25% of the Indian populace is identified as socio-economically poor. Of this 25%, about two-thirds are SCs and one-third are STs (Sedwal & Kamat, 2008).
Access to education has brought improvement, but significant change is slow. The upper castes continue to control the financial, educational, political, and judicial institutions, effectively abrogating advancement. Dhillon (2021) notes,

Out of the 89 secretaries – the most senior bureaucratic post – at the federal level in India’s capital, Delhi, in 2019, only one was a Dalit, according to parliamentary data. Even in the lower echelons, representation is dismal and nowhere close to corresponding to the 200 million Dalits in India – 16% of the 1.3 billion population. (para. 13)

As SCs begin to exercise political power and rise economically, Rao (2010) describes increasing examples of brutal violence against them. For example, in Sirasgaon, three SC women and an uncle complained to the landowner’s wife because her husband propositioned his niece. In retaliation, the four women were publicly paraded naked while being beaten by upper caste men. Legal recourse was minimal. The paper did not describe incident beyond “In Sirasgaon, something that should have never happened occurred.” (Rao, 2010, p. 223). In 2006, an upwardly mobile SC family in Kerlagi refused to sell their land. The women were also paraded naked, beaten, publicly group raped, and then mutilated. The SC men were murdered, and their bodies strewn in the village square. It was a month before the local police acted. All 11 accused received bail, three were acquitted, and the crime was never prosecuted under the Prevention of Atrocities against Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act which could assign more severe penalties. These incidents are not isolated. Legal recourse remains ineffective for most poor Indian citizens. Not only is there endemic class bias since almost all the judges are upper caste, but the system has a 30-year backlog before most cases arrive in court (Elavarasi, 2008).
The right to schooling was also written into the Constitution as a means of affirmative action for SCs and STs. After two and a half years of research on the status of education among these groups, Sedwal and Kamat (2008) report:

Education has been recognized as the primary means to overcome caste oppression and was a focus for liberation in the south and southwestern states of India. But common practices of discrimination persist in micro-practices of schooling (p. 5).

In addition,

Teachers and school administrators often reproduce deeply held and socially sanctioned prejudices against SC and ST in both subtle and other ways. …Some studies document how neglect and outright discrimination by teachers against SC and ST is a major reason for the high levels of drop out at the primary level (pp. 33-34).

India’s public school system is known for high teacher absenteeism and low teaching activity even when teachers are present (Cheney et al., 2005).

The tribes were forcibly removed from their land by the British and continue to suffer the same practices by the State of India (Sedwal & Kamat, 2008; Sundar 2014).

Sundar states,

Figures of displacement by large dams, industries, mining, wildlife sanctuaries and other such projects in India are stark, and while the government refuses to provide any official figure, the best (and conservative) estimate is by Walter Fernandes which indicates that between 1947-2000, approximately 60 million people have been displaced in the country owing to these big projects. Of this, at least 40 per cent are Adivasis (STs), 20 per cent Dalits and 20 per cent backward classes. Two-thirds of them have not been rehabilitated in any manner. Given that Adivasis (STs) are only 84 million, this means that *one in every four of them has suffered displacement*. (2014, p. 96, emphasis added)

Levien declares in the last decade India has experienced “thousands of small wars against land acquisitions” (Levien, 2011, p. 66, as cited by Oskarsson & Nielsen, 2014, p. 2). According to Max Weber, when an Indian tribe loses its territorial significance, it assumes the form of an Indian caste (Sociology Guide, 2022). Oskarsson and Nielsen
(2014) have seen a minor shift. Two major battles that previously would have been facilitated by the state (in favor of business and against the poor) were deadlocked in 2009 after a decade of political pressure by SCs, STs, and collaborating groups. This is an improvement over the status quo where business always wins. Intense public debate about expanding the rights of tribal peoples over their land and resources is also indicative of positive attitude changes towards STs within Indian society (Prakash, 2009). It is worth noting that during the 21st century, some ST scholars have published insider perspectives about being Adivasi or ST. In comparison, the SC have had articulate, educated voices, like Ambedkar, representing them since the 1940s.

As an example of changes that have taken place, in the 1940s, Dalits risked their lives just to secure the right to gather to protest, to be allowed to enter a Hindu temple, and to celebrate Ambedkar’s birthday. By the mid 1970s, more educated and economically secure SCs with some experience in government positions, were effectively agitating to form trade unions and mobilizing electoral clout. Mayawati, the first Dalit woman to become chief minister (equal to governor) has governed India’s most populous state, Uttar Pradesh for four terms. In her most recent election, Rao (2010) notes, “Virtually ignored by mainstream media, the BSP (Mayawati’s party) ran a highly successful campaign” by forming a coalition with the minority Brahmin called bhaichara, or Dalit-Brahmin brotherhood (p. 283). So, while atrocities against SCs and STs persist exposing institutionalized casteism in many areas of India, powerful alliances are surfacing in others.

In summary, SCs and STs continue to occupy the lowest socio-economic rung of Indian society and suffer from endemic, systemic, negative biases. Despite provisions for
equality and the affirmative action written into the Constitution 70 years ago, change within Indian society has been slow. However, these groups have achieved some gains within the democratic process amplifying their voices and resulting in some progress. These tensions and possibilities are current-day realities experienced by two of the three groups interviewed in this research, the Madiga group, an SC, and the Hakkipikki group, an ST.

This fifth section is about the role of language in India. It is divided into three units. In the first unit, I explicate dynamics of multilingualism. In the second unit, I describe how MT acts as an identity marker. In the third unit I summarize the language section.

**Language in India**

In the USA, English has never been declared the official language, however it is the one language that must be mastered to prosper economically; English dominates every geographical area of the USA with a few exceptions. The situation in India is completely different. English is spoken, especially among the elite, but multilingualism is common.

According to the Constitution, Hindi was to become the official language of India and English was to be phased out 15 years after independence. However, the traditions left by centuries of British rule and written law have made the English language a political reality that continues into the present. All official business at the national level must be conducted in either Hindi or English and is recorded in English.
Linguistic minorities were present in every region in mid 20th century when India gained independence. The linguistic situation was so complex that the Constituent Assembly responsible for the constitution left most language decisions unresolved (Agnihotri, 2013). They did recognize 22 regional languages, not including Hindi and English in the Constitution. They also gave each state the right to choose the language of governance in their area. This led to major shifts of some state boundaries. For example, the area of Karnataka state where this research took place had been carved into three pieces by the British in 1793. The States Reorganization Act of 1956 almost doubled the area to include the Bombay states and parts of three other regions because they all spoke Kannada.

To add to the complexity, the languages in India stem from five language families: Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic, Tibeto-Burman, and Andamanese Nicobarese. In the 2001 Census 6,661 MTs were returned on the forms. This number was reduced to 1,635 MTs and an additional 1,957 relegated to ‘other’ MT category, but merely 122 languages made the official report (Groff, 2017; Kidwai, 2009). It is beyond the scope of this research to address the State’s policy of minimizing minority languages by refusing to legitimate MTs. The common perception is only the 122 languages currently recognized by the Constitution are considered a “language;” all other forms are referred to as a “dialect” of the state language where the speakers reside.

Included in the Constitution are Cultural and Educational Rights for “any section of the citizens residing in the territory or India or part thereof” that has “a distinct

---

4 The number “one” was written in 15 scripts on the one Rupee bill.
language, script or culture of its own,” and guarantees the “right to conserve the same” (Prakash, 2009, p. 96). Article 350A states,

It shall be the endeavor of every State and of every local authority within the State to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother-tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguist minority groups (Groff, 2017, p. 148).

According to Sedwal and Kamat (2008), MT education for STs is not provided—even in central India where three million people speak Gond as their MT.

English is very popular. Seven states (primarily in the northeast) and five territories have made English their official language. There is widespread desire to study English from the early years of education (Agnihotri, 2013; Groff, 2017). Almost all university education is in English, and knowing English provides a significant economic advantage (Azam et al., 2011). But language policy is driven by the interests of the elite and public education in all state schools is by immersion in the state language.

**Multilingualism or “Little-Lingualism?”**

I mentioned that multilingualism is common in India. Mitchell (2009) contends that multilingualism was historically the norm in India; Sanskrit was used for ritual, Persian for administration, and Telugu for music. Nevertheless, it is important, especially for the monolingual reader, to understand some nuances of multilingualism. The question is, how conversant or competent are those who claim to be multilingual? Hofstede (1980) notes that people tend to ascribe fluency to anyone who states they are bilingual, but this is not usually the reality.

When I was a monolingual speaker, I remember the sense of awe I had for my European coworkers who spoke multiple languages. After 17 years in Ecuador, I, too, now call myself bilingual. This means I am fluent in English and in particular registers
of Spanish, specifically: casual conversation; women’s dialogue of home, food, and friendship; and teaching the Bible. During my years in Ecuador, I completed a BA in Spanish. My written Spanish vocabulary increased dramatically. Nevertheless, living in a small jungle town meant this vocabulary never became part of my speaking vocabulary. The CoI was also proficient in aviation and the dialog necessary to serve Indigenous and Latino clientele. But those two registers—aviation and casual conversation—were the extent of his proficiency. It was our experience that bilingualism (and multilingualism) usually means competency in a few, frequently employed registers. The term that would better describe the actuality is “little-lingualism”. Multilingual people often know how to communicate well within specific registers like greetings or business but miss an enormous amount of information when conversation moves beyond those narrow areas of familiarity. We saw this in our research. 14 of the 18 interviewees claimed they knew in English, but only one of them could sustain the simplest conversation in English. It is likely their reading ability was more proficient than their verbal skills.

Other factors worth addressing are the roles of status, gender, and geography. The norm among the educated elite in India has always been multilingualism and it remains more common among those who are educated. Men who need this skill for business and trade are usually multilingual. Due to lack of education, and limited access beyond the world of family, women are less likely to be multilingual in India. In addition, due to lack of infrastructure, travel can still be very difficult. An Indian proverb says, “Every mile the water changes, every four miles the language” (Groff, 2017)\(^5\).

---

\(^5\) Between 2015 to 2018, the Director’s team performed a language survey covering a three-state area. They identified 104 unwritten mother tongues; many were not officially registered by the government. In the villages, most of the older generation were monolingual.
This is pertinent to this research because Change Agents (CAs) who are cultural outsiders frequently rely on interpreters. It is important to assess the quality of the interpreter’s skills. In far too many settings, translation takes place without an assessment of the quality of interpretation taking place. When the interpretation is from a foreign language into the LWC, there are additional factors to consider. For example, how well does the Receptors who speak an unwritten MT understand the vocabulary being used in the LWC?

In this next unit, I explicate one of the issues—the relationship between language and identity.

Mother Tongue and Identity

Language is essential for communication, but it is far more than a tool. Language embodies the way we see and understand our world (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004; Fishman, 2001; Pinker, 2000). According to Aoyagi and Veliko (2021) writing for UNESCO, “Every language on our planet comprises a unique microcosm of beliefs, practices and customs that connect its speakers to their collective past” (p. 2). Language and culture are intimately bound.

Indigenous languages are disappearing at an alarming rate. Almost half of the world’s 7,000+ languages are listed as endangered by UNESCO. Aoyagi and Veliko (2021) identify this world-wide phenomenon as a human rights issue. Most of these groups lack adequate educational resources, technological tools, access to technology and media outlets necessary to preserve, protect, and revitalize their language and other forms of cultural expression. They are also more likely to be marginalized and misrepresented in the justice system.
According to Fishman (2001), identity is rooted in language. Using the MT is a means of validating the speakers and their culture. Aoyagi and Veliko (2021) remind us, Languages are not just efficient and extremely elaborate instruments of communication; they are also vehicles of cultural expressions and values and as such they constitute a determining factor in the identity of groups and individuals. (p. 11).

The Spoken method develops oral curriculum in the MT. Kraft (2000) and Steffen (2018) contend the MT is the best medium for communication, especially when dealing with beliefs, values and advocating community transformation. There is a significant, positive, emotional attachment to the MT (Fisher, 1989; Kraft, 1996; Kraft, 2000). MT fluency signals identification as an insider. Using the MT does not guarantee acceptance of the communicator or the communication, but it opens doors by communicating through a familiar modality.

The Spoken method was implemented in three MTs: Kannada, Madiga, and Vaagri Booli which is the language of the Hakkipikki. Kannada is the official language of Karnataka state. There are 47 million speakers making Kannada the 30th most spoken language worldwide (Krishnamurti, 2017). As to be expected, Kannada speakers constitute the linguistic majority within Karnataka state, but no other Indian states use Kannada as an official language. For the state and language details see Map 3.1. This makes Kannada as the ninth most spoken language in India (2011 Census of India, 2021). The Kannada language speakers are called Kannadigas and share a rich heritage. Kannada is an ancient language, spoken since the 3rd century B.C. It is one of many Dravidian languages of southern India. Kannada was recognized as a classical language of India by the government in 2008 (Krishnamurti, 2017).
The Madiga language is a mix of Kannada and Telugu languages spoken by the Madiga—a SC, living primarily in the rural regions of four southern states. According to *Joshua Project* (2022a), there are over 9 million Madiga speakers. In Karnataka state, their language is described as a dialect of Kannada. Telugu is the official language of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, two states east of Karnataka. The Madiga language is considered a dialect of Telugu in Andhra Pradesh. In Tamil Nadu state, the Madiga language is a mix of Tamil. The Madiga language mix in this research is not recognized by any state government; it is considered “uneducated” Kannada. This is similar to the bias of many teachers in the USA toward speakers of African American Vernacular English. Mills (2021) states “such ideologies are ubiquitous” and can negatively impact African American Vernacular speakers as they adapt to learning American Standard English in school (P. 2, Mills 2021). Kannada, Telugu and Tamil are all part of the Dravidian language family, but they have three different writing systems (scripts).

The Hakkipikki language, called Vaagri Booli, is known by many different names in various regions due to their nomadic lifestyle (Mathai & K, 2018; Varma, 1970). The *Ethnologue* classifies Vaagri Booli as Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Indo-Aryan, unclassified (Eberhard et al., 2022). The Hakkipikiki reside in six states with official languages belonging to the Dravidian language family. Very little is written in Vaagri Booli. A few primers and books from the New Testament are available in Tamil script. In addition, the number of speakers is difficult to determine. Numbers fluctuate; the *Ethnologue* (Eberhard et al., 2022) lists 12,000, the *Joshua Project* (2022b) lists 29,000, and Hakkipikki self-reported 500,000 in a survey done in Tamil Nadu state (Mathai & K, 2018).
Many report Vaagri Booli is spoken with pride in the Hakkipikki communities and taught to the children (Mathai & K, 2018; Meti, 2014; Naik, 2002). Youth text in Vaagri Booli improvising with Roman script. The Hakkipikki have a YouTube channel, and many are adept at using both the internet and cell phones to market products (Bhandre, 2020). These are all signs of language vitality and adaptability even though the *Ethnologue* lists Vaagri Booli as threatened (Eberhard et al., 2022).

The next part will address some of the linguistic pressures these three languages are experiencing and the particular difficulty speakers of an *unwritten* MT face in the education system.

**Mother Tongue and Public Education Realities**

In Karnataka, public education is in Kannada. Map 3.1 shows the Indian states and the official languages used in public education. There is increasing demand for English for business and higher education. The medium for most university classes throughout India is English. Public schools in Karnataka teach science and math primarily in English as early as seventh grade. All subject-specific college entrance exams are given in English and five official state languages, but none are offered in Kannada (Mallikarjun, 2001). English-only private schools are in demand. Mallikarjun (2001) observes, “English is replacing the mother tongue and the regional language.” Despite the growing hegemony of English, Meiringer (2009) notes increasing popularity of regional languages evident in the industries of radio, television, and cinema.
Both the Madiga, and particularly the Hakkipikki, whose language is even more distinctive from the state language, suffer from a hierarchical relationship of languages called the “double divide” (Mohanty & Panda, 2016, para 1). Private schools they cannot afford offer instruction in English, the language of economic opportunity, while the
public schools practice submersion in the state language without any transitional
considerations for the SC/ST child’s home language or culture. Despite the constitutional
rights for equality and cultural diversity, the priority in government schools is
mainstreaming tribal peoples, not conserving their language or their culture (Mohanty &
Panda, 2016).

Mainstreaming through education exclusively in the LWC results in the
diminishing use of the MT. Lo Bianco (2014) in his plea for MT primary instruction
reminds us:

But language is also the tool we use to make our presence felt in the world, to get
our desires expressed and met. And children, as they acquire that, are doing it in
the mother tongue. We can’t expect that when they go to school there will be this
instantaneous transition over to another medium of exchange for all of this really
important information they encounter at school. (p. 3)

Most ST and many SC children enter school at a tremendous disadvantage
because their informal learning from their language community has been in the MT
which differs from the LWC used in education. Consider the task most ST and SC
children face as they begin school. Using English as an example, the language threshold
necessary to understand simple text is 5,000 English words. Most children come to
school with a mother-tongue vocabulary of 4,000-6,000 words. The average child learns
four new vocabulary words per hour of second language instruction. Therefore, the
SC/ST child will need a minimum of 1,000 more hours of schooling before they are on
par with the students who speak the language of instruction in their home (World Bank,
2011). Agnihotri (2013) notes these minority languages are neglected. Particularly the ST
children must study in languages completely foreign (meaning from a completely
different language family) to their MT, then when they struggle to understand content due
to linguist difficulty “they are unfairly dubbed as dull and incompetent” (p. 193).

In addressing the education of minorities in Karnataka state, Mallikarjun (2001)
advocates improved training for teachers because most face a complex linguistic setting.
He notes that the more educated minorities want education in the MT, whereas the
minorities of lower socio-economic levels do not. He laments, “Unfortunately, any
discussion regarding the linguistic minorities is construed as divisive” (para. 1).
According to Kidwai (2009) there is significant pressure on smaller language
communities to assimilate by adopting the LWC to function fully as citizens. In a study
for the District Primary Education Program done in 1994, 48% of the teachers reported
having problems relating to language. Most surprising was the following dynamic
mentioned in the same study:

In some of the minority schools, it is observed that ‘though the medium of
instruction is Kannada, most of the schoolteachers use Telugu to explain the
difficult concepts and encourage students to respond in Telugu only. Except
teaching Kannada [language], other activities and instructions are given in Telugu
language only.’ That may be the reason that even after 7 years schooling the
students of this block are not able to identify the letters of the Kannada script and
not able to speak in Kannada (p.8, para 1)

Note that after seven years of schooling the ST children were unable to recognize
the letters of the state language, nor speak the state language! Neither the district study
nor Mallikarjun elaborated beyond the fact that tribal children in particular spent years in
school without any notable benefit. Several reports about the Hakkipikki reveal the
parents have a lackadaisical attitude toward their children’s schooling (Deepak & Sindhu,

6 The dynamic of schoolteachers preferring Telugu over Kannada within Karnataka state baffled me as a
researcher. My best assessment is that Telugu maintains a higher social status than Kannada, because the
Telegu speaking populace is much larger and has a powerful cinema and music arts industry.
2017; Mathai & K, 2018; Meti, 2014). The Hakkipikki take pride in their ability to learn languages for trade, but they do not look to the school system as a place to become proficient (Mathai & K, 2018; Meti, 2014; Naik, 2002).

**Language Summary**

The language dynamic in India is incredibly complex in comparison to the USA. Multilingualism is common in India but should not be confused with fluency. Frequently, there are limitations to the understanding that takes place between multilingual speakers. The MT is both a communication tool and a vehicle of cultural expression effectively embodying worldview, values and acting as a strong emotional marker of identity. The Constitution of India guarantees MT education for every child, but the reality is every state practices an assimilationist policy of immersion in the state language with no provision for MT instruction. Both Madiga and Hakkipikki children suffer a significant disadvantage as they are immersed in instruction in Kannada without any provision for even transitional MT instruction. The Madiga have a slight advantage because their language is in the Dravidian language family. The situation is worse for the Hakkipikki because their MT, Vaagri Booli, is unrelated to Kannada.

All three languages represented in this study—Kannada, Madiga, and Vaagri Booli—are experiencing some language shift due to the hegemony of English in the areas of business and education. Due to the large number speakers, the support of Karnataka state institutions, and the popularity of oral communication in radio, television, and cinema, it is likely that Kannada will remain a strong language community for decades to come. The Madigas’ language is less likely to survive because there is no official recognition, the parents are of a low socio-economic level and are likely to favor mastery
of the LWC (Kannada, Telugu or Tamil), and there is a wide variety of Madiga speech from state to state. Additionally, *speaking the Madiga MT denotes their caste which is a disadvantage to economic mobility*. Nevertheless, it will remain a powerful identity marker for in-group communication—how long is unknown. The Hakkipikki language is utilized with pride for in-group communication in *all* their communities. Many practices demonstrate its vitality, so it is likely to continue as a vibrant marker of identity.

When the CA is a cultural outsider, speaking the MT can open doors for the communicator’s message by demonstrating respect for the Receptor’s culture—this is particularly true when the Receptor’s MT is a linguistic minority. This is significant to this research because all three languages are experiencing differing levels of language loss due to the encroachment of English through the internet and as a language preference for economic mobility. In particular, the SC and ST groups both speak an *unwritten* MT. These languages issues are pertinent to this research because all three groups participated in a curriculum development process that prioritized using the MT and spreading the curriculum through oral practices.

In the sixth section, I describe the Kannadiga group. The leaders in this group include a mix of ethnicities whose focus is to reach gang members with the gospel.
The Kannadiga Group, a Modern Mix

The Kannadiga group is a good example of changes that have taken place in India which diminish the rigid caste distinctions of the Hindu religion. This group of leaders worked to create content in Kannadiga. Since this was the language they chose to work in and they all are residents of Karnataka, it seemed appropriate to call them the Kannadiga group. Actually, only two of the four LLs interviewed speak Kannada as their MT. They all studied Kannada in school (in addition to English and/or Hindi). One member is upper caste, another is SC, and a third is from a tribe. When they shared content with people that spoke another MT (e.g., with tribals, with SCs), those leaders who were fluent translated the content into the MT of their Receptors.

Gang members were the target audience of the Kannada team. Two of the leaders were active in gang life before they became Christ followers. Gang members in Karnataka were described by these leaders in the following ways: They have a group identity and hang out in a specific territory; they have an anti-establishment mentality; they have a high incidence of violence and delinquent activities; Many are under scrutiny by law enforcement, and some gang members must report to the police regularly (probation). Thomas et al. (2003) noted similar characteristics among active USA gang members in Galveston, Texas. The Kannadiga interviewees reported that local gang

7 There are many factors contributing to this more egalitarian group. 1) These Christian groups are more egalitarian because they are Christ followers who attempt to emulate Jesus’ style of servant leadership. Jesus said, “But the greatest of you shall be your servant.” (Matthew 23:11) 2) The Indian Constitution was founded on principles of fraternity and equality for all. Affirmative action for the SCs and STs have benefited many in these groups who have risen in socio-economic standing and in political power. 3) The government has made strides to make education available to the SCs and STs. Most of them will end up boarding for education beyond primary level. In their home communities, their societal standing is known. In the boarding setting and in the middle school and high school environments, the norm has been to address all students on a first name basis only, in an attempt to weaken the caste stereotypes and provide opportunity for students according to merit.
members were also prone to stealing, extortion, fighting and provoking fights in public places. They said most were addicted to alcohol or drugs, tobacco, and gambling. Two mentioned there were high suicide rates where they lived. Wood et al. (2017) also documented the higher incidence of suicide among USA gang members. According to Thomas et al. (2003), the age of the gang youth was 12 to 24 with an average of 18 and gang membership was transitional with an average of 2.4 years. The average age in Indian gangs appears to be older, somewhere between 16 and 35. What marked the exit from Indian gangs was marriage. The Kannadiga leaders ranged from 22 to 39, but they did not limit sharing content exclusively to the gang demographic. These leaders shared Spoken content both in their community and cross-culturally in other communities as well.

All the participants in this study spoke Kannada but language was not the primary bond that united them, rather, it was their desire to actively share their Christian faith with others. I will explicate what it means to be an evangelical Christian in India in section seven.

**Being an Evangelical Christian in India**

The Hindu pantheon includes over 330 million gods, so adding Jesus Christ to the line-up of deities is not offensive. In fact, Hinduism’s flexibility to adopt the local gods of other groups has fostered its spread. What is not acceptable is when Christ followers take seriously Jesus Christ’s claims of exclusivity in order to become a disciple of Jesus. All the leaders interviewed were actively seeking opportunities to share their faith—first by serving others, then by explaining their motivation to share the love of Christ. By
identifying as exclusive Christ followers—they became a minority in India. For the SCs and STs, this constitutes being a minority within a minority!

In India, the term *evangelical* is not widely used. These leaders are identified as Christians. For the westerner, however, the term “Christian” has such a broad connotation we have chosen to use the phrase “evangelical Christian” because characteristics common to evangelicals most accurately describes the values held by these Indian leaders. For this reason, I will first explain about evangelicals from a global perspective and then I will describe the ramifications of being an evangelical in India today.

According to Patrick Johnstone (2013), a veteran researcher of the state of the global church, Christianity is rapidly expanding in Africa, Asia, Latin America even as it is decreasing slightly in the U.S.A. and waning in former Communist, European, and Pacific countries. Where Christianity is growing, it is more evangelical, charismatic, and Pentecostal in character. A veteran researcher of global trends, Patrick Johnstone (2013), noted in an interview for Christianity Today magazine:

[Since the mid-19th century] Evangelicals were only just beginning to emerge from a half-century of marginalization; but from then on Evangelicalism became the most dynamic belief system in the world and its fast-growing numbers put it at the center of global Christianity. (p.130, *Christianity Today*, 2013)

Evangelicals have tripled from 112 million in 1970 to over 387 million in 2020. Trends identified by Johnstone (2011) indicate the 21st century evangelical movement will be dominated by the majority who live in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Bebbington (1989) identifies four characteristics: conversionism, activism, biblicism and crucicentrism. The emphasis on personal conversion indicates expectancy to see individual lives being transformed toward loving and serving others as an evidence of “salvation.” Being Bible-centric combines the belief that the layman can understand
the Bible *without* dependence on professional clergy or sacraments; every Christian is
duty-bound to become intimate with the Scriptures for him/herself. Evangelicals are also
cross-centric meaning the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross and his
resurrection is a non-negotiable doctrine above all others. Active Christian service means
evangelicals devote a significant amount of time to developing relationships and serving
others for the express purpose of being able to “earn the right” to share their faith. Today,
evangelicals do not constitute a particular organization or denomination but have a
significant number of adherents in most every expression of Christian faith (Johnstone,
2011).

**Evangelicals and the Rising Tide of Hindu Nationalism**

There are many Indian Christians who restrict their activities within their
Christian community and do not communicate their faith to others. However, actively
sharing about God’s love as demonstrated through Jesus Christ is part of evangelicals’
core beliefs. They seek opportunities to help others in need and to bring services to their
community in order to gain the right to share their story about how encountering the
person of Jesus has significantly changed their life. According to Lancy Lobo (2002),

The [Christian] church in India…covers 25% of the entire voluntary sector
operations in India though Christians are a mere 2.3 percent of the total
population. The church is the single most important NGO in India that has
activities in education and health, rural and urban development, caring for widows
and orphans, aged and handicapped, leprosy patients, droughts, cyclones, and
hurricanes. (p. 150)
The rise of the Hindu nationalist movement also referred to as *Hindutva*[^1], is well organized and networked throughout India. Over two decades it has turned the traditional attitude of tolerating difference in India to a focus on unity through uniformity (Rowe, 2018). Hindu nationalists believe anyone who is not Hindu should either convert to Hinduism or leave the country (Shah & Carpenter, 2018). Before recent political victories, *Hindutva* was seen as fringe radicalism and was outlawed on several occasions. But in 2014, their political arm, the *Bharatiya Janata Party* (BJP) captured a majority of the seats in the Lok Sabha (equal to our House of Representatives) (Zeidan, 2021). This instituted neo-liberal reforms, militaristic foreign policy, and criticizing minority religions, particularly Muslim and Christian. In 2019, Prime Minister Modi gained his second election with 65% of the vote (his next competitor had only 10%). Thambusamy (2018) states, “Modi’s victory was simultaneously *Hindutva*’s victory for mainstream acceptance” (p. 152).

In the previous decade, the focus was against Muslims, a larger group who made up 14.2% of the populace. But according to Ram and Smith (2018), “communal violence against minorities—especially Christians—has now become a regular occurrence in India.” (p. 198). Over the last 5 years, the government has instituted severe measures against Christians, Muslims, and Sikhs (Root, 2021; World Watch List, 2022). In an

[^1]: *Hindutva* is not simply anti-Christian. *Hindutva* is a fascist ideology that claims the superiority of everything Hindu. It uses an “us vs. them” rhetoric to demonize and deny the humanity of minorities. This paves the way for state-backed violence to subordinate or eliminate their opponents (Hindutvawatch, 2022). It is against everything western or secular. The Indian constitution and the constitutional assembly are both seen as western constructs that should be dismantled. A Hindu constitution has been written which will deprive Muslims and Christians from voting. (Albuquerque, 2022)
interview regarding the current experience of religious minorities, Rev. Vijayesh Lal, co-author of the 2012 and 2016 Universal Periodic Review of human rights in India held by the United Nations Human Rights Council, responded,

What was previously considered a “fringe” now seems to be the “mood of the nation” reflective of the way that common people of India think. The church and the average Christian today are viewed with suspicion. … We are now looked upon as fanatical converters and are increasingly counted as the Other.” (John, 2018, p. 190)

The Juvenile Justice Act closed almost all orphanages (John, 2018). It is now illegal for foreign entities to transfer funds to most Christian organizations within India effectively shutting down hundreds of Christian groups, many with over 50 years of history working in the country, such as Compassion International, Operation Mobilization, orphanages and outreaches by Baptists, Assemblies of God, and Methodists to name just a few. The impact not only puts thousands of orphans on the street but has limited secular NGOs working in the areas of minority rights, health, education, social security, and environmental advocacy. According to Sunil Abraham, “Foreign funding cuts on non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is a step to restrain institutions from debating and questioning government policies and freedom of speech.” (Sanskaran, 2016, para. 9)

In 2014 and 2015, Karnataka was listed with three other states reporting the greatest number of attacks against Christians. On May 17, 2022, anti-conversion laws, titled the “Religious Freedom Laws,” were passed through a “back door ordinance” when the legislative assembly and council were not in session (Kaur, 2022, para. 8). Karnataka is the 13th of India’s 29 states to pass legislation strictly limiting any activity that could encourage a Hindu from changing their faith. Restrictions include the following: Not
reporting one’s conversion is one year in jail and fines. Any “attempt to convert” is three years jail and a $164 fine. An attempt to convert women, juveniles, SC, or ST is four years prison and a $164 fine [10,340 Rupees] (Shah & Shah, 2018). Many fear that any charitable act by a Christian, such as providing a free medical clinic or helping a Dalit with school expenses, will be construed as a crime. In Belgavi, Karnataka, right wing activists have barged into churches and attacked Christians. When the final cases are booked, the pastors are accused of forcing conversions. In response, the police are suggesting that Christians skip prayer meetings to avoid attacks (Prasanna, 2021). The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom reports from 2016 and 2018 report few arrests and prosecutions under these anti-conversion laws. The commission’s observers note they “create a hostile, and on occasion violent, environment for religious minority communities because they do not require any evidence to support accusations of wrongdoing.” For example, in July 2017, Sultan Masih, a Christian pastor was murdered in public over suspicion that he could be engaged in conversion (Mathur, 2020, italics mine)

Indian Christians who do not actively engage in communicating their faith to others may weather this rising anti-Christian tide by remaining silent. For Indian evangelicals however, persecution is considered a normal part of the cost of being a disciple of Jesus Christ. As an example, in 2018 when the CI and I were conducting a Spoken training in Karnataka, during the first day of introductions, many of the participants’ stories included how they had suffered for sharing their faith. One Indian leader had recently been beaten by the police after being accused of converting someone. A few had family members who tried to poison them after they professed faith in Christ.
Others were threatened with violence or excommunicated from their community. One Indian brother who had recently moved to the area from a northern state mentioned that he had never suffered persecution. Everyone in the room responded with laughter and many assured him, “Just wait, you will!”

The leaders interviewed in this research were serious Christ followers who had publicly declared their allegiance to Jesus Christ and were willing to share their faith experiences with anyone who was interested and encourage them to consider becoming a Christ follower also. This act of “evangelizing” sets them apart in Indian society; causes rejection or ostracization both from the larger society and from their very important collective. This made them a minority in their respective group of origin. As a result, they had a strong bond of brotherhood as Christians uniting them across their linguistic and ethnic identities. This desire to share their story was a primary motivation to participate in the 2018 training and to implement the Spoken program.

The last section is a description of three fictionalized leaders developed from a composite of information from the interviewees from each group.

**Leader Profiles**

The goal of this section is to better understand the men who participated by describing an individual leader. However, to safeguard the men’s identities, particularly during these difficult times of Hindu-only politics, I have chosen to describe a fictional character to represent each group. There is a unit to describe a Kannadiga, a Madiga, and a Hakkipikki leader. The last unit contains final comments.
A Typical Kannadiga Leader

Ganagar, 28, grew up in a nominally Hindu home in the major city of Bengaluru. He left school in 8th grade as soon as he could work in construction. He also became involved in a gang with the other single men his age. He smoked, drank, or gambled earnings as fast as he made them. Sometimes he and his buddies would offer to “help” someone who was trying to collect a debt, by threatening to beat up the payee. Then they kept a 30% “fee for their services.” When a visiting pastor attempted to share the gospel in their neighborhood, four of his gang members beat the pastor and broke his leg.

Work, drink, gamble, sleep—life became one meaningless cycle, so Ganagar borrowed a large sum of money from his boss to go on a Hindu pilgrimage. But at the end, the monks told him he needed to go on another pilgrimage for the karma to be effective! He quit the gang and worked hard when he returned but could not earn enough to pay even the interest on the debt. So, he borrowed money again and went on a second pilgrimage. He came back feeling worse off than when he had started. He went back to work, but the loan-sharks began badgering and then threatening him for repayment.

His parents said it was his problem. His friends avoided him. He became suicidal. The day he prepared to poison himself, a child he did not know approached him and said, “Don’t worry. Your debts will be paid.” Then she walked away. Ganagar suddenly felt compelled to go home, but he slept in the street instead. The next day he found his own mother had invited the pastor who had been beaten by his gang to hold a meeting in their house! At the meeting, he chose to follow Jesus, and, to his surprise, he had great peace. He decided to live to tell others about this peace from Jesus Christ. After that, for some unknown reason, the debt collectors never returned.
A Typical Madiga Leader

Vinod, 38, was born into a devout Hindu home. His mother became very ill when she was pregnant with his baby sister. The family had no money for medical treatment, but his father bragged that their local god would heal her. She grew worse and died. The baby girl barely survived. Sometime later a visiting evangelist challenged his father about following gods who could not heal. The father collected all the family idols and threw them out. A year after that, his father and three elder sisters were baptized. The village reaction was both swift and strong. They were no longer allowed to farm the land allotted to their little ghetto community, they were blamed for anyone’s misfortune, and his sisters were no longer considered potential marriage partners. Despite the persecution, his family prospered. Then, a vivid dream impacted Vinod so forcefully that he publicly proclaimed that he, too, would follow Jesus and was baptized. Seeing that the entire family had become Christians, the elders said they had to leave the community.

Somehow, his dad always found work. In fact, they were closer to better schools, so he and his sisters began to improve. When he was in his village, everyone spoke a mixture of Kannada and a local tribal language which reinforced his lower caste status and destined him for the most menial jobs. But the school trained students in three official languages: Kannada for the state of Karnataka, and the two national languages, Hindi, and English. He was the first in his family to finish high school. Then he got a scholarship to a Bible school. He earned a degree and now pastors a church. He reports, “Ten years ago,” he says, “We lived like wretched animals dressed in rags. Now we have a good life.”
A Typical Hakkipikki Leader

Peter, 34, was born to Christian parents. Although they were illiterate, they recognized the value of education and sent him to school. He boarded to finish high school. It was there that he became serious about his faith and felt he should become a pastor. At first, his parents were unhappy with this decision. They wanted him to become a trader; every Hakkipikki knows that is where the “quick money” is. Besides, his parents said being a pastor is financially insecure; in some places it can even be risky. But finally, they allowed him to complete a 3-year degree from a Bible college.

It was living at home during school breaks in high school that Peter became aware of the differences in his community. Most Hakkipikki families were wracked by alcoholism, marital unfaithfulness, and internal quarreling about idols. Two of his uncles had even been in a knife fight over possession of one of the many family idols. Christians, on the other hand, seemed to enjoy good lives despite all the restrictions laid on them by the community elders and ongoing tensions from community members. One of those areas that affects Peter is that most Hakkipikki worship family idols and those who do won’t allow their daughter to marry a Christian. The first thing the prospective parents look for when they visit Peter’s family’s home is whether their family idols are in the sacred box. They have no idols in their home so at 34, Peter remains unmarried. His parents are really concerned. Single males are not considered a “man” until they are married and responsibly raising a family. He’s trusting that God will bring him a believing wife so that they can work together in the church.

For now, Peter spends at least an hour a day in prayer and Bible reading. There are only five books in his home and no television, but he follows news and listens to
music on his cell phone. Sometimes he accesses the Internet at public hotspots. He is active witnessing both in the house church and to other singles in the community.

The community speaks Vaagri Booli, but his high school conducted most classes in Kannada, Hindi, and English. A lot of the Bible school materials were in English with verbal instruction in Kannada. Peter likes to learn languages. He is picking up other languages when he occasionally travels with his father to trade in other communities.

**Concluding Remarks**

The Madiga as a SC have made some gains through the democratic process, but on the whole, they remain disenfranchised and marginalized in India. The Hakkipikki as a ST maintain greater ethnic pride in their language and culture, despite the fact that they, likewise, are disenfranchised economically and socially. Kannadiga speakers are a majority in Karnataka, but a linguistic minority in India. Multilingualism is common among the men in India, but proficiency might be limited to a few areas of communication. Using the MT denotes insider status and can positively dispose Receptors to the CA’s message. Being an evangelical in India is risky in the midst of rising Hindutva politics, but most of the leaders in this study considered sharing their faith stories as worth suffering persecution.

The next chapter will present the overall research approach, methods employed, evaluation strategies and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODS

In qualitative research it is important to identify the relationship between the research questions, goals, methods, contexts, conceptual framework, and validity (Maxwell, 2013). In the first chapter I explained the goals and questions. Chapter Two focused on the complex dynamic of orality and literacy in society. The literature review demonstrated a lacuna regarding the perspective of literate Change Agents (CAs) creating and implementing oral curriculum among groups of Connected Learners. Chapter Three covered the context, Karnataka, India, by explaining the difference between Indian and USA cultures and highlighting the realities of being a Scheduled Caste (SC), a Scheduled Tribe (ST), or an evangelical in India.

This chapter will clarify the research design and methods in three sections. First, I explain the rationale for the research in terms of design, the philosophical underpinnings, and the conceptual framework. Next, I describe the research team, the Spoken method, and delineate the participants’ learning preferences as gleaned from an impromptu survey. Finally, in the third section, I expound on the implementation of methods, evaluation strategies, and ethical considerations.

Overall Research Approach

This section is divided into three units: The rationale for the research in terms of design, followed by the philosophical underpinnings, and the conceptual framework developed for this research.
A Qualitative, Multiple Case Study Design

The research was designed as an in-depth qualitative, multiple case study of three groups that created oral-centric content and shared the content in their communities. The intent was to learn how the Local Leaders (LLs) who comprised each team that created content experienced the first year of implementing the Spoken process.

Qualitative

Qualitative research is a broad approach to social phenomena (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Cupchick (2001) describes qualitative research as a holistic process reflecting "an empathic understanding as if the structure of the social world is seen through the eyes of the participants” (p. 6). This optimizes capturing the perspective and voice of those who created the oral content.

Qualitative research also focuses on context and dynamic interactions (Creswell, 2013; Cupchick, 2001; Marshall & Rossman 2016). Researchers collect data within the natural setting, maintaining sensitivity to both people and place. In this research, sensitivity to the political climate in India required learning about the milieu of each community by interviewing the participating leaders.

Qualitative research allows flexibility and a variety of methods to be employed (Creswell, 2013; Cupchick, 2001; Marshall & Rossman, 2016), providing space for emergent and evolving insights to form as the researcher moves dialectically between inductive and deductive analysis to discover patterns and themes (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). This was an essential part of this study because some original assumptions were erroneous; further research was required after the data collection process was completed to clarify dynamics observed in the field.
Saldaña (2009) describes qualitative inquiry as “emergent, intuitive, indicative-oriented, and a socially conscious enterprise” comprising both art and craft (p. 42). While qualitative research is “fundamentally interpretive” according to Marshall and Rossman (2016, p. 2), the researcher engages in both systematic inquiry and reflection to comprehend and describe the complex social worlds they are observing. This study involves human action and interactions which are complex and nuanced. I used an interpretive approach employing a heuristic cycle of examining bias, new data, the particulars, and the whole, in an iterative and reflective manner to provide evolving insight concerning how literate leaders experienced implementing the Spoken process in their communities.

Multiple Case Study

Flyvbjerg et al. (2012) define a case study as an intensive analysis of an individual unit; valuable for theory building, generating, and testing hypotheses; having methodological value; and important in the social sciences. In case study research, it is also key that each group is bounded so the units of analysis are clearly defined (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2014). In this study, each case focuses on the experiences of the leaders in Local Leadership Teams (LLTs) from three distinctive cultures and languages: the Kannadigas who speak Kannada; the Madigas who speak a Kannada-Telegu mix that will be called “Madiga”; and the Hakkipikki who speak Vaagri Booli.

According to Creswell (2013) a multiple case study includes more than one case with the intent to show different perspectives on an issue. In a multiple case study, it is important for the researcher to replicate the procedures for each case (Yin, 2014). In addition, the researcher must select representative cases for inclusion in this kind of study
In this research all the groups who were regularly creating oral curriculum learned from the 2018 Spoken trainings were selected. While the three groups are distinct, they are also bound by common experiences that form a strong sense of mutual identification: persecution for their beliefs as Christians.

I chose a multiple case study design to broaden the insight gained beyond that derived from a singular case and to strengthen conclusions. Creswell (2013) refers to this as increasing “generalizability.” According to Marshall and Rossman (2016), post-moderns and critical theorists are skeptical of narratives or theories that can be broadly applied. From the critical perspective, the goal of this research was to acquire practical, applicable knowledge. Flyvbjerg et al. (2012) describes this as *phronesis*: “Practical wisdom on how to address or act on social problems in a particular context” (p. 1).

Practical wisdom informs others working with this content development process of how well the leaders of the LLTs grasped the basic principles central to the Spoken process, tackled obstacles they encountered, and were affected as they applied the method in their context.

Practical wisdom in this instance might lead to improvements in training, ongoing support, assessment of the role of technology and materials, and the role of relationship-building in future Spoken projects. As a researcher, I hope it helps highly literate CAs gain greater awareness of important dynamics to consider when working with oral communities and gain insights of how oral learning practices can reach the way they work with literate learners as well.
Critical Realism, the Philosophical Lens

According to Knight and Cross (2012) the philosophical lens of the researcher is an important element to clarify. Everyone operates under theoretical assumptions but an accurate representation of my epistemology—the source of our knowing, and ontology—our state of being, was challenging to articulate. In examining both positivist and interpretivist epistemologies, I found that critical realism synthesizes aspects of both by recognizing that there is an objectively existing world and a socially mediated understanding of that world. The world is real because it exists apart from our perception or representations of it (Au, 2013; Cruickshank, 2003).

This real world can remain relatively objective and unchanging as demonstrated through scientific predictability (Cruickshank, 2003). The world is knowable through human cognition, and yet our knowledge of the world is limited by human subjectivity and fallible social processes (Au, 2013). A “Reality” exists that extends beyond the physical environment and includes human nature, psychology, and divine revelation but we always perceive it through a variety of filters—theories and perspectives we were socialized in from birth—so the “reality” we know is always limited (Kraft, 2005). Critical realists take these theories, worldviews, models, and perspectives seriously but recognize they are “limited and inadequate ways of imagining what is not observable” (Barbour, as quoted in Kraft, 2005, p. 23). Critical realism is critical by linking relationships between structure and agency to actively work toward creating alternate ways of being that are equitable rather than exploitive (Archer, 2003).
The Connected Learning Framework, the Conceptual Lens

I also evaluated theories of adult education and communication, particularly as they pertained to the social dynamics surrounding orality and literacy, to see if there were any that explained what I had observed and experienced for 17 years serving Indigenous communities in Ecuador, and also in the following decade when I trained Christian leaders worldwide. No individual theory was adequate. This led to my developing a theoretical lens called the Connected Learning Framework for this research. This unit is divided into three parts. The first part covers Adult Learning Theory which contains guidelines for working with adults. The second part describes a relevant communication theory. The third part explains how guidelines from these two theories, along with characteristics of orality from Chapter Two, were resourced to develop the Connected Learning Framework.

Education – Adult Learning Theory

Many theories of education include adult learners, but literacy or a dependence on literacy is generally assumed, so they only partially applied to this research. Since Connected Learners rely on social and communal networks, I was keen to look at theories related to social learning and situated learning. Albert Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory speaks to the importance of the social environment and the centrality of people. However, Bandura’s four mediational processes—attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation—did not offer sufficient, practical tools related to the dynamic of the CA working in an oral community. Situated Learning Theory recognizes learning as a complex socialized practice within community with multiple stages. (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Neither did Lave and Wenger address problems I observed CAs working among
communities with a strong oral learning preference. However, I discovered that most of the guidelines suggested by Malcolm Knowles’s Adult Learning Theory (1970, 1980 and 1990) were highly relevant.


Knowles (1970, 1980) described adult learners as different from children in the following four ways: 1) Adults have a change in self-concept, due to their skills as self-directed decision makers. 2) Adults come with greater experience, providing them a significant, rich resource to draw on in their learning. 3) Adults’ readiness to learn is distinctive since adults often seek learning to respond to current challenges or needs they regard as relevant to their roles and/or tasks. And, related to the prior, 4) adults have a more problem-centered than content-centered orientation because their learning is frequently related to their current needs.

Knowles (1970, 1980) was more preoccupied with practical application than theory construction. He believed that due to the rapid changes of modern society, adults should be lifelong learners able to adapt to changing demands, and that the traditional teacher should function more in the roles of facilitator and counselor (Henry, 2009).
From the previous four assumptions about adult learners, Knowles proposed learner-centric guidelines for working with adults.

**Knowles’ Guidelines**

I chose the following five of Knowles’ six guidelines as a lens for this research. (The sixth, which was related to learning contracts, was dependent on literacy.) First, these guidelines are closely related to the Knowles’ descriptions of adult learners. Second, I recognized these as principles that operated in successful trainings with oral and literate Christian adults I had conducted in cross-cultural contexts. The Connected Learning Framework incorporates Knowles’ following guidelines:

- The adult learner, as a self-directed decision maker, should be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
- Adult learners come with a reservoir of life experiences, therefore, their life experience should be valued and utilized when it applies to the learning environment.
- The adult learner frequently seeks learning related to their job, personal life, or community issues, so learning should be relevant to their life.
- Learning should be problem-centered rather than content-centered, and the teacher-facilitator should encourage adults to reflect on how it relates to their life experience.
- Teacher-facilitators should provide a supportive environment of mutual respect. The teacher-facilitator models mutual respect even as s/he provides procedures and resources for helping adult learners to acquire information and skills (Knowles, 1990).
Academics debate whether Malcolm Knowles’s Adult Learning Theory withstands the test of being a valid theory (Jarvis, 2004; Merriam et al., 2007). Some claim anecdotal evidence outweighs empirical studies (Smith, 2002; Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Nevertheless, Merriam et al. (2007) admit that “andragogy has been the primary model of adult learning for over 50 years”, and also state, “practitioners who work with adult learners continue to find Knowles’s andragogy, with its characteristics of adult learners, to be a helpful rubric for better understanding adults as learners” (p. 125 and pp. 128-9). Henry (2009) explicates Knowles’ theory of andragogy and phases of andragogical process into a comprehensive framework. From my perspective as a researcher, Knowles’ Adult Learning Theory qualifies as phronesis—practical, suitable knowledge or wisdom that informs how to address adult learners in many contexts.

Knowles wrote little about the significant role of religion in most cultures. Consequently, I will turn to another expert in adult education, Jane Vella (2002), who addresses this important aspect.

Vella’s Spiritual Dimension

Vella (2002) has many years of experience teaching adults in Africa and other international settings. She taught at North Carolina State University, developed Dialogue Education®, started Jubilee Popular Education Center, and founded Global Learning Partners. In Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach (2002), Vella amplified what respectful relationships both in trainer-to-student and student-to-student interactions should include. The following characteristics describe a learning environment that optimizes mutual respect: safety, open communication, listening, humility, mutual mentoring, affirmation, mutual regard for ideas, feelings and actions, nonjudgmental
dialog, open questions, engagement in significant tasks, role clarification, and immediate
responses to questions raised.

Relevant to this study, Vella adds an important dimension secular western academics
have been trained (and in many contexts mandated) to avoid: the area of religion or
spirituality. She advised,

I urge teachers to work toward a learning-centered approach to their teaching via
a spirited epistemology, remembering, as St. Augustine said in the fourth century:
“No man teaches another anything. All we can do is to prepare the way for the
work of the Holy Spirit.” The spiritual dimensions of adult education are the
human dimensions, and attention to these dimensions makes for excellent,
effective adult learning. (2000, p. 7)

Religion, or spiritual reality, is a central concern to most cultures (Hofstede et al., 2010);
For many cultures, religion is integrated into every facet of their life. Understanding the
beliefs of adult learners who prioritize the spiritual dimension is a the way to remain
relevant to what is important to oral communities. A good facilitator can address spiritual
topics when adult learners feel this is important.

5). Establishing a relationship with the attendees before the training begins enables the
facilitator to get to know the participants in advance of a scheduled training, understand
more of their needs and expectations, and thus be prepared with pertinent resources.

In summary, several education theories focus on learning in social contexts, but
Knowles’ (1970, 1980 and 1990) guidelines provide practical working concepts
applicable to the situation of CAs working with Connected Learners. Knowles’
guidelines were written for a literate, western context: Nevertheless, five of the six
guidelines apply to oral communities as well. Vella (2002) describes what should be
prioritized in an environment that fosters mutual respect and adds two aspects that
Knowles missed: the importance of addressing the spiritual dimension and the importance of getting to know your audience before training begins.

In Part Two, I explain Kraft’s Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory (2000) which addresses communicating in a cross-cultural context.

**Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory**

Charles H. Kraft (2000), a professor of Anthropology and Intercultural Studies for 41 years at Fuller Seminary, published multiple books and articles focusing on effective communication in cross-cultural contexts. A Google search of “receptor-oriented communication,” reveals Kraft was the most frequently cited author (August 25, 2021). This part on communication theory is divided into two subparts. In the first, I explain the premises of Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory. Then, in the last subpart, I cover Kraft’s recommendations for communicators. I use both terms interchangeably.

**Five Premises of Receptor-Oriented Communication**

Kraft contends that effective communication requires that the communicator make every effort to understand the receptors, their culture, and the way they view the world. The communicator then forms her communication to work within the receptors’ frame of reference. According to Kraft, “The term frame of reference refers to the culture, language, life situation, social class, or similar all-embracing setting or context within which one operates” (Kraft, 2000, p. 15, emphasis original). Another term for ‘frame of reference’ is ‘worldview.’ I will use both terms interchangeably in this research.

Kraft’s Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory is built on four premises related to communication. They are the following:
1. There are three components in every communication act: the communicator, the message, and the receptor.

2. “When we communicate, we always send multiple messages.” (Kraft, 2000, p. 53). These come through words, but also include our tone, gestures, space between participants, eye contact, posture, attire and how we use the objects in our environment (Ruesch & Bateson, 2007). The implication is the communicator who is present is continually sending messages whether he is doing so intentionally or not.

3. There are always communication challenges or gaps because every message is very complex. Not only are multiple messages being sent, but the messages are formed via the frame of reference of the communicator, and then interpreted, or decoded, via the frame of reference of the receptor (Lang, 2007). These worldviews are never completely identical, even between persons sharing a common culture. Nevertheless, the more similarities the communicator and receptor share, the fewer the gaps. Thus, communication within culture is more likely to be understood than communication across cultures. See Figure 4.1. Kraft says, “Every communicational interaction involves a gap and a bridge. A communicational gap always exists between human beings and those who seek to interact with them, whether they be other humans or heavenly beings.” (2000, p. 3).

4. The receptor is ultimately the one who determines the final meaning constructed. (Kraft, 2000).
These premises lead to Kraft’s theory of effective communication which he presents using the example of Jesus as the ideal model. Kraft states, “To love communicatively is to put oneself to whatever inconvenience necessary to assure that the receptors understand. We call this ‘receptor-oriented communication.’ This is God’s approach and should be ours.” (2000, p. 15, emphasis original). He goes on to explain this involves respecting the receptors by valuing their “culture, language, life situation, social class, or similar all-embracing setting or context” (p. 15). Another way to state Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory is that receptors can interpret the message with greater accuracy to the extent that the message is presented according to the receptors’ worldview.

Kraft’s Recommendations for Communicators

Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory cannot guarantee receptivity, but when applied well it minimizes communication gaps and increases meaning transfer so that the receptor understands the message in the same way that the communicator intends it. Kraft clarifies important elements the communicator must know and do as he transmits

Figure 4.1 Communication Gaps (adapted from Kraft, 2000, p. 3)
his message. For this research I focus on the six recommendations Kraft details in


- Communicators should work within the receptors’ frame of reference and adjust their interactions within that framework. This requires participating in the receptors’ life and community. The process should allow the communicator to earn the right to be heard and concurrently expands his understanding of the receptors’ worldview. Steffen (2018) advocates listening to the perspectives and preferences of local voices to identify and encourage acceptable cultural currents and to counter unacceptable ones.

- Communicators should understand current challenges and specific needs of the receptors and relate to them as individuals who are members of a certain cultural commons. “Communicators are effective when they not only choose a specific audience but when the content of the message is presented in such a way that it is specific to the receptors in focus” (p. 150).

- Communicators should learn behavioral patterns of the receptors’ culture. This includes the who, what, where, when, and why of communication patterns and working within contexts and social networks familiar to the receptors (Steffen, 2005).

- Communicators “control the vehicles employed in the communicational interaction” (p. 150). This involves an awareness of key symbols and foundational stories of the receptor’s culture. It means using proverbs, song, dance, or other mediums of communication that present the message in ways recognized as familiar and natural to the receptors (Box, 2014; Steffen, 2005, 2015).
Communicators should focus less on data transfer and maximize receptor involvement in communication. This includes using more illustrations, applications, and questions. Kraft encourages employing a dialogic manner to promote discovery learning (Steffen & Bjoraker 2020). As Vella (2002) cautions, Teaching can get in the way of learning. The design of dialogue education, …protects learners in their learning from teachers teaching that could steal the learning opportunity from learners by telling, or ‘helping’ (p. xxiii).

Communicators must present themselves with integrity as dictated by the receptors’ cultural norms. This includes the message aligning with the communicator’s life.

Earlier in the same book, Kraft (2000) addressed two additional recommendations for effective communication. I have included them because of their relevance to this research. They are the following:

- Communicators should prioritize the receptors’ language (MT). This means learning the language well and using the language whenever possible.
- Communicators should trust positive responders to continue to spread the message.

In summary, Kraft’s recommendations for maximizing communicating clearly in a cross-cultural situation provide practical wisdom for this research context of highly literate CAs working with Connected Learner communities.

In this final part, I explain the conceptual lens for this study, the Connected Learning Framework. This part has five subparts. The first four explicate the underlying constructs of the framework. The fifth subpart explains the necessity for a new framework.
The Connected Learning Framework

The Connected Learning Framework was developed by noting intersections of the guidelines given by Knowles (1970, 1980) and Vella (2002) about adult learning and the recommendations by Kraft (2000) regarding communication, and characteristics of orality. Before explaining the framework, it is appropriate to review the characteristics of orality described in Chapter Two because they are key components. The learning strategies Connected Learners employ are directly related to a worldview that includes these dynamics of orality. In settings where oral communication and social learning are prioritized, the spoken word is considered powerful and binding. The orientation is social, favoring empathetic, participatory, and experiential forms of communication. Artistic presentation is important. Redundancy is appreciated and aids retention. Relationships validate credibility. Communication is usually relevant to the lived world of community members (in contrast to being objectively distant). Relationships are vital since people are the living repositories of knowledge, so oral communities prioritize harmonious inner group relations. Communication is often intuitive, implicit, and indirect. In addition, the oral community is more conservative and traditional compared to highly literate groups. Participants employ narrative logic by comparing new stories to their lived experience. For a composite table of the guidelines from Knowles (1970, 1980) and Vella (2002), the recommendations from Kraft (2000), and the characteristics of orality, along with source references, see Appendix B.

To create this framework, I recognized commonalities and intersections between the education and communication theories and oral characteristics and reordered them into emergent aspects in four areas: social, motivational, psychological, and
delivery/performance. Each aspect has a key word or phrase to represent the construct. These are:

- Social aspect: Relationship
- Motivational aspect: Relevance
- Psychological aspect: Mutual respect
- Delivery and performance aspect: Communication modes

These four aspects constitute the Connected Learning Framework. This framework serves as a lens for CAs to understand more clearly how to interact with, and to communicate in oral communities. The teacher/facilitator/counselor Knowles (1970, 1980) addressed from here after will be referred to as the CA. Likewise, the communicator Kraft (2000) referred to will be called the CA in the framework. See Table 4.1.
Table 4.1   The Connected Learning Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Phrases and Learning Aspects</th>
<th>Adult Learning Theory (AL)</th>
<th>Receptor-Oriented Frame-of-Reference Theory (RO)</th>
<th>Oral Characteristics and Connected Learning Strategies (ORAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP</strong> (Social Aspect)</td>
<td>Change Agent establishes a relationship (intake) before course or training begins</td>
<td>Change Agent shares life together by participating in receptors’ life and community</td>
<td>Receptors prefer working with known individuals or those approved by community elders. Relationship underscores credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Agent values building relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group is conservative and traditional (prefers ingroup wisdom, counsel from elders) and slow to adopt new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Agent works through existing social networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group prioritizes maintaining harmonious relationships within the group Group priorities take precedence over individual’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong> (Motivational Aspect)</td>
<td>Learning must be relevant to real life challenges and needs of the adult learners and their community</td>
<td>Change Agent understands and addresses receptors’ challenges and needs.</td>
<td>Relevant – close to what concerns the adult learner and their community today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning should be problem and/or task centered</td>
<td>Change Agent responds to receptors as individuals.</td>
<td>Use narrative logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Agent can integrate spiritual perspective when appropriate;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic Spirit and material realms are interrelated and experienced in daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Agent recognizes the learner is taught by the Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Phrases and Learning Aspects</td>
<td>Adult Learning Theory (AL)</td>
<td>Receptor-Oriented Frame-of-Reference Theory (RO)</td>
<td>Oral Characteristics and Connected Learning Strategies (ORAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUTUAL RESPECT</strong> (Psychological Aspect)</td>
<td>Change Agent provides supportive environment of mutual respect; facilitated discussion gives everyone &quot;voice&quot;</td>
<td>Change Agent relates in a dialogic manner or in ways that promote discovery learning</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult learners are seen as collaborators and co-creators. Adult learners are involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction</td>
<td>Change Agent entrusts positive responders to spread the message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult learners come with a reservoir of life experience to be valued and utilized, so learning is multidirectional</td>
<td>Change Agent presents himself with integrity as dictated by the receptors' cultural norms</td>
<td>Learns socially; every member has a part; interconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adults seen as autonomous, self-directed decision-makers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Agent encourages reflection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION MODES</strong> (Delivery and Performance Aspect)</td>
<td>Learning is socially oriented</td>
<td>Change Agent understands how to use cultural mediums of communication: Narrative, song, dance, key stories, artifacts, symbols, rituals</td>
<td>Socially oriented Empathetic and participatory Event oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Change Agent understands behavior patterns and social contexts</td>
<td>Artistic presentation highly appreciated Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Change Agent prioritizes the receptors' language, learns it well, and uses it wherever possible</td>
<td>Intuitive, implicit, and indirect communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spoken word is powerful and binding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before delineating details of each aspect, it is important to note that there are overlaps between the constructs. I have attempted to demarcate the guidelines, recommendations, and oral characteristics into four quadrants, but the human experience often defies such objective, tidy classification.

**Social Aspect: Relationship**

This theme involves several characteristics of orality which makes it an important component of Connected Learning strategies. This means Connected Learners prefer to learn from those they know or are known by their community, so relationships underscore credibility. Their conservative and traditional orientation means they will often defer to the elders’ approval of an outsider(s) before they are willing to work with outsiders. Connected Learners defer to the group’s assessment of how to interpret new information or practices, rather than relying on scientific facts or an outsider’s credentials as an authoritative voice. They learn best in environments where intergroup interactions are harmonious. Kraft (2000) recommends the CA spend considerable time in the community building relationships with community members. If the CA is a cultural outsider, he should be actively observing, learning about, and adapting to the receptors’ culture. Vella (2002) optimizes the training setting by admonishing the CA to establish a relationship with those to be trained well before the course begins whenever possible. Interaction with known individuals is foundational to Connected Learners, so I chose “relationship” as the key word for the social aspect.

**Motivational Aspect: Relevance**

Adult Learning Theory (Knowles, 1980) and Receptor-Oriented Communication Theory (Kraft, 2000) stress the importance of relevance—learning should be related to
the real-life challenges adults face. Adult Learning Theory recognizes that meeting work and personal needs is frequently the reason adults seek further education. Learning should be problem and/or task-centered since discovery motivates adult learners and builds self-confidence. Reflection is another important practice to develop insight. The CA should be able to appropriately address religion or spirituality when their target audience demonstrates this is an important aspect in their worldview. The CA recognizes learning is revealed to each learner in process. Kraft shows it is essential the CA is acquainted with the receptors’ current challenges and interests. The CA relates to those he interacts with individually as he strives to be relevant to their needs. Relevance is also a characteristic of orality, as seen by Ong’s (1982) phrase, “close to the human life-world” (p. 42) describing how oral learners are occupied with the present more than the past or future. Connected Learners intuitively employ narrative logic comparing new stories to their lived experiences to evaluate coherence and fidelity. I chose “relevance” to represent the motivational aspect because all three sources for the Connected Learning Framework mentioned it was important.

**Psychological Aspect: Mutual Respect**

Knowles (1980) and Vella (2002) highlight the importance of providing a supportive environment of mutual respect between the facilitator and adult learners, and also in student-to-student relationships. Respecting the adult learner is demonstrated by the CA in multiple ways: First, by involving adult learners in the planning and evaluation of their instruction. Next, dialog and facilitated discussion honor the life experience of individual learners, promote discovery learning, and build learners’ self-confidence. Mutual respect means acknowledging that everyone learns from one another, including
the CA learning from the adults present. A safe environment is created so each person can share their opinions in a positive atmosphere. Kraft (2000) emphasizes mutual respect by recommending the CA understand the community’s values and adapt to them. An example would be the CA presenting himself with integrity by complying with what integrity looks like according to the receptors’ cultural norms. In addition, the CA shows respect by entrusting the message to positive responders, confident they will know best how to pass it on. Connected Learners value dependency to strengthen communal ties. These are the reasons I chose “mutual respect” as the key phrase for the psychological aspect.

**Delivery Aspect: Oral Modes of Communication**

Where there is a high reliance on oral communication, the spoken word is recognized as powerful, so the MT is valued. Other dynamic communication modes are proverbs, dance, song, music, drama, and artifacts such as sculpture. These manifestations are culturally specific. Connected Learners value artistic expression. Performance becomes an experiential memory for both performer and audience. Because of the temporality of oral communication, repetition is important. Audience participation is common. Connected Learners thrive in a social context that is empathetic. Communication is frequently more intuitive, implicit, and indirect than in highly literate communities. For example, when there is a problem, a proverb may be spoken rather than an explicit correction. Social interaction is central when most learning is taking place.

The CA understands and utilizes local, cultural mediums appropriately and in the correct social contexts. The CA values oral practices of the community by presenting learning opportunities in familiar modes of communication. If the CA is an outsider, he strives for
proficiency in the MT. He knows foundational stories and key symbols function as highways to understanding the receptors’ worldview. In review, MT communication and learning environments that prioritize local, cultural expressions honor Connected Learners in oral communities. Therefore, I chose the phrase “communication modes” for the delivery and performance aspect.

Why Develop a New Framework?

If education and communication theories attend to the necessary concepts, why develop a new framework? The existing theories in isolation (i.e., andragogy, receptor-oriented learning theory, situated learning, etc.) fall short because they do not adequately address the gaps in worldviews related to communication and ways of learning between highly literate CAs and Connected Learners. The Connected Learning Framework highlights these gaps in the four key components.

There are fundamental worldview differences related to the learning environments of Connected Learners and the CAs with respect to how to design learning. Frequently CAs are unaware of these differences. Eight of these differences are summarized in Table 4.2. The list is not exhaustive because the context represented by each Connected Learner culture may add to or modify this list. Also, note that Table 4.2 emphasizes the two ends of the spectrum for comparison’s sake. *The reality is not a dichotomy but a continuum* with individual CAs and Connected Learner groups in a wide range of points on the continuum depending on their exposure to formal education, and regarding those who are highly literate, depending on their awareness and appreciation of orality and Connected Learning strategies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Designed by Connected Learners</th>
<th>Learning Designed by Highly Literate Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust/credibility gained through relationship; observing how one has lived their life</td>
<td>Trust conferred institutionally via degrees or certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group oriented</td>
<td>Individual oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-centered - what is learned is specific to needs of the learner(s); curriculum is learner-driven</td>
<td>Teacher-centered – what is learned is determined by the teacher or an institution; learner has little input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employs oral communication modes (literacy may be used, but is not central to the learning process)</td>
<td>Dependent on literacy (teacher cannot function without literacy, learners must access written material to master content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is experiential – observing, doing, task- or project-oriented, relevant to the student’s “lived world”</td>
<td>Learning is knowing – mental, content heavy, may be abstract or removed from daily life of the learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive (particular to abstract)</td>
<td>Deductive (abstract to particular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories teach and are metaphors for life involving both mind and emotions Experiencing the story is part of participating</td>
<td>Stories are primarily for children (they may occasionally be helpful for an illustration or example) Appeals to the emotions are seen as manipulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic expression is highly valued Repetition aids retention</td>
<td>Content is dense and must be written Content is copious, categorization is essential for access and retrieval because it cannot be remembered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative logic normative - learned intuitively and informally, Wholistic - includes intellect and emotions, morality, value judgments and operates through story</td>
<td>Propositional logic (ex. syllogisms) recognized as the highest level of functioning - learned formally and must be practiced; focus on observed, physical world, what is material, limited in making judgments relating to nonmaterial world (values, beliefs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions and harmonious relationships are stabilizing factors for the community Respect given to elders who have lived wisely. Elders make decisions for the group</td>
<td>Innovation and change are valued Relationship (personally knowing) the innovator/expert/community leader is secondary to expertise conferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 below shows how the four constructs of the Connected Learning Framework relate to how highly literate CAs experience developing curriculum designed for Connected Learners in the context of Karnataka, India.

![Diagram of Connected Learning Framework](image)

Context: Three Oral Preference Groups in Karnataka, India

**Figure 4.2 The Connected Learning Framework in the Research Context of India**

This completes the first section, which began with the rationale for the investigation in terms of design, the philosophical lens, and the conceptual framework. The second section is about the research team, the Spoken process and trainings, and a survey describing ways the interviewees prefer to learn.

**The Research Team, the Spoken Process, and the 2018 Trainings**

This section is divided into three units. In the first unit I introduce the research team. In the second I describe Spoken Worldwide® and the Spoken process. In the third, I explain the researchers’ history in India and the 2018 Spoken trainings.
The Research Team

Three people made up the research team: I (Regina Manley) was the Primary Investigator; Jim Manley was the Co-Investigator; Prashanth Raj was the interpreter. In the first part of this unit, I review the years of experience that Jim and I have living and working with other cultures and additional qualifications. Then I will explain the research skills acquired prior to this study. In the second part, I discuss the interpreter’s qualifications.

The Investigators

Because this research took place among different cultures and languages it is important to note both Jim Manley and I have extensive experience working among, and living in, multicultural and multilingual contexts. This was mentioned briefly in Chapter One. We lived for 18 years in Latin America—one year in Costa Rica for Spanish language school, then 17 years in Ecuador serving eight different ethnic groups who spoke seven languages. Our team consisted of pilots from the USA, Finland, Holland, and Ecuador. Our employees were Ecuadorians who represented the ruling class of “Blancos” along with Indigenous peoples from the Shuar and Quichua groups. Jim was a pilot and radio technician, and then the manager of this multilingual, multicultural team during the final six years. After we left Ecuador, I continued traveling and training Christian leaders for 12 years in 14 countries including India. Multilingual trainings with two to five language groups participating were common in my work.

The key quality we as researchers share from this rich experience among cultures is the gift of wonder and reflection. We are continually enriched by the diverse perspectives we experience as we work in multicultural contexts and continually humbled
by how much we must learn from others’ unique perspectives. This has made us keen observers, slow to form judgments, and curious to test and retest assessments directly with our partners from other cultures with whom we interact.

My experience in leading Bible storytelling trainings for 10 years in multicultural settings prioritized oral learning practices. There were three goals of the trainings. The first was to empower nonliterates and low literates so they could serve equally among literates in Christian leadership. The second was to demonstrate to the highly literate gatekeepers the wisdom and insight of the nonliterates and low literates among them so they would consider them for leadership roles. The third goal was to have highly literate gatekeepers experience the power of oral strategies to enliven the Scriptures from a prison of intellectual assent to a fresh, impactful, experiential reality.

My skills as a trainer and workshop director expanded when I became a volunteer coach with Spoken International in 2017. I trained in the USA, Texas, Kenya, and Ghana. In 2018, I acted as director of Spoken trainings for the first time. The three trainings were done in Karnataka, India. The final two trainings included the three groups that participated in this investigation.

Additional abilities that qualify Jim and I for conducting this research include the following: I honed interviewing skills in two prior research projects. The first was in-depth interviews of Shuar women in Ecuador in 1998. The second was a phenomenological study interviewing six cross-cultural workers about their experiences with nonliterate and oral preference learners in 2017. Jim’s second passion, after flying, is writing. Because of this, he is not only an astute observer, but a prolific note-taker—an important quality during the heuristic cycles of reflection, research, and final
interpretation. In addition, Jim oversaw all the recordings and managed the technical aspects. We collaborated on the coding, reviews, and analytical processes. From here on, Jim will be referred to as the Co-Investigator (CoI).

**The Interpreter**

Obtaining an interpreter who was competent and sympathetic to Christians was our greatest concern regarding this research in India. The political climate dominated by Hindu nationalistic policies under the rising popularity of Prime Minister Narendra Modi recently captured 25 of the 28 parliamentary seats from Karnataka state. We noted a dramatic shift during our last visit to India. In prior years, most Christians we knew were participating in prayer meetings taking place in house churches because it was practically impossible to receive permission to build a church. But in October of 2019, everywhere we searched, the house churches had been forcibly stopped—only individuals with “Christian” on their identity card9 were allowed to host a prayer meeting in their home. In this environment of growing hostility toward religious minorities, our top priority was protecting the identities of the Christians involved in this inquiry. Therefore, it was critical that our translator be a reliable Christian who was also a skilled interpreter.

Prashanth Raj is a multilingual interpreter fluent in six languages. From hereon he will be referred to as Raj. Raj interpreted for all the interviews except for meetings with

---

9 Indian identity cards combine a citizen’s identity number, picture and other information including caste and religion which are determined at birth. It is not difficult to change from a minority religion to Hindu, but it is extremely difficult to change from Hindu to a minority religion. The applicant encounters the following obstacles: interrogation leading to the arrest and beating of the individual who “converted them,” bureaucratic obstruction, and high fines. In addition, changing to Christian status immediately disqualifies the citizen from government benefits given to low-income groups. These benefits include: public schooling, subsidized electricity, free health care, monthly food subsidies, labor subsidies for agriculture workers, and also, reserved quotas for admittance in schools (elementary through university) and government jobs.
the Director who spoke English articulately. Raj was familiar with the Spoken method because he interpreted for our team in the 2018 training with PAUL\textsuperscript{10} Ministries in Kolar Gold Fields. That week of experience established a good working relationship between we three investigators. In our 12 years of prior trainings in India, Raj was the most skilled translator the CoI and I had encountered. I estimate his translation skills according to the US government’s Interagency Language Roundtable scale at Level 3 - Professional Working Proficiency. At level 3, the individual is able to operate in the target language

… with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations in practical, social, and professional topics. … Discourse is cohesive. The individual uses the language acceptably, but with some noticeable imperfections; yet errors virtually never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. (para. 9, Interagency Language Roundtable, 2021)

Raj is a member of PAUL Ministries which is not affiliated with the Director’s ministry. This increased our confidence in the objectivity of his reporting. In addition, Raj instructs classes in cross-cultural communication and anthropology and works among a different culture in a northern state of India.

In review, the research team was made up of myself, the CoI, and Raj. All three had extensive experience working and living in multicultural settings and brought specific, pertinent skills to the research project.

**Spoken Worldwide® and the Spoken Process**

This unit has three parts. First, I will tell about the organization that developed the spoken process. Then I will give details about how the content creation process works. Finally, I explain the different approach to training under the Orality Coaching program.

\textsuperscript{10} PAUL stands for “Preach to All Unreached Living”
Spoken Worldwide®

Spoken Worldwide® is an organization that has roots in a nongovernmental startup that created an audio player designed for Christian outreach. I will refer to the group as Spoken from here on. The concept was first field-tested in Afghanistan to prepare a primarily oral population to participate in the country’s first election in 2005. The challenge was to educate a largely illiterate populace in the never-experienced process of voting in democratic elections with less than a year of preparation. Afghan locals produced informative stories, songs, and dramas in eight languages. These were disseminated on 68,000 digital players. Over six months, three million people listened to and discussed the audio content in small groups. This basic model—local content creation disseminated on audio players and discussed in small groups—is still utilized by Spoken Worldwide® (E. Weaver, CEO Spoken Worldwide, personal communication, July 24, 2019).

Spoken Worldwide®’s core values are: 1) Projects should be Indigenous led so they have the potential to become movements without dependence on foreign funding. This is accomplished via collaborative partnerships with locally embedded organizations. 2) The work should be where few or no others are working. This implies there are no Christians or few Christians, and often there is no established church in the community. 3) Spoken Worldwide®’s staff and the Team Leaders are “doers”–actively involved reaching “the least [resourced]” with practical demonstrations of the love of God. 4) Staff are constantly learning by practicing, so frequent evaluation, reflection, openness to new ideas, and learning from mistakes are normative. (E. Weaver, CEO Spoken Worldwide, personal communication, July 24, 2019)
2009 was a significant turning point for the organization. They had been implementing the model successfully with an evangelism focus, but the staff realized that without trained leaders, new believers would not mature nor withstand the pressures to abandon their faith in the dominant, non-Christian culture. With this scenario in mind, they developed theological training for oral leaders called the Pastor Development model. The Pastor Development model is a three-year program. One individual, the TL, with biblical knowledge works with a team of Indigenous leaders\textsuperscript{11} who develop short, audio pieces called “content,” in their MT. The Indigenous team chooses what topics to address. What local proverb and Bible story relates to the problem and combines these elements as audio content. The TL mentors the leaders by facilitating discussion about the Bible story. Every week the Indigenous leaders use the content as a basis for facilitating discussions and, likewise, mentoring other leaders in their community. The TL ensures the Indigenous team covers pertinent stories from the entire Bible, so they develop a good grasp of applying biblical principles and how to apply them to daily problems after three years. Ideally, the Indigenous leadership team creates 40 pieces of content each year. At least one fourth of the content addresses concerns such as health, finances, agriculture and/or animal husbandry, sex trafficking, microfinance, etcetera. Wisdom for these themes usually comes from sources unrelated to the Bible. Establishing a three-year program requires about three trainings in the first year, and one or two trainings in final years. The method prioritizes communication in the MT, relies on local oral communication practices, and affirms the decision-making abilities of local

\textsuperscript{11} Spoken Worldwide\textsuperscript{\textregistered} encourages including a wide range of experience on the leadership team. Ideally, it should include men and women, youth through elderly participants. Since the local leadership makes this decision, this broad range is not always included.
Indigenous leaders. The Socratic method and mentoring are key components; it is “more caught than taught”. From here on, the Spoken method will be referred to as “Spoken.”

In fall of 2022 Spoken Worldwide® had active Pastor Development programs in 42 languages. Nigeria and Ethiopia have several programs in their 3rd cycle (year) with three generations of leaders being developed\(^{12}\). In addition, Spoken Worldwide® occasionally has their programs evaluated by an independent research firm. Table 4.3 shows the outcomes used to determine success (B. Whiteaker, Vice President Spoken Worldwide®, personal communication, 2022, September 22).

---

\(^{12}\) Generation 0 creates content and mentors Generation 1. Generation 1 uses the content to mentor Generation 2. Generation 2 mentors Generation 3. This represents four tiers of mentoring and expanding discussion groups.
Table 4.3  Spoken Pastor Development Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Outcomes</th>
<th>Qualitative Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing numbers of leaders</td>
<td>• Growth in understanding how to use oral tools to effectively minister among oral learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successive generations of leaders (1st Gen discipling 2nd Gen, and so forth)</td>
<td>• Growth in confidence and ability to communicate God’s Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing # of small discussion groups (hub for active evangelism, discipleship, and maturing as a leader)</td>
<td>• Growing knowledge of Scripture by each leader/participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growing list of audio recordings used in small discussion groups</td>
<td>• Growing ability to connect stories to one another to form a maturing biblical theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We also report on church plants and new believers, but don’t have these as specific metrics to evaluate success</td>
<td>• Spiritual growth with accompanying actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stories of transformation at personal, family and communal level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2015 a new thrust was initiated so the Spoken method could be adopted and adapted by other organizations. Orality Coaching was established to transfer the concepts of the method into the “DNA” of other organizations who desired to work among oral groups. Further trainings would develop coaches within the interested organization and there would be greater flexibility to adapt the oral principles to the organization’s goals and initiatives (E. Weaver, CEO Spoken Worldwide, personal communication, July 24, 2019). Since these organizations are not always working with Indigenous groups the leadership teams are called Local Leader Teams (LLTs). Orality Coaching began in India, Kenya, and Ghana. As of October 2022, there are 247 active language projects worldwide. Over 100 projects have been completed and closed but the Ghana programs are still running within the Assemblies of God and Four Square denominations. Ray Neu, who developed the Orality Coaching estimates during the last seven years over 1,000 Ghanaian men and women, both literate and nonliterate, have been trained. He writes,
“Orality trainings have led hundreds of people to faith in Christ, planted churches and raised up pastors. It’s been a natural outflow of the impact of God’s stories transforming lives.” (R. Neu, Director Orality Coaching Spoken Worldwide®, personal communication, 2022 September 16).

In third unit, I delineate how Orality Coaching presents the Spoken process.

**The Spoken Content Creation Process**

There are five parts to the Spoken process of creating oral content and disseminating it through the community. They are the following:

1. **Learning**

   The LLT, made up of the Team Leader (TL) and the Local Leaders (LLs), discuss their community, culture, concerns, and identify underlying beliefs and values.

2. **Choosing a Problem**

   The LLs determine a specific problem related to their situation or their community they want to address.

3. **Local Wisdom**

   The LLs find appropriate wisdom, frequently in the form of a proverb, related to the problem chosen. It can also be a myth, a story, a song, a mini drama, or some other artistic expression. It is always expressed in the MT.

4. **Bible Wisdom/Other Wisdom**

   The LLT searches for a relevant Bible story. When necessary, the TL clarifies the biblical context. After a story is chosen, the TL facilitates and the LLT discusses the story in depth. During this dialogue, the TL is mentoring the LLs. The LLs also
consider the local wisdom, the story’s lessons, and decide how to apply lessons learned to their own lives.

- Evaluating if all three components align - When the LLT confirms there is a good fit between the problem, the Local Wisdom, and the Other Wisdom, these three are combined to create one piece of Spoken content.

- Recording - The content is recorded in the MT on an audio file. The audio file is duplicated to an audio player, to chips to use in cell phones, or to USB sticks. Sometimes, the content is dispersed via the Internet or by using apps such as WhatsApp or WiseChat.

5. Sharing

Each LL shares the audio content with a small group in his/her community. First, the audio is listened to several times. Next, the LL facilitates discussion so everyone can participate in hearing, learning, commenting, and adding to the information presented. This time of sharing and discussion is also a time of the LL mentoring another generation of leaders. The discussion group members (DMs) are encouraged to start their own groups where the DMs re-share the same content and become the leaders who facilitate discussion. In this way, the content spreads through the community’s established oral networks.

- Feedback informs making future content - The small group discussion time informs the DMs about the Bible story and how it can relate to their lives. It also helps the TL and LLs to understand what is going on in the lives of their DMs and in the community which informs the LLT for the next round of content creation.
Training Differences in the Orality Coaching Program

In the first training, the Bible is the exclusive source of Other Wisdom. In the second training, which normally takes place six to nine months later, other sources of wisdom are used for a broad variety of topics. Some examples are information about health, hygiene, small business enterprises, micro finance, animal husbandry, agriculture, sex trafficking, to name just a few. For example, if avoiding the spread of malaria was the topic chosen by the LLT, instead of a Bible story, the LLT would use information from the health department and then craft a story about how a families removed or covered recipients of standing water from their area and started using mosquito nets in their homes which improved the situation in their village. The goal is to create 40 pieces of content per year with about 30 topics centering on Bible wisdom and a minimum of 10 topics using other sources of wisdom. In the Coaching thrust, the hosting organization/ministry has liberty to modify many of these details to fit their organization’s goals. For example, an organization may choose to use the Spoken method primarily for evangelism and not work comprehensively through the entire Bible as the Pastor Development Program does.

Another distinctives of Orality Coaching is the Coaching workshops are completely oral other than occasional references to the Bible for learning the stories. No notes are taken during the training. No manual, notes, or written guidelines are left with the attendees after the training other than the graphic in Appendix C. More time is spent developing a Coach within the organization or area, to provide in-country help, encouragement, and guidance in the method. There is less involvement of foreign personnel.
The Investigators’ History in India and the 2018 Spoken Trainings

The CoI and I first traveled to India in October 2007 where we met the Director at a Bible storytelling training in Delhi. Technically, I was the foreign expert training the Director, but I also gained insights from the Director. This began a friendship of mutual sharing, email communications, and visits extending over 15 years. The CoI and I returned to India four times to work with the Director often collaborating on evolving Bible storying and discussion models and encouraging his leaders through workshops.

In 2016, I expanded my skills by becoming trained by Ray Neu as a Spoken Coach. In 2017, I traveled with Neu to Kenya and Ghana for further field training. In addition to the storytelling and discussion techniques I already knew, I learned how to train leaders to examine their community’s worldview, the underlying beliefs, and look for causes to community problems; how to connect this to Local Wisdom (often a proverb); and how to link these two components to a relevant Bible story.

The 2018 Spoken Trainings in Karnataka

In June of 2018, the CoI and I went to India with a dual purpose. First, we wanted to train 18 language teams from two different ministries to use the Spoken method. Second, we hoped to identify and begin to train an Indian couple with the long-term goal of their becoming Lead Coaches to represent Spoken Worldwide® in southern India. During the first week, PAUL Ministries hosted the first five-day training in Kolar Gold Fields. Six language groups participated. The CoI and I taught; Raj interpreted; and a trainee couple observed. The two trainees led practice groups in Kannada and Tamil languages.
During the next two weeks, the Director hosted two trainings, the first in Mysuru and the second in the outskirts of Bengaluru. Since I had taught Bible storytelling workshops with the Director’s leaders in prior visits, both Spoken trainings were shortened to four days. Four language groups constituted each training, and all attendees were bilingual in Kannada. The two trainees who attended the PAUL Ministries workshop did some of the presentations in Kannada. This also saved time because less interpretation was required. The trainee couple taught one-third of the presentations in the Mysuru training, and most of the Bengaluru training. Raj was not present for the trainings with the Director’s groups. Unfortunately, the Kannada to English translation (for me and the CoI) was extremely limited in the Mysuru and Bengaluru trainings.

Most of the training time was spent practicing. Concepts were first demonstrated to the entire group with English to Kannada translation. Many of the concepts, such as Bible storytelling and discussion, were participatory in nature. Important points were modeled twice. Next, the attendees were divided into their language groups where they practiced the same skills in their MT. All large group sessions were in Kannada, the LWC. All small group work was in the MT. What follows is a description of each day’s activities. (See Appendix D for the 2018 Spoken Training Schedule with the Director’s groups.)

- Day One – After introductions and an overview, the CoI and I reviewed the skill of telling Bible stories and facilitating discussion, demonstrated the skill with all participating in the discussion. Next, a team of two from each group practiced telling a Bible story and facilitating discussion with their language group. We also introduced the Spoken method. As a large group we discussed problems, culture,
underlying beliefs, and values. We explored connecting a problems to a local proverb. Then each language group spent time pairing problems with proverbs. Next, as a large group, we took a Problem + Local Wisdom pairing from each group and together discussed what Bible stories might be an appropriate match. Each approved grouping (Problem + Local Wisdom + Bible story) became a sample of content.

- **Day Two – The CoI or I modeled an example of one piece of content chosen from the content of day one. We presented the Bible story portion in multiple, interactive ways and then facilitated discussion. We reviewed the five steps (and principles) of developing Spoken content. Each language group then developed one or more pieces of content in their language groups. Next, each group presented their content to the entire group to evaluate the “fit.” Together we discussed how well the Problem linked to the Local Wisdom. Then, how well the Local Wisdom linked to the Bible story. Then, how all three related. Each team presented one to three examples. As time permitted, some presented their content and facilitated discussion with the large group.**

During the first two days, there were four to five leaders in each language group. Then new attendees were added to each group on the third and fourth days. Most of the training was repeated.

- **Days Three - Additional MT speakers attended making the groups larger. The original two-day training was repeated. It began with a Bible storytelling and discussion model, but the practice in small groups was eliminated. The Spoken content creation process was discussed. We explored connecting a problem to a**
local proverb. Then each language group spent time pairing problems with proverbs. Next, as a large group, we took a Problem + Local Wisdom pairing from each group and together discussed what Bible stories might be an appropriate match. Each approved grouping became a sample of content.

- Day Four – The trainee modeled an example of one piece of content chosen from the end of day three with the large group. She presented the Bible story in multiple ways and then facilitated discussion. We reviewed the five steps (and principles) of developing Spoken content. Each language group then developed several pieces of content in their language group. Next, each group presented one piece of content to the entire group to evaluate the “fit.” Each team presented one to three examples. Each group recorded a piece of content. We all listened to the final recordings. We then made plans for implementing the Spoken method as individual groups.

This training format provides the leaders who participate all four days, time to practice Bible storytelling and discussion at least once. As a language group, the leaders attending all four days will have created four to six pieces of content and presented content for large group review at least twice. They will have participated in evaluating at least two pieces of content from each of the other language groups. Some leaders will have facilitated discussion with the content. All will leave with one recorded sample of content in their MT.

After each training, the Director challenged those who attended to form a LLT and to meet monthly to develop four pieces of content. The LLs were also encouraged to share one content piece and facilitate a discussion group in their community on a weekly
basis. This monthly cycle of creating four pieces of content and then sharing the content weekly in the local community was to continue for a year. Then there would be a follow-up training to learn to create content related to non-biblical topics.

The trainings took place in June 2018. Three of the Director’s eight groups became active creating content starting in September 2018. The Program Director (PD), who was the Director’s son, occasionally emailed me reports. By summer 2019 the PD had sent five reports indicating that three of the language groups had each created 20 pieces of content. We hoped this was sufficient activity to research how they experienced the Spoken process, so we coordinated a return in October 2019 to do interviews for this research. On arrival, we were surprised and grateful to learn that two of the groups had both completed 40 pieces of content and one group had completed 48!

In summary, as the Primary Investigator, I had over a decade of experience training Christian leaders in Bible storytelling and facilitated discussion which was a key component of the process. I became trained in other aspects of Spoken three years prior to this research. By 2018, both I and the CoI had 16 years of relationship with the Director. In June 2018, we supervised the training of eight of the Director’s groups in creating Spoken content. Of the eight groups trained, three actively implemented the method. We returned in October 2019 to interview the leaders participating in the LLTs of these groups.

**Implementation of Methods, Evaluation, and Ethical Considerations**

This section is divided into four units: implementation of methods, evaluation of the data collected, ethical considerations, and a final report about the ways the interviewed leaders learn.
Implementation of Methods

This first unit which focuses on methods has three parts. First I explain how the participants were chosen. In the second unit I discuss interview strategies. In the final unit I cover data collection practices.

Participant Selection

Before we arrived, the PD provided names of the 18 leaders constituting the LLTs of the three groups. I hoped to interview all 18 leaders and one to three DM per leader from the community groups (18 to 54 DMs). The selection of the interviewees was inclusive; all the leaders were invited. Twelve leaders chose to participate. After interviewing the three Team Leaders, we requested that each LL return with one to three DMs from their community to be interviewed later in the week. Six DMs participated. In total, 18 male participants from the three groups were interviewed. None of the groups had women. Table 4.4 shows how many participants were interviewed in each group and their role in the Spoken process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Team Leaders</th>
<th>Local Leaders</th>
<th>Discussion Group Members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hakkipikki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madigas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviewees represented three levels of involvement: Team Leaders (TLs), Local Leaders (LLs) who met with the TL to develop content, and Discussion Group Members (DMs) with whom each LL shared and discussed the content in the community.
**Interview Strategies**

This part is divided into four subparts. First, I explain why I chose focus groups and semi-structured interviews, and also how the interviews were recorded. Next, I cover the questions asked. Third, I explain details with regard to the Learning Preference Survey. Fourth, tell about the recruitment scripts and consent forms.

**Focus Groups, Semi-Structured Interviews, and Recording**

The focus group interview provides a social orientation well-suited to research. In addition, the focus group format allowed me as the interviewer to explore unanticipated issues as they arose (Marshall and Rossman, 2016). Since we had to limit gathering information to interviews within our apartment, and to maximize the comfort level of the interviewees, we chose the group setting so that the men would be surrounded by well-known individuals. The members of the group outnumbered the research team in all but one group session.

The interviews were semi-structured. I asked a series of ten questions but there was flexibility to change topics, return to a previous topic, and for interviewees to interact freely with one another. Galletta states this kind of interviewing “allows a systematic and iterative gathering of data where questions are arranged in a protocol that evokes rich data but is also focused for efficient data analysis.” (quoted in Marshall and Rossman, 2016, p. 150). Occasionally, one-to-one, informal interviews took place with the TLs as we waited for their LLs and DMs to arrive at the apartment. These were audio recorded with permission when the discussion was related to the research questions.

Creswell (2013), Marshall and Rossman (2016) say confidentiality is a significant issue when focus groups are composed of individuals unknown to one another but in this
context every LL and DM were well known to one another. The LLs had also met me and the CoI in the 2018 training. Confidentially in this Indian context was met primarily by the approval of the Director and his assurance to the TLs of our trustworthiness. At first, we were disappointed we could not speak with any interviewee without their TL present. Gradually, we realized the Team Leader’s presence provided both security for their members and, most importantly, also validated that we could be trusted. The way trust and truthfulness are negotiated in western and Indian cultures was discussed in the previous chapter (p. 65).

Some of the interviewees expressed concern when they learned that the research findings would be published. I assured them of anonymity by not identifying their names or their communities.

We prioritized security by having focus groups meet in the privacy of our apartment located in a large urban setting some distance from their community. As a foreigner, if we had visited their community, our presence would have brought unwanted negative attention to these evangelicals. Our urban setting was deemed safe by the Director.

We met the Director on Wednesday, October 2, 2019. We reviewed the schedule that had been communicated via email a month prior. He assured us he had informed the TLs. The next day we introduced Raj and the Director. The focus group with the TLs began Friday, October 4th. The first LLT focus group was Saturday, October 5th.

In the first focus group interview with the three TLs, we asked that their LLs to return individually with one to three DMs in the days following the Saturday team interview. To encourage participation, we suggested the LLs could bring their DMs on
any following weekday, as was convenient to them. However, all three TLs explained this plan could not work. It was unthinkable for the LLs to return unless their TL was also present! (The “flexibility” of the original plan would have required the Team Leader to return up to four additional times!) A second reality check was the problem of public transportation. Even though the furthest community was only 22 miles away and our apartment was located near a major highway into Bengaluru, travel times were two to six hours one way by public transport. The interview plan with the DMs was quickly modified. All the LLs would return along with their TL and one or two DMs on Friday (six days after their LLT group interview).

Making major changes to our research plan became a frequent event during our first days in India. After the Team Leaders’ focus group on Friday, we dejectedly considered how much information we would be unable to attain by not being able to visit any of the three communities, nor being able to observe a content creation session, nor see a sharing time between the LLs and their DMs. In addition, the TLs informed us they must attend every interview (or their LLs and DMs would not attend). This meant all levels of interviewees would be influenced by the TL’s presence; candid responses and crosschecking information was unlikely. In response to this inability to observe a group setting, on Friday evening I quickly designed a Learning Preference Survey to glean more information about the interviewees’ ways of learning and accessing information. Further details about the survey will be covered in the next subpart, “Questions.”

Beginning with the Hakkipikki, I interviewed the LLT on Saturday, October 6. Then some Hakkipikki LLs returned the following Friday, October 12th with two LLs (!) and two DMs. This Saturday-Friday pattern was repeated with the Madiga group,
followed by the Kannada group. Interviews ranged from 20 minutes to three hours depending on group size. We would break for lunch after asking the main body of questions. When we returned from lunch, we finished with the questions from the Learning Preferences Survey.

After the Kannada group interviews, we met one last time with the three TLs on November 2nd. We listened to and evaluated recordings of three pieces of content created by each group over the prior 13 months. The interview schedule is Appendix E.

All focus group interviews were both audio and video recorded. We chose to video record to compensate for the cross-cultural context. We knew there would be cues that we could not pick up adequately in the fast-paced, interactive context of a focus group interview. Videoing the sessions enabled us to review both video and audio recordings and continue to make observations ex post facto. The CoI set an audio recorder on the central coffee table and a video recorder to one side. The CoI kept a low profile once the interviews began. He observed and made notes from across the room without interacting with the interviewees. At the end of each day, the CoI made a second copy of all tapes and videos. The tapes, videos and paperwork were stored in two, separate, secure locations. The Institutional Review Board approval is Appendix F.

Questions

The interview questions were reviewed by an Internal Review Board because the Madigas and the Hakkipikki were socioeconomically marginalized groups, and I had anticipated interviewing nonliterates in all three groups. The questions were first written in English, then approved by the Director, then translated into Kannada, and finally double-checked by the Director prior to our arrival.
Nine of the ten questions were open-ended. Open-ended questions give participants the opportunity to speak in depth and to focus on issues important to them. In addition, this kind of question allows the researcher to ask follow-up questions for elaboration or clarification (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

When referring to the Spoken process, I never mentioned “Spoken” to the interviewees because the PD was vague in response to what the groups called the process. He simply stated it was “the project.” Where “Spoken” is written in the question in this research it is for brevity’s sake. With the interviewees, I always described the process by saying something like, “this process of combining a problem, local wisdom and a Bible story.” I also referred to what the LLT produced as “content,” ascertaining the interviewee(s) clearly understood what “content” meant.

The first three questions were related to the interviewee’s culture, ministry, and experience of becoming a believer. These questions provided insights about the men and what they believed was important to share about their community. We wanted to put the interviewees at ease by allowing them to talk about their people and share their personal story. This gave us important information about what the men felt was most important and what they experienced in their local setting. All the interviewees were asked all the questions except #2 which was for the TLs only. The questions were: 1) I am unable to visit your community/village. What would you like me to know about your culture (Alternate: About your community)? 2) Tell me about your ministry. And 3) Tell me how you became a Christ follower (Alternate: Became a believer).

The next request helped establish how they shared their faith before experiencing the Spoken process. 4) Thinking back at least a year ago, share an example of how you
witnessed about Christ (Alternate: How you shared the gospel) with others. Then I asked the only closed question: 5) Did you attend the Spoken training in 2018? (If yes,) how many days did you attend?

The next four questions were related to the Spoken process. 6a) What do you like most about the Spoken method? (Alternate: What is working well?) 6b) What do you find challenging or difficult with the Spoken method? For the Team Leaders and LLs: 7a) Tell me about the last time you met to create content with your group. For the DMs: 7b) Tell me about the last time you met with your leader to listened to content. I asked all interviewees, 8) Have you ever shared the content (you created/you heard) with others?” (If yes,) tell me about the last time you shared content with others.” Then I asked, 9) Have you seen any changes in your life or in the lives of others because of creating/listening to/sharing the Spoken content? (If yes,) please share. The last interview question was, 10) Is there anything else you want to share with me?

When an interviewee finished answering a question, I routinely responded with Tell me more (if the answer was short), or Anything else? before moving on to address the next interviewee. The question protocol approved by the IRB is Appendix G.

Besides these ten questions, I asked the Director if he wanted me to ask any additional questions. He added, 11) “How can our ministry serve you better in the future?” The answers to the Director’s question are not part of this research.

**Learning Preferences Survey Questions**

The purpose of the Learning Preferences Survey was to augment information about the leaders that could not be obtained from observing their groups within their contexts. The survey included questions about their age and years of education, what kind
of cell phone used, what languages they spoke and where they learned secondary languages. I queried where they accessed news, music, and new information. I had them estimate how much time they spent using various forms of technology and how much time they spent reading. I inquired about how many phones, TVs, and books they had in their homes.

Interspersed in these questions I posited five different learning scenarios to understand how they had learned skills or knowledge they deemed important, and how they planned to learn future skills or knowledge. First, I asked, how did you learn to use your cell phone? and second, how did you learn to use your favorite app? For the third learning scenario, we asked what skill or knowledge should every (Kannadiga/Madiga/Hakkipikki, respectively) know? When the interviewee answered this question, I followed it with, how did you learn this skill or knowledge? Much later I asked the question again for the fourth scenario, what other skill or knowledge should every (Kannadiga/Madiga/Hakkipikki) know? And then asked, how should they learn this? Finally, for the fifth scenario I asked, what skill or knowledge would you like to learn in the future? Followed by, how do you plan to learn that it? The interviewees sometimes answered with more than one way of learning. The order of questions and the results are in Appendix H.

Recruitment Scripts and Consent Forms

The recruitment scripts and consent forms were reviewed by an Internal Review Board. The recruitment scripts were completed prior to our arrival for the Director to use when he recruited the men participating in the LLTs. I wrote the standard and simplified consent and recruitment forms first in English and then had them translated to Kannada.
The Director reviewed and made appropriate corrections to these forms. The Director used the Kannada recruitment scripts with the TLs before we arrived. The recruitment scripts in Kannada were made available to the TLs for their LLs, however, in the first focus group the three TLs informed us these pages of writing would have a negative impact if used with members of their community (The LLs’ invitations to their DMs in the community setting were probably verbal.).

The consent paperwork was read out loud in Kannada and reviewed before each focus group session. Because we always interviewed in the presence of a highly literate and trusted TL, I employed only the standard consent form. Recruitment scripts and consent forms in English and Kannada are Appendix I. After forms were signed, we began the interview process. When I had finished the ten interview questions, we took a lunch break. Then we returned to the apartment and finished with the Learning Preference survey. The survey finished the focus group interview.

Translation added complexity to this research. All of the men appeared to be comfortable in their use of Kannada and the interpreter was highly competent in Kannada and English. There were instances when I needed to remind Raj not to summarize but to interpret exactly what the men were saying. There were also times when I needed to ask the men to pause or slow down so that Raj had time to interpret everything they were saying.

Most focus group sessions took most of the day. Sometimes we spent a long time waiting for all the men to show up. While waiting, occasionally the conversation with the TL would be about implementing the Spoken program. When the topic was answering the research questions, we paused to receive permission to audio record their responses.
We always bought lunch for everyone. We also reimbursed public transport fares and provided stipends for those who had missed work.

In summary, interview strategies included, primarily, focus group sessions employing open-ended question. Each language group was interviewed separately beginning with the LT on Saturday, then most of the LT would return with a few DMs the following Friday. A Learning Preference Survey was created to augment information that could not be obtained by observing the groups in their context and was given at the end of the day. The focus groups were both audio and video recorded. The Learning Preference Survey and an occasional one-to-one interview with a TL were audio recorded, only.

Data Collection through Transcription and Memo Writing

Data collection involved transcribing the audio and video recordings into written texts. Some information came from reflections of the researchers which were written both during the five weeks of interviewing and during the analysis and writing processes. This part is divided into two subparts: Transcription and Memo Writing.

Transcription

The transcription process itself is a form of translation by transposing the spoken word into text (Marshall and Rossman, 2016). Transcription began after the fieldwork was completed in December 2019. Most of what was transcribed was word for word what Raj interpreted into English. There were also some unique challenges. First, the Madiga TL who used English regularly in his work environment often chose to bypass Raj and respond directly in English. This diminished the quality of communication because he had difficulty expressing his thoughts. The vocabulary he needed for these interviews
was probably different from the register he used at work. Whenever he or the other
interviewees answered directly in English without using the interpreter, this was noted by
adding the word “ONLY” after the speaker’s name (e.g., Vinod ONLY). A second
challenge was the communication style of the Hakkipikki. Interviewees were frequently
interrupted, primarily by the TL, but they also completed one another’s sentences and
occasionally interrupted the TL too. There were also “eruptions” of conversations with
many people speaking at one time or side conversations that were probably taking place
in Vaagri Booli. Many people talking simultaneously and side conversation, of course,
could not be interpreted.

As I transcribed each focus group session, I primarily used the audio recordings
and double-checked difficult portions with video recordings. The recordings ranged from
28-148 minutes in length. Each focus group meeting had two to three sessions. I also
included the one-on-one conversations with the TLs that had information about the
Spoken process. The one-on-one conversations represented less than 5% of the total
transcription time.

I endeavored to catch everything spoken word for word, including pauses,
repetitive wording, and unfinished phrases. A “/” indicated the point where someone
paused, and translation occurred. When I was unsure of a word or phrase, I used the
following symbol: (?). I underlined text when the interviewee’s tone indicated emphasis.
Encouraging comments and very short remarks, such as “yes,” and “uhuh” were written
in caps to denote the speaker change without breaking the flow of the interviewee’s
response. I made notes of nonverbal activity with italics within parentheses. I wrote
personal reflections and observations in red ink. I reviewed each focus group
transcription twice using the videos in the final check. I saved my original but prepared a copy of the document without my personal reflections for the CoI. The CoI then checked my transcription using the video recordings. The CoI, noted any different interpretations and added his observations and comments in green ink. When the CoI completed his review, we discussed each discrepancy in interpretation by reviewing the audio and video files together. Then we agreed on a final interpretation resulting in a final written transcript for each focus group interview. Red and green comments were inserted as black. Each of these became the master document for coding. Rather than using names for quotes, I use the interviewee’s group and position, such as MAD TL (Madiga Team Leader) or KAN PD (Kannada Program Director). When there was more than person in that position, I added a number, for example HP LL4 (Hakkipikki Local Leader #4) or MAD DM2 (Madiga Discussion Group Member #2).

Most of the answers to the Learning Preferences Survey were numerical which required straight-forward transcription but data related to the learning scenarios was written by the CoI verbatim as I asked the questions.

Singal and Jeffery (2008) notes that further changes occur as written language is then transformed into academic prose. Verbal speech is rarely as succinct as written speech which can be erased and recrafted. While striving to maintain the men’s voice and style, I errored on the grammatically correct side when representing what they said. I chose to transform their talking speech into a more polished academic form by completing sentences and blending sentence fragments into complete thoughts. When context or vocabulary needed clarification, I used the following symbol: [ ]. The CoI
reviewed all the quotes written in the dissertation and checked them against the original transcription to ensure accurate representation. For transcription samples see Appendix J.

I chose Dedoose Version 9.054 (2022) software to process the data for many reasons. The program is designed for mixed research with the ability to integrate both qualitative and quantitative data. It is securely encrypted. Dedoose can be used concurrently by researchers. It accepts multiple media forms. It links memos, notes, and reflections. Dedoose has an extensive suite of analysis tools, and they are responsive in providing technical support. Dedoose is affordable, only billing for months when the data is accessed.

First, I uploaded all the transcribed master files relevant to the Kannada group into Dedoose. Each interview was cloned with a separate copy for each interviewee. The same steps were followed for the Madigas and Hakkkipikki cases.

The Learning Preference survey, spanning all three cases, was transcribed by the CoI on an Excel spreadsheet during the interviews in India. Most responses were numerical. For nonnumerical answers, the CoI used the interviewee’s exact wording. When the men’s answers were more complex and the CoI felt a summary phrase was necessary, he immediately restated his summary phrase and checked for feedback with the interviewee. Upon returning to the USA, I checked the CoI’s transcription with the audio and video recordings. As became our custom, the CoI and I collaborated on differences until we agreed and, then produced a master document in excel.

**Memo Writing**

Experts agree making notes or memos throughout the process of qualitative research is critically important (Creswell, 2013; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). It is useful
to remember details during interviews, capture observations, assemble thoughts, and for describing the inductive process as one is “discovering patterns, themes and categories in one’s data” as well as the deductive process “according to an existing framework” such as the Connected Learning Framework (Patton quoted in Marshall and Rossman, p. 222). Capturing ideas and insights as they emerge from both field work and processing the data is a key component to qualitative research (Creswell, 2013; Marshall & Rossman 2016).

In addition, much communication is nonverbal (Fidler, 2012; Mehrabian, 1980). Because of this, extra detail was given to observations taken during the focus group interviews by the CoI and augmented when reviewing the video recordings later as part of the transcription process. As researchers we met regularly to discuss impressions after the focus group sessions. We kept journals. I saved related email correspondence before, during and after the time in India and maintained a daily log during field work. I also wrote memos of our verbal collaboration coding rounds and the analysis phases as they continued iteratively throughout the research process. These multiple sources were important aspects of gathering data during all stages of the research process. Memo writing was also loaded into Dedoose sporadically during the coding and analysis phases.

Data Analysis

This unit is divided into two parts. First I will describe how we coded our data. Next, I show how we utilized tools in Dedoose software to further analyze the data. While the procedure is listed in clear steps here, Marshall and Rossman (2016) note the reality of the actual process, “The process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation to a mass of collected data is messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative, and fascinating. It does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat.” (p.216)
Coding

According to Saldaña (2009), coding is “primarily an interpretive act” (p. 5) ascribing meaning to individual datum in order to detect patterns, assert categories, develop propositions, build theory, or aid analysis. A code “represent(s) and capture(s) a datum’s primary content and essence” (p. 4). Coding is a progression allowing the researcher to look at the information collected through a variety of lenses or angles. The process adds value, capturing the essence of essential elements of the research story that facilitates the development of clustered patterns and categories to analyze their connections. Charmaz (2014) uses bones as a metaphor stating the integration of one’s coding eventually becomes the skeleton of one’s conclusion interpreted into a report.

Coding is a systematic and heuristic process which “requires deep reflection on the emergent patterns and meanings of human experience” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 11). As primary researcher, I chose the first two rounds of coding. I also maintained the code log showing the code tree and samples of each code developed.

This part about coding has five subparts. The first four subparts represent each of the four coding rounds: attributive, structural, sub coding and theory. The fifth part is about coding the Learning Preferences Survey.

Attributive Coding

Attributive coding is a basic set of descriptors for each interviewee. Namey et al describe structural coding as “acts as a labeling and indexing device allowing researchers to quickly access data likely to be relevant to a particular analysis from a larger data set” (quoted in Saldaña, 2009, p. 98).
I began Attributive coding by giving each participant a pseudonym which was their position in the group (TL, LL, or DM) and a number given in order of when they first answered a question in the interview process (one through four). Other details were the name of the group and language. I noted source document particulars of date, type and focus of interview, format of audio and video files, length, transcription length, source of memo (journal, email, log, transcription notes, conversation) and major themes.

**Structural Coding**

Next, I applied structural coding, also referred to as question-based coding. Structural coding “acts as a labeling and indexing device allowing researchers to quickly access data likely to be relevant to a particular analysis from a larger data set” (Namey et al., quoted in Saldaña, 2009, p. 98). The structural coding round linked each of the ten questions with their respective answer(s). Most of the coding was done using the focus group interview data. On occasions when important details were mentioned in the one-on-one interview, these were included in the coding.

Beginning with the structural coding round, we, as researchers, did the following:

1. I applied codes to a cloned copy of each participant’s responses from the focus group sessions.
2. I made a copy for the CoI by deleting my code choices but retained the preselected divisions.
3. The CoI used the copy with preselected divisions to assign structural codes.
4. We compared our code work. We discussed until reaching consensus.
5. We updated the final codes for each participant. This file became the new master file in Dedoose for the next round of coding.
6. I saved all the initial work of both researchers in another file location but deleted them from the Dedoose program to minimize confusion.

7. Once this was done, I updated the code log.

Then, we began the process again. Appendix K provides a few examples of excerpts that were coded, comparing the original transcription with the final edited portion as shown they appear in the dissertation.

Sometimes, a coding round would be broken into smaller sections. For example, the structural coding round 2a focused on the five questions related to the Spoken process (Q4, and Qs 6-10). Round 2b coding covered the questions about culture, ministry, and how they became a Christ follower (Qs 1-3). Round 2c represented adjustments. For example, Q9, changes observed, primarily yielded information about how they shared the content, so it was recoded as Q8. Question ten, Anything else? was always related to one of the previous questions, so it was recoded into the question it referred to. Three sub-rounds constituted Round 2, the structural coding round.

Sub Coding (Child Codes)

Sub coding is the assignment of second-order tags to primary codes (Saldaña, 2009). Dedoose refers to second-order codes as “child codes” and this is how they will be referred to them hereon. The child codes reflected themes that were apparent as we poured over the interviewees’ responses question by question. Many codes were identical. We divided sub code round 3 into sections of related questions. We began with the five questions related to the Spoken process. For example, how they shared the Gospel a year before (Q4), and how they shared currently using the created content (Q8) became round 3a. These two questions had 11 identical child codes. They included five
possible activities: Bible story shared, Facilitated discussion, Local wisdom, Needs met, Prayed, Preached, or taught, Testified. There were two ways of presenting: using Written material, and using Technology. There were two settings: Christian meeting, or Other. Question eight (shared content) had an additional presenting child code: by Memory.

Questions 7a (content creation) and 7b, (listening to content) constituted sub code round 3b. We determined seven identical child codes. The activities were the following: Bible story shared, Facilitated discussion, Local wisdom, Preaching or teaching. The settings were: Christian meeting, or Other. There was an additional code: When. Question 7a (content creation) had some distinctive codes including three activities: Needs identified or discussed, Recording, Copying content. Whereas Question 7b (listened to content) had two distinctive activities: Memorized, and, Needs discussed or met, and three additional ways to present: by Memory, using Written material, and using Technology. The total child codes were nine and 12, respectively.

Questions 6a (like) and 6b (challenges) made up sub code round 3c. The four child codes chosen for 6a (like) were: Benefits the uneducated; CA Learns, benefits from, or enjoys the process; Linking Bible Story + Problem is helpful; and Positive response of audience. The eight child codes chosen for 6b (challenges) were: Difficulty facilitating discussion; Difficulty finding local wisdom; Language complications; Limited scope; Rejection or negative response by audience; Schedule and timing issues; and two technical challenges--Device limitations, and Recording challenges.

Questions one and three constituted sub code round 3d. These questions were also given distinct child codes. For question one (culture), the 12 codes were the following: Alcoholism or drunkenness; Caste issues and restrictions; Deception or stealing;
Education valued; Fights or violence; Honoring elders; Hypocrisy in the Christian community; Idols and idol worship; Immorality or adultery; Pride in Christian culture within their group; Rejection or persecution and Traditions (not related to idol worship).

For question three (becoming a Christ follower), some distinct codes were chosen. There were three kinds of experiences: Born into a Christian family; Dream or spiritual encounter; and Miracle, healing, or deliverance. There were six ways they were exposed to the gospel message: Heard Bible story; Heard prayer; Heard preaching or teaching; Heard a testimony; Heard via Technology; and Read Bible or Christian material. There were two other individual codes—results of deciding to follow Christ. The first was the interviewee’s response—Dedicate life to Christian service, and the other code was a common experience the interviewees had as a result from making this decision: Rejection or persecution.

Question two (describe your ministry) was also coded in sub code round 3d. The child codes for question two were identical to the 11 child codes for question 4 (shared before) with the following differences: Question two did not have two actions: Facilitated discussion or Local wisdom. Question two had three additional child codes: Rejection or persecution; (shared) With other culture or language; (share) with own group or language.

The CoI and I followed the seven steps listed previously (p. 167) for the Sub Coding round. Sometimes a new child code would need to be added because of a particular group’s experience. When this happened, we would recode all the prior groups’ data applying the new child code.
Theory Coding with Child Code Descriptors

According to Saldaña (2009), theory codes are developed from a prediction about what will happen in the data. In the fourth round of coding, we developed theory codes to address the sub question, *What role did mutual respect, life experience, and modes of communication play in implementing the Spoken process?* The theory codes derived from the Connected Learning Framework were the following: Relationship (the social aspect related to life experience), relevance (the motivational aspect related to life experience), mutual respect, and oral modes of communication. The greatest challenge was defining each code discretely because there are overlapping elements in the four aspects. After a trial run coding the Kannada language group, we clarified definitions, and rewrote some characteristics, and then recoded all three groups by employing four to five descriptor codes to clarify each construct. For example, the theory code relationship, has five descriptor codes which are the following: CA (as insider) is working with family friends and members in his community; CA networks in familiar community locations and gatherings; CA (as outsider) is building social relationships in the Receptors’ community. CA spends time with the Receptors/Target Audience; 5) Receptors/Target audience are greatly influenced by the elders and group opinion. The theory code and each theory code’s set of descriptors were coded concurrently and constituted one coding round, Round Four. Table 4.5, Theory Coding Samples, provides a description of the four theory codes—one for each construct of the Connected Learning Framework and descriptor codes for each construct, and examples. (The descriptor codes were coded in Dedoose as child codes under each theory code.) See Appendix J for the Transcription Key. The CoI
and I followed the seven steps listed previously (pps. 167-8) for Round Four – Theory coding. The entire Code Log with examples is Appendix L.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connected Learning Construct</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sample Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relationship                 | - The CA, as an insider, works with family, friends and/or primarily within his own community  
- The CA spends time with Receptors because he recognizes relationship building as important  
- The Receptors are greatly influenced by their peers, the community’s elders, and/or their group’s opinion. The Receptors may align with the CA (and the Christian community) for a time, but return to the community’s norms of behavior  
- The CA, as an outsider, builds social relationships in the Receptor’s community | LL1: In Wenkesh’s sister’s house, I also shared this story./ Okay, usually he (the TL?) shared with me, but LL1, he shared with our family. (MAD DGM1 26455-26728)  
TL: I also share with those who are our fathers, who are leading our community/ as you have told the stories./ “See here in this Bible it is also telling/ the real god is Christ.” (HP GL1 03689-03916)  
When I TL ONLY: [When creating content] we are supposed to think twice, Ma’am. Twice means we need to think how the problems started [and] solving the problems. We will have to discuss with our leaders and again we need to go from our leaders’ [meeting] to their areas [of ministry] to understand them. And again, once more in that manner. (MAD GL 46850-47222) |
| Oral Modes of Communication  | - Oral modes of communication are employed or preferred. This includes narrative, song, dance, symbols, music, artifacts, and/or artistic expression, to name a few. Reading may be present but is not mandatory  
- The CA works through familiar networks and contexts, for example: in homes, in the marketplace, at church or temple, in businesses, at the community’s festivals and/or WhatsApp  
- The spoken word is powerful. Receptors speak of being impacted by stories and/or local wisdom  
- Learning is social, participatory, experiential, and/or empathetic  
- The CA prioritizes use of the Receptors’ mother tongue. (The CA, if an outsider, is actively learning the Receptors’ mother tongue) | TL: So, in our community, they won't read, but they will hear, and they will get the message. (HP GL2 12666-12764)  
TL: So, if we go for this [to make content]/ three or four house people will come in together;/ They’ll will sit and do [it]. (HP LL1 39039-39179)  
TL: Previously, we were telling only stories./ But we didn’t bother about local content and local wisdom/ the problem—we didn’t bother about those things./ So then, we would tell the story [and] they heard and then they would go./ But now,/ with the problem and the making content/ and [local] sayings,/ that touches their hearts./ So, they learn it nicely and they can share it with others also. (KAN GL1 05861-06255)  
TL ONLY: Because I’ll explain again what the Kannada means, so I have to speak again in Madiga language, in Madiga I need to speak. They need for the word to be there in Madiga; then everybody can understand. Yes. (MAD GL3 12657-12890) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connected Learning Construct</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sample Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance**                | - The CA does something to address Receptors' felt needs, problems, or challenges  
- Receptors respond positively because felt needs are met or they feel heard. (Initially positive, the second response may be negative)  
- The CA effectively addresses spiritual issues  
- The CA personally identifies with the Receptor’s needs | There is a village far from my place. We go there and we gather the people and I share these things with them, the stories. And I ask the questions: What [do] you like? What don’t you like? Oh, Who do you want to be? / So, there are so many families coming there./ So they said that “You know, you please, conduct these meetings every Sunday also./ So you do not have much age, but you are speaking like old people.” They said./ “So seeing our problems, nobody is there to speak there about that problem, but you are speaking to [it]. You are responding to our problems.”….They like that./So most people are like that—they love to hear the stories. (KAN LL1 57115-57825)  
So, t |}

| **Mutual Respect** | - The CA values Receptors' input and/or encourages discussion. The CA learns from the Receptors  
- The CA entrusts positive Receptors to spread the "message" or new ideas appropriately  
- The CA involves Receptors in decision-making activities  
- Receptors express honor, respect, and/or show appreciation of the CA  
- The CA, as an outsider, respects Receptors' culture by adapting to it | But while discussing, everybody is speaking./ everybody shares their own opinion./ Whatever they understood, they share./ So when we preach, people simply hear. But when we discuss, all will speak and they will share their opinions and [what] everything is, [they share] some hidden things also, what we didn’t know. Then, we know it.  
…Yah, we never heard those truths, but someone will be telling those truths. (MAD LL1 15008-15379 and 15492-15575)  
In four villages I have seen transformation./ So they said, “Those who are came before, they have not shared like you are sharing.” [Interpreter clarifies: He means using content.]/ “So, whatever you share, we are understanding. And we do also our discussing./ So, please come every week.”/ So, they learn, and they will share with others also. (KAN LL1 57998-58466)  
So now a days [because of these interviews] I’m being encouraged and, I really want to make a search in our Madiga community about their language and their culture. I want to go in deep. (MAD DGM2 0510-5329) |
Coding the Learning Preference Survey

The Learning Preference survey had numerical answers for most of the questions but the how-did-you-learn questions (4, 6, 22, 26, 29, 30, and 31) were descriptions. After reviewing the transcribed responses, we decided on the following nine codes to describe how the men learned: Seeing (Observing), Doing (Experimenting), Interacting with others, Learning by myself, Hearing, Via Technology (TV, YouTube), Praying, Reading, and Learning Formally. Learning formally meant learning in a class, from a business that offered instruction or at an institution. It did not include online learning which was categorized as technology. When more than one activity was mentioned, we listed all the activities in order of mention. Both I and the CoI coded the interviews independently. There were a few differences which required discussion until we came to an agreement. The Learning Preference Survey and the learning preference code log are in Appendix H.

Rating Reliability

An important part of our process was checking our intercoder agreement through Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) tests. IRR is a measurement that assesses how consistently codes have been applied by multiple coders. According to Saldaña (2009), “There is no standard or base percentage of agreement among qualitative researchers, but the 80-90% range seems a minimal benchmark to those most concerned with an evidentiary statistic” (p. 37).

Finding the best way to address IRR was a journey with a high learning curve. For Round Two - structural coding I designed a test in Dedoose’s Training Center. The test applied the kappa pooled formula to just 20% of the coded excerpts. Kappa measures the
actual agreement in coding while keeping in mind the fact that some agreement would occur by chance (IRR, 2022). The IRR for structural coding using Dedoose’s Training Center for Round Two was 82%. This was remarkable considering the fact that the Dedoose IRR test added an additional level of complexity—the excerpts were isolated, meaning the larger context was not viewable to the CoI! But this method did not work for any future rounds. The large number of codes in Round Three – Sub Coding (aka Child codes) combined with too little data made it impossible to design further tests using Dedoose’s Training Center. For several months, I manually calculated Kappa for various subsets of Round Three. This required many hours of mathematical calculations. Finally, I chose to simplify the IRR process by dividing the number of excerpts in agreement by the total number of excerpts for each code. This was a simple percentage agreement, and it did not account for agreement that may happen by chance.

According to Olesen et al., (1994), coding as a team provides opportunities for multiple ways and perspectives of analyzing and interpreting the data. When our agreement numbers dropped below 80%, the CoI and I discussed, brainstormed, and rewrote better codes. For example, I identified sixty-six child codes (sub codes) needed in Round 3. But our percentage of agreement on the first language group of round 3a was only 4%! This clued us to some knowledge gaps, including the necessity of reviewing basic assumptions and defining terms more specifically. Together, the CoI and I generated forty-eight sub codes. We recoded the Kannada language group obtaining an IRR of 85%. All subsequent coding rounds were over 80%. Coding and IRR checks were iterative, adding structure and insight to the analytical process. Encountering differences challenged us both to code only what was defendable. By honing our definitions and
applying a keener analysis in the code construction process we accomplished a thorough
and comprehensive investigation. We began with the Kannada group material. After data
analysis, we returned and repeated the same coding steps with the Madiga group and
finally with the Hakkipikki group.

**Ethical Considerations and Subjectivity**

In this final unit, I will first explore ethical considerations in the first part and then
discuss subjectivity and bias in the second part.

**Protecting, Valuing, and Benefiting Participants**

Ethical research should be grounded in respect for the persons involved, regard
for their beneficence and concerns for justice (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). In the
following paragraphs I will describe how we valued the participants, endeavored to
protect their identities, and were frank about the benefits they could expect from
participating in this research.

Our greatest concern in doing this research was that we might increase the
interviewees’ risk of persecution in India. As mentioned in the previous chapter, being an
evangelical in India can be risky and the is exacerbated in the growing popularity of
*Hindutva* politics (pp. 102-105). While we were there, we took many precautions to make
sure the men could participate in the interviews where their activities would not be
suspect. We chose a location distant from their villages and home areas so they could
come and go without drawing notice. We did not visit the homes or communities of the
Madiga and Hakkipikki groups for this same reason. Instead, we gleaned information
about how the leaders learned and accessed information through a Learning Preference
Survey.
I chose to increase their anonymity by identify the three groups as parts of a larger population to whom they belonged so that the individuals could not be easily traceable from this dissertation. For example, the SC group interviewed is a subset of the Madiga which has a population of 9 million in southern India. The Hakkipikki are 29,000 strong so anonymity was ensured by not mentioning the area where they reside because there are multiple Hakkipikki communities in Karnataka. There are 49 million Kannada speakers in Karnataka. In addition, I did not use their real names in the dissertation but addressed them by their position in the Spoken process—PD, TL, LL, or DM. Another cautionary step I employed was describing each group through a fictitious composite profile rather than describing actual individuals. All these practices align with the dictum *primum non nocere*—first do no harm. It demonstrated how I valued the men and implemented practices to ensure their safety.

Another demonstration of valuing their free agency was following the IRB protocols. I appreciated the IRB process because it made explicit a number of issues that were important for me to inform the interviewees before beginning the interviews. These include the purpose of the research, their rights to participate, stop participating, or not participate. Unfortunately, the formality of signing pages of paperwork was an oddity. Knowlton (2006) notes how this act can have a negative impact with “illiterate and marginally literate populations”:

> Not infrequently the act of having to read a document and sign it removes the research from the space of ordinary interactions…to equivalent acts of signing forms in formal society, where generally something is at risk. As a result, the act itself generates suspicion and distrust. Instead of generating informed consent it can generate outright hostility, fear of loss, and suspicion about the broader concerns of the researcher. It changes the nature of relationships and interactions, not infrequently in ways that can make research impossible. (p. 36)
All of the participants were literate with six to 16 years of schooling. After reading the paperwork in Kannada at the beginning of each focus group session, the TLs graciously re-explained, in their MT, how this paperwork-and-signing-forms was what an academic institution required me to do to conduct research. This was another indication of how relationship is of primary importance in these groups. In the Indian context, it would have been more natural if I could have explained these issues verbally with translation. I also provided recruitment scripts for the Director, the TLs, and the LLs (Recruitment scripts are Appendix I) (It is possible they made the invitations orally when they spoke with potential interviewees in their community and did not use the paperwork).

Two of the TLs asked me directly what benefit they would receive for their participation. I had to meekly answer that, beyond the free lunch and reimbursement for bus fare, all of their hours of participation would net little immediate personal benefit. I did explain how the research would inform others who could improve future trainings for groups working cross-culturally with Connected Learner communities. I appealed to their altruistic nature that every method is a work in process and their experience could have an impact of future improvements that could positively impact both how the process would be implemented in India and in other parts of the world. I also promised to return to do the follow up trainings which had been delayed because of this research and complications from COVID.

Subjectivity Statement

As human researchers, none can claim to be free from bias and Creswell (2013) points out the best approach is to clarify one’s bias as a researcher and employ validation
strategies. My first priority in life is to live as a disciple of Jesus Christ. As an evangelical, I closely identify with the participants’ focus of sharing the good news about God’s love demonstrated through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. To act as a check, I was also in conversations peers and with my academic advisors who provided another level of scrutiny with regard to bias. I especially valued the comments from those who were not Christians to help bring balance to this research through their input.

I am also a citizen of the USA. So, I am looking at these leaders’ experience from an outsider’s view. Sometimes, an outsider can see things that are too common or mundane for the insider to notice. For example, part of what made Tocqueville’s insight on American democracy so insightful was his perspective as an outsider. Another asset we investigators brought to this research to minimize the outsider perspective was decades of cross cultural experience, 17 of which was working with a multicultural, multilingual team in Ecuador.

Insights on How the Interviewed Leaders Learn

The Learning Preferences Survey helped garner some insights about the 18 men who participated in this research. The ages of the interviewees were ranged from 18 to 55 years old and their years of formal schooling from six to 17 years with an average of 11.4 years. This was an educated group considering the social demographic included 9 STs and 5 SCs. These leaders maintained a discipline of daily Bible reading. Most reported reading every day for more than an hour (this may have included time for reflection and prayer). Nevertheless, Table 4.6, Leaders’ Learning Preferences, shows that when asked
how they preferred to learn, 75% of their responses were oral modes of learning. They mentioned reading or participating in formal schooling for only 25% of their responses.
### Table 4.6 Leaders’ Learning Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Interviewees Answering Each Question</th>
<th>How did you learn to use your cell phone?</th>
<th>How did you learn to use your favorite app?</th>
<th>What knowledge or skill should every Kan/Dad/HP know? How did you learn it?</th>
<th>What other knowledge or skill should every Kan/Dad/HP learn? How should they learn it?</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/18</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing / Observing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing / Experimenting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn by Myself</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Technology, TV, YouTube</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate 25%</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn in School, Take a Class (not online)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a good example of strong oral learning preferences even among literate leaders who are reading on a regular basis. It is likely the general populace demonstrates even greater preferences for learning using oral modes of communication.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS

This research explores how the leaders of three teams acting as Change Agents (CAs) working among groups of oral preference learners experienced the first year of implementing the Spoken process in their communities. In this first year, the new ideas these leaders were introducing were using stories from Christian Scripture as a source of wisdom to help with community problems.

This chapter has five sections. The first two sections address findings related to the sub questions: *How was the Spoken process implemented? What challenges and benefits were experienced?* In the first section, I describe findings that are common to all three groups. In the second section, I explicate findings distinctive to each group. The third section consists of tables that summarize Section One and Section Two. In the fourth section, I report findings related to the content created. In the fifth section, I discuss findings related to the final sub question: *what role did mutual respect, life experience and mode of communication play in implementing the Spoken process?*

**Findings Common to All Three Groups**

There are two units in this section about findings experienced by all three groups of leaders. First, I give details on how all three groups implemented the Spoken process during the first 13 months. Then, I discuss challenges and benefits all experienced.

**Implementation Practices Common to All Groups**

All three groups met monthly to create content, but the time, the day, and the place of meeting could vary. All three teams made content even when some leaders were
absent. The Madiga Team Leader (TL) said there were four leaders on his team, but once he commented there were six (perhaps two of the six leaders worked as a team). The Kannadiga team was made up of four Local Leaders (LLs) and the TL. If other believers were present when the teams made content, they were welcome to join in the discussion. The Hakkipikki team was fluid. When asked how many met to make the content, first the TL said, “Ten to 15. Sometimes 20. …So if we go for a house meeting, three or four people will come together. They’ll sit and do this.” (HP LL1, 38890-39175)

Each TL started the Spoken content creation process by asking their leaders what problems they faced personally or as a community. After choosing a problem, they looked for a relevant Bible story. This could come from the TL, or the LLs could also offer suggestions. After the Bible story had been chosen, the amount of facilitated discussion that followed varied widely. Next, they look for local wisdom to relate to the problem and Bible story. All three teams added a conclusion after the Bible story. The Madiga TL gave the following detail:

So, after reading the story, we’ll take the main points/ the main points are repeated. These have to be applied in our lives. Yah. / If he [the listener] gets fearful, so he must apply [the lesson from the Bible story]. (MAD GL3, 31372-31559)

They expanded from the original design of Problem + Local Wisdom + Bible Story to: Problem + Local Wisdom + Bible Story + Moral/Lesson. When four pieces of content were completed, the TL called the PD.

When the PD arrived to record, the TL was usually accompanied by two or more LLs, or with an LL and the leader’s Discussion Group Members (DMs). The PD checked to see that the problem was something being currently experienced in the community. The PD ascertained that the Bible story and the local wisdom were both clearly related to
the problem. Sometimes the PD suggested changes. Because the PD’s Kannada orientation was different from the Scheduled Castes’ (SCs) or the Scheduled Tribes’ (STs’) worldview, sometimes discussions ensued to bring greater understanding regarding content choices by these cultures. The Madiga TL described the process:

So, when the PD comes, we will discuss with him the problem, the proverb, and the storytelling. The PD will explain [things] with me and we again will explain [things] to him. So, the PD corrects some things if there are some mistakes or problems. He also asks about the problem if it is really happening or not. “Oh, in your communities [are these] things going on?” he asks. So, we say, “Yah it’s happening. It’s happened here, here [and] there and we share with him and tell him. So, sometimes he shows us the correct Bible passage. And again, we must explain [our culture] to him. After taking in all that, we record it at his place. (MAD GL3, 27631-28324)

Next, the LLs and DMs provided the narration for the recording which could require several “takes.” After making the recording, the PD continued to edit background noises. When the final copy was ready, the PD would give the TL chips (memory cards) so each of the LLs could replay the content via their cell phone. The TL would also disseminate the content via his Christian community’s WhatsApp network. This meant that not only his LLs but all the Christian leaders within the group’s network received the content.

About half of the interviewees reported positive responses from the Christian recipients of the content via WhatsApp. However, these responses were vague. Hakkipikki LL4 commented: “So many people they encourage us [saying], ‘Good thing.’ [and other] good comments.” (HP DGM1, 45798-47048). We had the impression the TLs were unsure of the actual impact of the content or the extent of its spread via the app.

Within a few months after the 2018 training, the LLs from all three groups began making content and gathering with discussion groups in their respective communities and
sharing the content. But this diminished significantly in the Hakkipikki group. All the LLs, to varying degrees, included some teaching or preaching after presenting the content with their DMs.

**Challenges and Benefits Experienced by All Groups**

The challenge mentioned by all three teams was the need for audio units that could lock the content they created. Apparently, after listening to the content, the chips were often repurposed and recorded over. When the chip was not returned, new memory cards had to be used to record the following month’s content. Another advantage of dedicated audio units would be the ability to project the sound to a larger group13. Their cell phones had audio projection capacity for only three to five people.

Every leader reported that when they shared the content in their community the initial response was positive. This held true when sharing with non-Christians, too. Even though leaders had used Bible stories when witnessing prior to participating in the Spoken training, leaders on all three teams rediscovered how captivating stories could be. The Kannadiga DM1 experienced it in this way:

So sometimes people are disturbed, and they are distracted by people who are walking here and there. But when I share this story, they all will be seeing me, and they will all observe, and they will hear my words. So, with eagerness they hear me. (KAN DGM1, 55843-56123)

At the end of the first focus group, the Hakkipikki TL commented, “So our wish is that the whole Bible would be in stories.” (HP GL2, 16288-16350)

---

13 Spoken Worldwide® strives to make their programs self-propagating, so their policy is to provide no more than 50% of the resources for technology. They require the local partner to pay the other 50%. The audio players cost about $20 each. The networks the Founder works with are self-supporting. The groups’ 50% contribution was sufficient for four, $5, audio speakers that could connect to a cell phone. In 2018, we left eight audio speakers, one for each language team that attended the training.
Leaders from each group shared that linking a relevant Bible story with a problem that an individual Receptor or the community was experiencing was particularly helpful. Sometimes their audience gained insight about the problem or could apply a Bible principle to their life because it was demonstrated in the story. Examples of linking Bible stories to specific problems will be described in the Unit Five - Relevance (p. 241). In other circumstances, connecting a relevant story to the problem captured the listener’s interest so the leader, acting as a CA, could continue and address spiritual issues. The Hakkipikki TL explained it this way:

I like knowing the problem of the people and giving a solution using Bible stories./ While we are sharing the stories some hear with interest,/ but some have no interest./ …Previously, I was not doing like this, finding the problem, and telling stories. I was simply sitting and worshiping the Lord and then getting up [to preach?)./ So, after coming here I have learned so many things./ I understand that after knowing their problems and speaking according to their way, that would touch their hearts./ That’s what I’ve come to know./ So, this is very benefiting [for them] and I’ve benefited from this./ So using this, I have learned many things. Still, I want to learn many more. (HP GL2, 01871-02798)

Leaders from all groups observed that those who had no formal education benefited when they shared content. Kannadiga LL2 noted:

Those who are uneducated, those who do not read and write, they are getting more light./ They are not able to grasp theology studies, preaching and teaching./ So, they all like to hear stories. (KAN LL1, 63960-64173)

Madiga DM1 responded:

So those who are old people, they won’t speak Kannada. They speak Madiga language only, ma’am. But from 2000 on, we are all educated, and we are studying, and we are mingled\textsuperscript{14} with the people. So, we know [how to speak]

\textsuperscript{14}Interviewees who were traditionally in the outcast category used this term to indicate they were now associating more freely with others in ways that had previously been forbidden. Even among this Madiga subgroup that speak the same dialect, there were three further divisions marked primarily by occupation, that continue to practice rigid caste restrictions. For example, the farmer group would not even take a glass of water from those of the leather-working group. Any socialization between groups was discouraged and intermarriage was strictly prohibited.
Kannada./ So, it has benefited those people, [the] old generation,/ the uneducated. (MAD DG7M1, 36744-37054).

And Hakkipikki LL1 commented: “This way of doing things really helps those who are ignorant—those who don’t know anything.” (HP LL1, 31851-31973)

**Findings Distinctive to Each Group**

This section reports the findings that were specific to each group. There are three units. In the first unit, I explicate the unique ways the Kannadiga Local Leader Team (LLT) implemented the Spoken process followed by the challenges and benefits the Kannadiga leaders experienced. This reporting structure will then be repeated in Unit Two and Unit Three for the Madiga and Hakkipikki LLTs, respectively.

**Findings Specific to the Kannadiga Leaders**

The Kannadiga LLT was united around a common desire to influence gang members but actively used the method in diverse settings. The leaders were ages 26 to 30—close in range to their target demographic. Their years of formal schooling was from seven to 17 years. Interestingly, the interviewee with the least number of books in his home had over 50, and three mentioned owning several hundred!

**Implementation by the Kannadiga Leaders**

The Kannadiga team made 36 pieces of content (nine sets) in the 13 months from early September, 2018 to late September 2019. The leaders implemented the content creation process and shared the content with their DMs similar to the pattern presented in the 2018 training. When I asked about creating content, the Kannadiga TL responded,

TL: So, we would have a group./ We’d all gather./ First, we would all discuss about the story. I would not tell15 about the story./ The story and the

15 Meaning he avoids preaching or teaching about the story.
problems perhaps I will not tell./ I would ask the team—the group—I would ask them. So, they would say, “We are having these kinds of problems.”

RM: What’s going on?

TL: Yah. So, I’d tell them, “Search for the local wisdom.”/ Then they would link it with that problem./ So, if it was correct, I would say, “Okay, that’s good.”/ But if there were any issues there, then I would explain that to them./ So, then again, they would search about that until they would make a good piece./ So then, I’d ask, “For this problem is there any link, any stories in the Bible that connect well with this?/ We would search for that./ So, as they search. I’d just be guiding them./ For example, if I went to LL2’s home, maybe LL2 would be searching for that story./ So, after their searching, I would check that story./ If it was okay, / then we would sit and we would do a recording./ If it [the content] was not [lining up] in a good way, / then I would make them search until it made a good connection./ That’s the way we are doing [the content creation]. / After recording that story/ I have it in my laptop./ So, after the recording, I will send it out via WhatsApp./ There are pen drives [chips]./ So, we’ll also use pen drives/ that we also share. (KAN LL1, 48861-50235)

When asked to add to their leader’s description of the meeting to create content, the Kannada LLs declined to comment. At first, we were dismayed by this response, but later we considered two probable reasons. First, the TL’s description had sufficient detail, and second, to add additional information could cause the TL to “lose face.”

Nevertheless, a later focus group with the DMs confirmed activities in the LLT session. For example, DM1 talked about the group discussion facilitated by his LL as follows: “So sharing step by step, that I like, sharing step by step. Sometimes I miss so many things but sharing step by step I like.” (KAN DGM1, 41424-41558) This step-by-step sharing indicated that LL1 asked questions working through the story slowly and in chronological order. This important facilitation technique was practiced in the 2018 training. We inferred that LL1 was modeling what the TL practiced regularly in their LLT meetings.
At one point, the TL listed all five of the questions taught in the 2018 training. Additionally, questions and/or discussion time were mentioned by most of the Kannada LLs and both Kannadiga DMs. DM2 remembered two of LL2’s questions: What do you understand? and, How will you share this? LL2 followed this with an admonition: “So, you not only need to share this verbally, but by your experiencing [a changed life] then with conviction you will share./ That is good.” (KAN DGM1, 49882-50061)

In addition, both DMs described the content creation process. This went beyond the task assigned the LLs in the 2018 training where they were instructed to share the content and facilitate discussion with their community groups. Both DMs described implementing elements of the content creation process in their own groups. DM1 shared:

So, we will come to know about the problem [in the community]./ After knowing the problem,/ we will see how we can suggest [a way to help] them by telling them a story,/ saying, “In the Bible there is a story like this.”/ For example, so if there is a married couple [and] they have no children,/ then we might share the story of Hannah saying, / “So Hannah16 came and Eli prayed for her./ In the Bible there is a verse: The womb is the fruit of God.” So, we ask them, “What is your problem?” So usually they share their problem./ So after understanding that problem, then we share a Bible story. / And starting by using the local wisdom, we say some saying or proverb, and then we say the story. (KAN DGM1, 41706-42301)

DM2 confirmed learning the content creation when he mentioned connecting community problems with a relevant Bible story: “So, first we see if there is a problem in our group./ So then we decide what way we have to share that story./ So, using that story, we will share the gospel.” (KAN DGM1, 39723-39905) The Kannadiga LLs did not limit their sharing to discussing the content. Additionally, they taught the DMs the skill of

16 For many years Hannah, was barren. When she poured out her soul in prayer at the altar, the priest, Eli, accused her of being drunk. When she explained her anguish, Eli then blessed her. Hannah bore a son, Samuel, whom she dedicated to the Lord. After being weaned, Samuel became a servant to Eli and later, high priest to the nation.
identifying the problems of their group and then creating content relevant to the specific situation.

In the Kannadiga group, content moved through the community. LL1 had the audio speaker purchased after the 2018 workshop for the Kannadiga group. He used it in his larger church group, but he also gave an example of sharing the content from memory. The other LLs shared the content with a chip played in their cell phones but were not limited to sharing the content only when they had the use of technology. LL2 recounted, “So the phone I had wasn’t working so I just shared verbally from memory.” (KAN DGM1, 48092-48207) The TL commented about sharing content in a cross-cultural context, “So, [using the Spoken process] they [the Receptors] can learn nicely, and they can share it with others also.” (KAN GL1, 06191-06254)

The DMs did not receive a chip, so they repeated the content several times to commit it to memory in order to share. One DM mentioned enjoying listening to the content multiple times. Both DMs employed content in their home churches. When asked what questions he used in the post story dialogue, DM1 replied: “So, you have heard this story, what is your opinion?” And “Did you understand about God?” DM2 used the content with people outside his home church, too. “So, usually when people are visiting outside and speaking this and that, in that time I go and share these things. … Whenever I get the opportunity.” (KAN DGM1, 50636-51005) The DMs also asked their listeners questions.

Challenges Experienced by the Kannadiga Leaders

The Kannadiga team members were widespread, so logistics were difficult. The entire team rarely gathered. The TL and LL1 worked together at a computer center, so
after work they would ride a motorcycle to one of the other LL’s homes on alternating months. Local believers were welcome to join in the discussion and content creation process at these different locations.

The team also found it difficult to find a quiet place to record the content. LL1’s house was constructed of palm fronds and a tin roof. LL2’s house was suitable, but they only met at that location every other month. The TL’s home was adequate, but he lived more than two hours west of the three LLs, so meeting in his home was not practical.

The age range of the LLT members may have constituted an additional difficulty in finding local wisdom. LL2 noted:

So, you see, searching for local wisdom is difficult because we are now in this generation./ Our fathers and grandparents, they know many things, but we don’t know about them./ The problem will be there….It’s not hard to find./ But searching for local wisdom is really challenging for us. (KAN LL1, 50560-50913)

Most had spent two to eight years at boarding schools with studies predominantly in English. This limited their exposure to the Kannadiga elders and their wisdom. LL2’s father had provided many sayings for local wisdom component. Unfortunately, his father had passed away a few months prior.

**Benefits Experienced by the Kannadiga Leaders**

The common focus of the team’s content creation was to reach gang members with the message of God’s love through Jesus Christ, but all the interviewees were also excited about the results they had sharing the content in multiple contexts: within the church setting, with family members, in their community and when ministering in other cultures. Two worked extensively in cross cultural settings. Another leader visited at least four villages distant from his home community on a regular basis. All the leaders shared
about their positive experiences. For example, the TL explained how the content opened doors with people who adamantly oppose anything not Hindu. He shared,

For example, take my friends,/ they are RSS\textsuperscript{17} people; they don’t like Jesus./ I say to them, “Tell me a problem./ In your family, is there a problem? You can share with me.” I ask them./ So, for that problem, I created local wisdom—a saying or a proverb./ So by telling that saying or that proverb, they are attracted to me,/ and we begin joking together./ So I won’t directly use the name of Jesus or say, “This story is in the Bible.”/ I will share it as if it is a local story. (KAN PD2, 01551-02024)

Two leaders addressed the problem of anger and intentions to commit murder with two different gang members by sharing the Bible story about Cain and Abel\textsuperscript{18}. In each situation, the content had an impact on their listeners. LL1 described his discussion as follows:

So, one week ago I spoke with this person. He was sharing that he wanted to kill that person./ I said, “Nowadays you feel like this and [do you know it is] like previously?” I asked him./ So, he begged me to tell it - [the] I-want-to-kill-him [story]. / So, I shared this story because I thought that was good./ So, he has been changed. (KAN LL1, 60259-60627)

LL3 stated there was transformation in the four of the villages he visits. This is ministry he does in addition to reaching gang members. He shared one group’s response:

[The people said,] “Those who came before have not shared like you are sharing./ So, whatever you share, we are understanding, and we do also our discussing./ So, please come every week.”/ So, they learn, and they share with others also. (KAN LL1, 58181-58465)

\textsuperscript{17} RSS, \textit{Rastriya Swayamsevak Sang}. Hindi for “National Volunteer Organization” is a right-wing, Hindu, nationalist, paramilitary organization with 5-6,000,000 members. It has a presence in all levels and facets of Indian society. It was banned once by the British and three times by the post-independence Indian government due to its role in communal violence.

\textsuperscript{18} The first book in the Bible tells a story of the first murder among men. The first man and woman had two sons. Cain, the older brother, was angry with Abel, his sibling, because God had accepted Abel’s offering of a lamb and rejected Abel’s offering of fruit from the field. Cain killed Abel by striking him with a rock. (Genesis 4:1-15).
He also mentioned how presenting Scripture through the Spoken method impressed older community members: “They said, ‘Please, conduct these meetings every Sunday also./ You have not much age, but you are speaking like old people.’” (KAN LL1, 57429-57562)

Four of the Kannadiga participants mentioned being impacted personally. DM2 commented, “Using local wisdom and comparing that with the Bible story, so it goes really deep in your heart, and I can understand.” (KAN DGM1, 50271-50402). LL2 benefited from seeing changes in others. He states, “So, what I like in this process is taking a problem from our community/ and telling a story about that will affect their life./ Yah, that’s the part I like.” (KAN LL1, 45493-45712) Three of the leaders mentioned the positive difference made by adding local wisdom to the process of sharing Scripture. The TL described the following scenario from a cross-cultural setting:

If there are no Christian believers,/ then we are using this story method./ We say proverbs or sayings./ Then, they think, “This is ours! These are our proverbs!” They think like that when we share that local wisdom./ Then we seek for the problems—the trouble and the problems they are having./ In those problems, [we search for] what is the Bible story./ We explain that story./ So, in that time, they will easily understand./ We are not speaking directly about Jesus with them, because they will get angry./ With the using story, we are telling them,/ and…they listen. (KAN PD1, 21003-21601)

Including local wisdom frequently engendered a positive response. This made it easier for these leaders to find opportunities to share how belief in Jesus Christ had transformed their personal lives at an appropriate time. In addition, three reported their recipients were continuing to share the content again with others in the community.

Findings Specific to the Madiga Leaders

The Madiga LLT team was made up of four LLs and the TL but only one LL participated in this research. The ages ranged from 35 to 38. All had about 12 years of
formal schooling. For at least two this included a year or more of training in Bible school to prepare for ministry. The leader owned over a 100 books but the other interviewees had ten to 15 in their home.

The TL had arranged for more LLs to be interviewed. We spent four hours waiting for them to arrive for the first Madiga focus group session. This provided an unexpected benefit of passing the time by talking with the TL who gave us a more detailed picture of the process than would have occurred in the group interview setting. In addition, we discussed with the TL ways the Spoken method honors oral cultures and affirms the community’s unwritten mother tongue (MT). Finally, by midafternoon, one LL1 arrived. For the second Madiga focus group session with the DMs, the TL brought two DMs. Their leader was LL1 who had been interviewed five days earlier, but he did not attend the session.

Most of the findings represent the TL’s view and experience. The Madiga LL and the two DMs answered the first questions freely and without interruption, but when I asked about the Spoken process, the TL frequently answered the question before the other interviewees could answer. Other times the TL appeared to explain the question, or possibly cue the LL/DM before they answered. When they responded to questions about their experience with the method, most of the Madiga LL and DMs’ answers were brief.

Implementation by the Madiga Leaders

The Madiga team made 32 pieces of content (eight sets) during the period between the 2018 training and the focus group interviews in October 2019. The TL described the previous LLT meeting as follows:

So, after coming here and learning from you, we understood that we are to take a problem and local wisdom and/ take a Bible portion./ So, everyone is talking, and
everyone is participating. Really that helps us. Last time when we gathered, we were speaking about fear. We were afraid. So, we discussed with the men what fears they have. They said they were fearful about their children’s futures. They were fearful about future things—especially for their children. In our community, if we do any misdeeds or anything that will offend the community, I’ll ask, “Will the community take action against us?” That’s fear. (MAD GL3, 03516-04374)

And later in the interview he provided more detail (without using the interpreter):

We ask, “What kind of fear are you facing in this world?” OKAY. They may say they are fearful about education or financial problems, or community problems, or their personal problems. And some people, they won’t explain it. [Others] they will explain, “Oh I had this kind of fear. And at that time, I was afraid about these things.” Like, “I have taken a loan.” YES! And some other people, “We fear about when they will come.” YES! “If my debt has come [due], and they knock on the door, [this] means that financial fellow—the time has come for the money [to be paid].” YES. “That kind of fear we have.” These are the things they will share. (MAD GL3, 15354-16177)

After discussing and choosing a problem, they looked for a Bible story that will help. The TL commented,

See, I studied the Bible but some of our leaders, they have not. They know about Lord, which means they have a deep [relationship] in Christ, but they do not have a lot of knowledge in the Bible. But for some topics, they’ll have a lot [of Bible knowledge] to say. (MAD GL1a, 43566-43782).

He also had mentioned:

Sometimes it [finding the story] is very difficult. YES. Yah. Sometimes when we think of the problem, we say, “Oh this chapter speaks about this” without even opening the Bible. UHUH. But sometimes we have to really search, and we’re saying, “Oh, where is the right story? Where?” and things like that. (MAD GL3, 22426-22792)

In the LLT meeting, in response to the problem of facing fear in many different forms, the team chose the Jesus-walks-on-water story19.

---

19 The TL chose the Bible story from Matthew 14: 22-33. He had sent his disciples to cross the sea of Galilee while he went up a mountain to pray overnight. They battled contrary waves and wind for many hours. About four in the morning, they see Jesus walking on the sea. They are fearful and cry out, “It is a ghost!” Jesus responds, “Take courage. I am. Don’t be afraid.” When he enters the boat, the wind stops. 
Next, the Bible story is always read out loud in Kannada, even though all the Madiga LLs are literate. They read two verses at a time, and no one repeats the verses (repeating the verses is the common practice in the home church meetings). No one interrupts the reading but after it is read, if someone does not understand something, the Scripture portion is read again.

The TL went on to describe his teaching about how Jesus’ presence within them can give them courage to face their fears:

I said, “If you give your heart to Jesus Christ he will come into [your life], and any fears, like spiritual problems, physical problems, problems with relationships, anything that comes against us, Jesus is within giving courage to face that. Because if he, Jesus is in us, he gives us peace of mind—peace and courage to face all the problems.” Then again, [I reminded them] “Jesus said, ‘Be strong! Do not be afraid!’ because Jesus said, ‘I AM, I AM’ is here. Do not be afraid. Be strong!’ So, Jesus is telling you this today, ‘Be strong!’ And wherever you have some fear in your life— UHUH. like [a] financial problem, or [an] education problem, or your children’s future problem—be courageous because Jesus is there in our life. (MAD GL3, 06298-07034)

The TL said all the LLs were “actively involved” in the meeting but beyond sharing their problems, praying for each other in pairs, and discussing upcoming house church activities, what was described in greatest detail was his teaching and admonishments. In the LL focus group session, when I ask LL1 to describe the previous content creation meeting, he retold the Jesus-stills-the-storm story and added, “We

---

20 “I am” is a name of particular significance to the Jews. In Exodus, chapter 3, Moses had an encounter with God. Moses asked how to respond to the Israelites if they asked God’s name, to which God responded: “I AM WHO I AM”; and He said to Moses, “Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, ‘I AM has sent me to you.’” (Exodus 3:14). Many Bible versions translate Jesus’ words as “It is I.” “I AM,” is an alternate translation.

21 Jesus was crossing the Sea of Galilee with his disciples. A fierce windstorm assails the boat. It has filled with water almost to the point of sinking. Jesus had been sleeping in the stern when they anxiously awaken him asking, “Teacher, don’t you care that we are perishing?” Jesus stands up; rebukes the storm which is immediately becalmed and then rebukes the disciples saying, “Why are you so timid? How is it that you have no faith?” And then, they become even more afraid saying to one another, “Who then is this, that He commands even the winds and the water, and they obey Him?” Mark 5:35-41; Luke 8:22-25
discussed so many things, like fear, and have faith in Jesus, the Lord is with you. So many things we have discussed in that meeting.” (MAD LL1, 13359-13502) He gave very few details. It is possible both facilitated discussion and teaching occurred after the Bible story, but in this LLT meeting what the TL described in detail were his words of encouragement.

Where in the process local wisdom was discussed or connected was not mentioned by the TL nor by LL1. LL1 could not remember what the local wisdom was, and the TL never gave an example of Madiga local wisdom. Neither was it clear whether the team discussed one set of content or the monthly goal of all four sets at this meeting.

According to the TL, content creation is a two-step process where he follows up by visiting with the LLs individually to verify what each leader is facing in the home church group.

TL ONLY: We are supposed to think twice, ma’am. Twice means we need to think in two ways. We need to think about how the problems started [and about] solving them. Yah, I told you already. First, we will have to discuss with our leaders, and again we need to go from our leaders to their areas to understand them. (MAD GL1, 46850-47168)

The TL’s follow up meeting may be with just the LL when things are going well. When problems are larger than the LL can resolve, the follow up meeting may include the entire Christian group that the LL oversees. The TL described one such meeting:

Sometimes we meet face-to-face with the leaders, and sometimes we go for a group meeting, and we plan for one day. We go and gather in one leader’s area, in his house. And we call all our [Christian] community people and we sit. And we discuss about their problems, and we preach, and we sing one song. And we pray and we preach the word of God using a portion./ UHUH. During that time, they [the LLs] will understand more than me. He [the LL] is understanding their problems because he is taking care of the group./ YES. I go to understanding what his problems are, what he is facing, what they [the LLs] do not understand. When I go, they will say, “Okay. We can go with this, with this portion [Bible story] we can help them.” And we can discuss with that. (MAD GL1, 43902-44756)
After confirming the content was helpful to the Christian community, the TL calls the PD and coordinates a time to make the recordings the monthly goal of four sets of content.

When asked how long it took for his team to create four pieces of content, the Madiga TL twice answered 30 to 45 minutes. This would leave little time for discussion. When I responded with surprise, the TL quickly changed his answer to 40 minutes per piece of content.

LL1 reported sharing content in his home church. This began with a Bible story. When asked what the group does after listening to the Bible story, he was vague:

LL1: We all discussed about how great is God and how mightily God uses us. / The thing[s] which God has done, are really great things, we discussed about that.

RM: And how many times do they listen to the story? (It appears the question was misunderstood or incorrectly interpreted as “How long did they listen to the story?”)

LL1: Sometimes, for a few minutes.

RM: What do you think they like best about listening to the story and the time you have with them? (It is possible this was translated, “What do YOU like about listening to the story and the time you have with them?”)

LL1: The way they hear the word—they hear the story—I like that. And after that they give more respect to us. That I like. (MAD LL1, 18165-18797)

This LL’s father was the village priest who was locally revered and frequently sought by others as an expert religious storyteller before he converted to Christianity. His father converted due to a dramatic healing of his eldest son when the boy was 12 years old. This Madiga LL is that son now grown. Interestingly, the LL links receiving greater respect to “The way they hear the word—they hear the story.”

When reporting how they shared with others who were not Christians, both LL1 and DM1 provided examples of using Bible stories. There was no mention of facilitating discussion. In addition, several times the TL mentioned teaching or preaching as part of
the process, although teaching and preaching are *not* part of the Spoken method. DM1 confirmed this pattern in his description of his leader sharing content with his family. DM1 commented, “[LL] shared with us the stories, then he has to teach.” (KAN DGM1, 24294-24356). DM1 also mentioned that story and discussion occurred in the larger church group led by LL1 but commented that the TL was present, and the TL also preached. To this, the TL responded: “Once in a while, I will do like that. Occasionally, like once a month, three times a month only, I went there. LL1 is also with them.”22 (MAD DGM1, 24961-25122). When asked if he had ever been in a discussion group where an audio recording of content had been shared, DM2 simply answered, “No.” (MAD DGM1, 29025-29035). We considered four interpretations for this answer: 1) The content may not have been shared as an audio recording, but verbally. 2) Perhaps little discussion took place because LL1 was mostly preaching or teaching, so DM2 did not recognize the content. 3) DM2 had only recently returned from boarding school; perhaps LL1 had not shared the content very frequently with the group during the last few months. 4) LL1 was not using the content.

When asked for an example of how they shared the content with others, the two DMs both repeated the first story they told about how they shared the gospel with someone *before* the Spoken training. It was apparent the stories, the message, nor the method was replicating through LL1’s network of influence.

22 This may have been one of the follow up meetings that the TL mentioned in the “two-step process.” If the LL’s leader, in this case the TL, is at the gathering that the LL regularly leads, it would be expected that the visiting TL speak via teaching, preaching, or giving an encouraging word to the gathered believers. It would be discourteous for the TL not to share in some way. In a community meeting mentioned earlier, the TL also facilitated discussion.
The TL made an interesting comment at the end of the DM focus group interview. During the hours spent waiting for the LLs to arrive, I had the opportunity to speak positively of the Madiga culture and language. It is possible that my perspective was different than the pejorative attitudes the TL experienced in most settings. Five days later, it appeared he had been pondering those conversations because at the end of the Madiga DMs’ interview, he said, “So nowadays [because of these interviews], I’m being encouraged, and I really want to make a search in our Madiga community, and about their language and their culture. I want to go in deep.” (MAD DM2, 05104-05318 [emphasis in original transcription])

At the end of this interview the TL also asked for a follow-up training so the leaders who were more knowledgeable about Madiga culture could be sure to participate.

**Challenges Experienced by the Madiga Leaders**

One significant challenge experienced by the Madiga was that they felt they needed more resources for content. The “mingling” and “oneness in Christ” that the Madiga Christians boasted about when sharing their Christian community culture presented additional problems related to marital relationships and community support. Evidently, leaders are expected to help both in the task of finding a spouse and may also be called on to help when there is marital stress. These inter-caste marriages, even ones uniting spouses between the three closely related Madiga groups who speak the same language mix, were more fragile when the spouses had problems. Unfortunately, the traditional, extremely rigid divisions between every caste result in both spouses unlikely to find support from their extended families in a time of crisis. In both of the Madiga focus groups, the interviewees referred to the dissolution of mixed caste marriages they
were struggling to resolve but to which they had found no adequate solution. LL1 asked, “We made content, but we have many other problems also. Can we make content concerning those other things also?” (MAD LL1, 16030-16428). DM1 mentioned that even information about simple hygiene was needed by many in the Madiga community:

So, there are people that will not take a bath every day. They will not take bath. / So, they’ll not wear good [meaning clean or mended] clothing. / So, when we share using the stories like this, they’ll also get the idea that we should have a good life—good clothing, a better way of [personal] hygiene—they’ll also do that. (MAD DGM1, 29971-30280)

I told LL1 that the follow-up training that normally occurs after the first training covers how to create content related to a broad range of community issues such as health, hygiene, community development, farming, or whatever problem is affecting the group. (Unfortunately, that training was delayed several years due to the demands of this research and then due to COVID restrictions.)

Language issues also created challenges for the Madiga group. The Madiga MT is an ingroup identifier, but they also want their children to gain competence in English because of its commercial value. The state schools that provide education in Kannada are free, but the quality is extremely poor. Many parents, even those from these very poor SC families, sacrifice for the children to learn English by sending them to private schools23. As a result, many Madiga do not value their MT and the children might not master speaking, reading, or writing Kannada either if most of their education is in English. For example, due to boarding for 15 years of schooling, DM2 did not speak his MT well enough to tell the Bible story to a monolingual “grandma” in the village without assistance.

_________________________________

23 48% of students in India were enrolled in private schools in 2018 (Kanwal, 2021).
All four Madiga interviewees used Kannada in their Christian gatherings. There were several reasons: First, free schooling is in Kannada. The TL referred to Kannada as the “Equaling language. …because they are all writing and reading in Kannada only” (KAN DGM1, 36328-36355 and 36419-36487). Those who have been to school understand Kannada. Second, the Christian ideology of a brotherhood of believers regardless of caste or race allows inter-caste socializing and marriages. This increases the linguistic and cultural diversity of their gatherings making Kannada preferred for group settings. And third, they read the Bible in Kannada because there is no Madiga Bible translation. DM2 commented that many Madiga now speak only Kannada; they have lost the Madiga language completely. Nevertheless, the TL mentioned the importance of explaining Kannada words in Madiga language during leadership meetings:

Because [during the Scripture reading] they’ll be speaking in Kannada [not knowing what it] means, so I have to speak again in Madiga—Madiga I need to speak. RIGHT. They need for the word there to be in Madiga. Madiga everybody can understand. YAH? Yes. (MAD GL3, 12657-12877)

In this shifting linguistic environment, some need the Kannada passages explained in Madiga, while others only function proficiently in Kannada!

In addition to these language challenges, finding related local wisdom was the most difficult part of the process for the TL. In part, this difficulty stems from all the time the TL has been living outside his community. His family was forced out when they converted during his middle school years, and he spent over a decade in school and ministry outside of his community, so he missed a significant amount of Madiga enculturation. Unfortunately, the leaders who were most familiar with the Madiga culture had not participated in the 2018 training. It was important to the TL these key leaders be included in future Spoken trainings:
So, if we add so many other pastors, and leaders also, it would be good./ yah, [to] join with us and they’ll come to know with us about this content. UHUH It will be helpful./ if you would have [an]other workshop./ You can join with them./ I will tell them./ I will bring them. UHUH So when I will get time, we can share this content also with them. (MAD DM2, 03318-03804)

Two other factors made finding local wisdom difficult for the Madiga leaders.

First, the Madiga utilize proverbs exclusively for chastisement. Second, sayings that are familiar to one Madiga community may not be familiar in other Madiga communities. At the end of the second Madiga focus group session, while pondering the Madiga team’s challenges finding local wisdom and the complex language issues, I asked the TL whether it was worth making content in the Madiga MT. Despite all the difficulties described here, he responded, “Yes!”

Benefits Experienced by the Madiga Leaders

The Madiga TL’s experience with community discussion time demonstrated the process of discovery learning taking place both among the participants and the discussion leader. In the following excerpt the TL explains how the uneducated Madiga, who are normally reluctant to talk in a group when there are educated members of their caste present, were beginning to speak and share:

TL ONLY: They [the uneducated] think, [and have] their opinions: ‘Oh, this is good. This is not good. They’re here. They are supposed to be like that. [They are] not supposed to be like that.’ UHUH This is their feelings. The storytelling encourages the community to be thinking. And sometimes, oh the people, they think: ‘We don’t know a thing! / We know nothing!’ But we have the community listening. Then, they [the community members] are now used to speaking. Whatever he knows, he speaks. And he knows, he speaks. Because everybody has some ideas. UHUH But before, only they would not speak out when we had community gathering. UHUH Now they can say their understandings. And what they think, according to his [each one’s]

24 This is not a pejorative description by the researchers. The context of the conversation is about those with no, or little formal schooling. This is the norm for those who are SC and ST.
understanding, is something different. Your understanding is something different. We can agree or we cannot agree. But the saying is: Everybody available in the work. In other words, in story—what do they say?—a real important word.

RM: So, everybody’s word is important?
TL ONLY: Yes.

RM: You can agree or not agree, but everybody’s voice is important?
TL ONLY: Yes. (MAD GL1a, 39547-40708).

Not only were people speaking up, but the TL was gaining insights into the lives of the Madiga Christians. He explained:

TL ONLY: There are very important things here that I came to know in that community discussion. UHUM. Like in our community, madame, like the problems are not like [in only] one place. The community, like in every area, [in] every area the community problems will be there. But they’ll not share their problems for everyone. But we need to find out what their problems are. Then, and only then, we can give a solution from the Bible.

RM: Has this method helped you to find out more about the community problems?
TL ONLY: No. The solution for the community problems.
RM: It has enabled you to provide ideas for solutions?
TL ONLY: Ideas. Yes. Okay. What they think is good or bad. But our solution must [be] give[n] from the Bible, [if] it is to be good, (GL1, 38845-41564).

What the TL means by solutions being “given from the Bible” is explained in his response to the way the Spoken method unites a Biblical answer via story to specific problems:

What I like most about this method is the way it brings our problem into the Bible stories—our communities have so many problems, ma’am. Before when any problem was there, we would take one passage [verse] from the Bible here, and another from there, and then we would preach. And after your teaching, we now link with the Bible [story]. AH. We have so many problems in our community, but we need to read right from the Bible. But we now find the solution from the Bible [story] itself. (MAD GL1a, 34934-35413).
Before, the TL linked isolated Bible verses presented in an expository manner. This was difficult for his audience to remember which also made it more difficult to apply the lessons. In contrast, when the TL began presenting stories directly related to their problems, educated and uneducated alike could easily compare the Bible story to their life experience, and then discuss. For example, to address the taboos of casteism, the leaders employed Jesus’ encounter with a Samaritan woman\textsuperscript{25} at the well of Jacob. Samaritans were despised by Jews as an impure race, yet Jesus asked this woman to give him water from the well. He also declared to her openly that he was the long-awaited Messiah. Note the nonliterate’s response to the story of Jesus and the Samaritan woman: “Oh, the Lord of lords, Jesus Christ is the highest of the Jews. He came from the Jewish community and he went to the lowest caste people, okay? That is interesting for our community, that story.” (MAD GL1a, 36073-36264 [emphasis in original]) They can easily compare their story, how they are treated in Indian society, and this story about Jesus, where he valued even the lowest members of society. This begins the process of reflection and discussing the implications for their lives.

The way the Spoken method emphasizes discussion also shifted the dynamic of the Sunday gatherings. In the past, the audience listened passively to the preaching. Now, the people became engaged:

\textbf{TL:} On Sunday, while discussing, everybody is speaking. / Everybody shares their own opinion. / Whatever they understand, they share. / So, when we preach, people simply hear. But when we discuss, all will speak, and they \textsuperscript{25} Centuries of animosity between Jews and Samaritans resulted in the Jews of Jesus’ day having no dealings with them. Women were also disparaged. A common morning prayer for Jewish males thanks God “that he was not born a slave, a gentile, or a woman.” https://torah.org/learning/women-class31/. In addition, this woman was probably drawing water from the well at midday because even the Samaritan women despised her for being divorced seven times. She was also living with a man to whom she was not married. Jesus spoke to her in a respectful manner, even as he tactfully demonstrated that he knew of her previous marriages and her current affair. John 4:4-30.
will share their opinions and [what] everything is. They share some hidden things also, that we didn’t know. Then [when they share], we know it.

RM: I love that part about storytelling and discussion.

TL: Yah, we never heard those truths, but someone will be telling those truths.

RM: Sometimes it’s surprising who God is using to tell the truth.

TL: Yah! (MAD LL1, 15008-15663)

The TL, as a preacher and teacher, was used to being the source of wisdom and information. But through the Spoken method, he learned not only the peoples’ opinions, but also “hidden things” which included spiritual truth that he, a Bible-school educated Christian, had not previously considered.

Another benefit of the Spoken process was illustrated through multiple examples of how the LLT developed content of Bible stories to fit specific community problems. For example, to encourage the believers to become free themselves from restrictive traditions and to adopt new practices, the leaders share the story of how Peter received the revelation that he was no longer bound to observe some of Old Testament laws. In the Bible story, Peter went into a trance. Then, he saw angels lowering a sheet full of “forbidden” meat before him followed by a command from heaven saying, “Peter, arise and eat!” This occurred three times. Immediately after the trance, some Gentiles arrived at the house where Peter was staying. They explained their master had been told by an angel to find Peter and to listen to his message. Peter, as a Jew had never dined with or entered the house of a Gentile, but he realized God was commanding him to share the message of Jesus the Messiah, so he went with them and preached in their house. To counter bitterness in the Christian community, they share Jesus’ parable of the

26 Acts 10
unforgiving debtor. A slave was forgiven an enormous debt by his master, but later he refused to forgive a fellow slave who owed him a relatively small amount. The parable ends with a stern warning that whoever does not forgive their brother will receive no forgiveness from God in heaven. To encourage hope and persistence in response to their poverty and the many injustices suffered, he tells the parable of the widow and the hard-hearted judge. This encourages the Madiga believers to persist in demanding justice and also provides comfort by stating that God is pleased when they do not lose faith in Him even when He seems slow to answer. Fear was a significant factor for the Madiga. In the previous leaders’ meeting, the TL shared the story of Jesus walking on the water. In this Bible story, Jesus’ disciples were struggling at the oars in a boat in the middle of a violent storm. Then, they saw Jesus walking on the water toward them. They were terrified! In response, Jesus called out to them, “Take courage; it is I, do not be afraid.” When Jesus enters the boat with them, the sea immediately becomes calm.

Linking a story that is relevant to a problem the Receptors were facing allowed the listeners to engage mentally, emotionally, and imaginatively into an alternate set of circumstances. They could learn vicariously from the characters’ actions. The Bible

27 The context is a disciple asking Jesus if he should forgive his brother “up to seven times, to which Jesus responded he must forgive seven times 70. Jesus followed with a parable of a rich man calling his slave to repay a debt of 1,000 talents-an astronomical sum. The slave begs for mercy and is forgiven the entire debt. When the forgiven slave leaves, he encounters a fellow slave who owed him a day’s wage. But when entreated for patience, the forgiven slave refuses, and has the debtor thrown into prison. When the rich man’s servants report this encounter to the rich man, he recalls the slave, berates him for his lack of mercy and turns him over to the torturers. Jesus declares, “So shall My heavenly Father also do to you, if each of you does not forgive his brother from your heart.” (Matthew 18:35, Context: Matthew 18:21-35, NASB)

28 In the parable, a widow begs for justice from a callous judge who fears neither God nor man. The judge is weary of her persistent pleas and finally judges her case. Jesus finishes the parable asserting that God in heaven hears and will bring justice to those who believe (the elect) and challenges his followers to persist in their faith. Luke 18:1-8.

29 This story can be found in three of the four gospels: Matthew 14:22-27; Mark 6:45-52; John 6:15-21 (NASB).
stories often brought a spiritual dimension of hope to their current dilemmas because the stories demonstrated how Jesus acted on behalf of those who place their trust in him.

**Findings Specific to the Hakkipikki Leaders**

Four Hakkipikki attended the LLT focus group session. Three were related. The TL brought his older brother and his son who had just graduated from Bible college. The three older LLs were ages 44 to 55. The son was 21. Most had completed high school and one or more years of post-high school education. One had seven years of formal studies. The three family members and two of the new interviewees who came to the second focus group for DMs had attended the 2018 training. Because these two Hakkipikki had attended the training and had participated in making the recordings, I choose to identify them as LL. As mentioned previously, the concept of who constituted the LLT in the Hakkipikki group was very fluid.

**Implementation by the Hakkipikki Leaders**

The Hakkipikki team created slightly more content than the other teams—40 pieces (10 sets), but it was difficult to understand how the Hakkipikki LLT functioned. The TL’s answers about when and how the content was formed varied widely. During the interviews, the TL interrupted, cued, or answered for the interviewees 49 times! Most of these interruptions were related to the questions about the Spoken process. In addition, none of the four DMs could give an example of listening to content in a group with a LL!

Given these complexities, the findings related to the implementation will be relayed via three perspectives. The first is what the PD observed when he arrived to record the Hakkipikki content. The second is the perspective of the Hakkipikki TL. The final perspective is gleaned from comments made by the other Hakkipikki leaders.
The Program Director’s Perspective

When the PD came to record with the Hakkipikki team, they had content ready.

The PD noted,

When I reach there [to do the recording], they’ve made ready the content. …I see three or four people with him [the TL]./ After I come, those there, they gather, and they discuss. …I just do corrections; I see if some sayings are not proper or the story’s not right. I just give suggestions. (PD3 1310--2023)

When, where, how, and with whom the content was “made ready” before the PD arrived was unclear.

The PD also acknowledged that understanding Hakkipikki culture was challenging. He commented, “Their sayings, I could not understand those things./ Sometimes, I got confused with their sayings. … Yah, it’s very different [from Kannada and Madiga culture].” (PD3 02741-02863 and 03172-03202841)

The Hakkipikki Team Leader’s Perspective

During the first group session the three TLs, I asked the Hakkipikki TL when his LLT met to make content. He responded, “Sunday/ Friday/ Monday and Friday and Saturday, Sunday/ Saturday.” (HP GL2, 04960-05034) And then, “Sometimes we meet in the afternoon, sometimes evening. Sunday after worship we gather.” (HP GL2, 05592-05681) His answers to how many participated in creating content varied from “three to four” to “Ten to 15, sometimes 20” (HP LL1, 38890-39175) and then he mentioned everyone in a Christian gathering.

After the 2018 training, the Hakkipikki LLs were leading discussion groups in the community, but this practice waned. The TL admitted, “Previously they were doing like

30 The PD judges if the problem + proverb + Bible story relate clearly to one another.
leaders having group discussions, but not now.” (HP GL2, 14661-15344). The TL’s example of sharing the gospel before and after the Spoken training was also vague.

Previously, I was not doing like this, finding the problem, and telling stories. I was simply sitting and worshiping the Lord and then I’d get up [to preach?]. / So, after coming here I have learned so many content things. / I understood that after knowing their problems and speaking according to their way, that would touch their hearts,/ That’s what I’ve come to know. / So, this is very benefiting [for them] and I’ve benefited by this./ So, using this, I have learned many things. (HP GL2, 02285-02763)

Nevertheless, we believed the TL used content regularly because during the focus group sessions, he gave seven of the eight examples of content. He also recited specific Hakkipikki proverbs with six of them.

Some of the examples of content used to address community problems were the following: There was frequent fighting and tensions within families regarding the highly-prized household idols. This topic was talked about at length among the three older Hakkipikki leaders during the LLT focus group. In addition, community members were very concerned harm would come to them if they neglected or abandoned the family idols. To address family problems related to idols the TL began with this local wisdom:

“Hearing but dumb; seeing but blind.” Then, he shared a story from the Old Testament prophet Isaiah31 that highlights the futile thinking of those who craft idols and worship

31 The man shapes iron into a cutting tool, and does his work over the coals, fashioning it with hammers, and working it with his strong arm. He also gets hungry and his strength fails; he drinks no water and becomes weary. Another shapes wood, he extends a measuring line; he outlines it with red chalk. He works with planes, and outlines it with a compass, and makes it like the form of a man, like the beauty of a man, so that it may sit in a house. Surely, he cuts cedars for himself, and he takes a cypress or an oak, and raises it for himself among the trees of the forest. He plants a fir, and rain makes it grow. Then it becomes something for a man to burn, so he takes one of them and warms himself; he also makes a fire to bake bread. He also makes a god and worships it; he makes it a graven image and falls down before it. Half of it he burns in the fire; over this half eats meat as he roasts a roast, and is satisfied. He also warms himself and says, “Aha! I am warm, I have seen the fire.” But the rest of that he makes into a god, his graven image. He falls down before it and worships; he also prays to it and says, “Deliver me, for thou art my God.” They do not know, nor do they understand, for he has smeared over their eyes so that they cannot see in their hearts so that they cannot comprehend. And no one recalls, nor is their knowledge or understanding to say, “I
them. Isaiah noted the irony of how a craftsman uses half a block of wood to roast his meat and eat. Then, from the other half of the same block of wood, the craftsman makes an idol and worships it as his god. Another common problem is envy. The TL also shared an example of content related to the problem of young people not obeying their parents. For this situation he told the story of the prodigal son. A second Bible story he uses for this problem is telling how Jesus responded to his disciples’ quarrel over who among them was the greatest. Jesus told the 12, “If anyone wants to be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all.” Then taking a child, He set him before them, and taking him in His arms, He said to them, “Whoever receives one child like this in My name receives Me; and whoever receives Me does not receive Me, but Him who sent Me.”

The Hakkipikki Leaders’ Perspective

There seemed to be a division of interests between the older group of Hakkipikki and the younger Hakkipikki. The older LLs were seriously concerned about discord in families and the community due to envy over possession of the family idols. In fact, in the years he was not walking as a Christian, the TL had been in a knife fight with his uncle over one of the family idols. The younger DMs never addressed this topic and I noted twice that LL3 (who was 21) “look bored” during these animated discussions.

32 The younger son of two brothers requests his share of the inheritance from his father, leaves home and squanders the money on reckless living in a foreign country. There is a famine, and the son is starving as he works feeding pigs. He returns home, ready to beg his father for a servant’s position. But the father embraces him with an open heart, cuts short the son’s apology, restores his position as his son, and celebrates with a great party. Luke 15:11-32.

33 Mark 9:35-37.
Most of the younger interviewees (four of the five) were single and mentioned the difficulty they faced as Christians finding a spouse. Several felt a lack of support from their Christian parents with regard to their desires to work in ministry. Two were concerned that some Hakkipikki pastors were poor leaders. LL4 explained,

They have no knowledge of how to share the word of God with our community./ Even though they are pastors, they do like other people./ …they are not leading by example but are going back [to traditional ways], backsliding./ That’s why the work [the church] is not prospering. (HP DGM1, 28245-28863)

Their examples included multiple divorces, fostering church splits, and taking financial advantage of believers. Later, LL5 added, “They have desire to do Lord’s work and to serve./ but they don’t know how to lead the church people.” (HP DGM1, 28774-29068)

Three of the younger interviewees were children of parents who converted to Christianity before they were born. These three had deepened their commitment to follow Jesus during their teen years at boarding school. DM2, a Hindu from a family of nine children, found peace in Jesus Christ at age 25. These younger interviewees all shared pre-workshop witnessing stories, but could tell a story about sharing content. LL4 attempted to respond to the question of how he used the content via WhatsApp, but he was cut off by the TL twice! LL4 admitted: “As you taught us [in the training], in that manner I have never shared.” (HP DGM1, 41034-41105)

In comparison, the two older LLs asserted they had shared the content. Nevertheless, when asked to share what that experience was like, only the TL and LL3 could follow up their positive responses with a story of how they had done so. LL1’s enthusiastic responses of the TL’s sharing content and the TL’s use of the pronoun “we” made us infer he had been present with the TL when the TL had shared content. Interestingly, LL2’s content-sharing-story never mentioned any aspect of the Spoken
process. This did not mean he did not share the Spoken content, but the lack of pertinent
details, once again, left us uncertain.

LL3 mentioned twice that discussion occurred during church meetings. We
gleaned from this that the TL was using the content regularly and occasionally led
discussion during some church gatherings.

**Challenges Experienced by the Hakkipikki Leaders**

The Hakkipikki were the first group to be interviewed after the session on Friday
with the three TLs. These men appeared startled when I asked *what they did not like
about the Spoken process*. Noting this, I quickly changed the question to *What did you
find challenging when working with the Spoken process*. I always encouraged
transparency. I expressed our interest in *their* opinions by emphasizing that we, as
foreigners, had a lot to learn about their experience. I’d tell the interviewees that *they
were the resident experts regarding their context and regarding how the process worked
or did not work in their context*, and *we had a lot to learn from them*. Their only
comment was their need for dedicated audio players.

A difficulty unique to this group was managing facilitated discussion because
they all liked to talk at the same time. We counted 25 “eruptions” of conversation in the
two focus group interviews. We had also observed this with a different group of
Hakkipikki that attended the first training in with PAUL Ministries. These bursts of
communication where many people are speaking simultaneously appear chaotic to those
who are socialized in take-your-turn, polite conversation. They can be sorted out by those
who are used to tracking several conversations at the same time\textsuperscript{34}. However, facilitating discussion in conversations like this is extremely challenging. It is difficult for the leader to acknowledge any individual idea. He cannot get the group to collaborate or follow through on a specific thought. It is also difficult for the leader to understand how people are processing all the multiple inputs. This may be what the TL meant when he made the following response to what was challenging with the method. “There is a lack of oneness. There are a lot of differences speaking.” (HP GL2, 03670-03795)

Another problem was not all the Hakkipikki LLs owned a smartphone with the capacity to hold a memory card or online access to receive WhatsApp. When I had asked LL2 if he used WhatsApp, the TL answered, “Yes.” But LL2 responded with a surprised look. Next, I asked LL2 if he had shared the content on an SD card. LL2 answered but before it could be translated, the TL talked to him again. I read the men’s expressions and queried the interpreter, Raj, “So, he can, but he hasn’t. Is that right?” Raj replied, “Yah. But he is saying if someone gives him a smartphone, he’ll certainly share the content via WhatsApp!” (HP LL1, 40024-41767). LL2 was the only Hakkipikki other than the TL who provided a story of sharing content. He had shared it from memory.

\textsuperscript{34} I recognized the linguistic multitasking occurring because I, one of 12 siblings, grew up in an environment where multiple, concurrent conversations were the norm. I learned to track several conversations at once. The co-investigator, who had two siblings, felt he was observing verbal chaos.
**Benefits Experienced by the Hakkipikki Leaders**

Storytelling was well suited to this group. According to the TL as many as 70% of Hakkipikki they were in contact with were illiterate. He says, “In our community, they won’t read, but they will hear, and they will get the message.” He also shared how, as a child, he was impacted by the stories shared by the Hakkipikki elders during the feasts:

So, previously I used to sit with the elders of our community, and I used to hear the stories about origins, and about creation, I used to hear./ Before reading the bible,/ I would learn from my grandma and my grandfather’s how creation happened,/ about the origins, about how humans were created,/ how sin has entered. They were all sharing this with their mouths orally./ There was no writing/ and after hearing that, I remember those things still now. (HP GL1, 02336-02796)

LL1 felt stories made it easier to teach truth and find truth. When asked what he liked best, LL1 responded: “Bringing out the truths from the stories and giving them to the people, it helps.” (HP LL1, 31698-31781) Then he gave an example of the Bible story of a woman who had suffered from bleeding for 12 years and had spent all her money on doctors. She touched the hem of Jesus’ garment and because she did the action with faith, she was instantly healed. Several LLs agreed this story encouraged Hakkipikki Christians to trust Jesus for healing rather than spend money on sorcery, amulets, and other occultic practices. When I asked how this was different from how LL1 had shared stories over a year ago, he explained, “Before we had some difficulties, but now it is easier to dig out the truths.” (HP LL1, 32354-32436) Three Hakkipikki connected storytelling to facilitating the communication of truth. Above, this was expressed as “Bringing out truths” and “easier to dig out the truths.” And because the Spoken method addresses problems the Receptors are facing, we inferred that the story examples made it

---

35 Matthew 9:20-22, (NASB)
easier for the Receptors to see a biblical perspective that could be applied in their present situation.

**Summary of Findings in Three Tables**

Table 5.1 summarizes the findings related to the sub question, *how was the Spoken process implemented?* Tables 5.2 and 5.3 summarize the findings related to the second sub question, *what challenges and benefits were experienced?*
Table 5.1 Findings Related to Implementation by Leaders

### Implementation Common to All Groups

| Content Created by Local Leadership Team (LLT) | • Meet monthly – times and locations vary  
• Team Leader (TL) +3 or more Local Leaders (LLs) make up a team to create content. (If other believers are present, they also participate.) They discuss and create content. Each unit of content contains: A problem, a local proverb, a relevant Bible story, and a conclusion and/or application.  
• Program Director (PD) is called after 4 pieces of content are ready  
• PD travels to the team location and reviews content with TL and some LLs; this group discusses with the PD when clarity is needed  
• PD records LLs’ voices producing 4 pieces of audio content. This group reviews the audio. PD makes final edits and copies 4 sets of content to memory cards  
• TL disburses memory cards to LLs (DMs do not receive a card)  
• TL sends content to all the Christian community’s leaders via WhatsApp networks |  |
| Content Shared | • In 2018, LLs begin sharing content; each LL had a community discussion group  
• Positive responses from Christian leaders upon receiving WhatsApp |  |

### Implementation Distinctive to the Groups

| Kannadiga | • TL models facilitating discussion  
• LLs share beyond their community (present in other languages)  
• Discussion Group Members (DMs) describe creating content  
• DMs review content multiple times  
• DMs give examples of sharing content in their church and community  
• Content continues to spread without technology |  |
| Madiga | • When creating content, the Bible story is always read in Kannada, then portions are explained in Madiga  
• LLT field tests content before calling PD to record |  |
| Hakkipikki | • Most LLs cannot give an example of sharing content  
• LL-led discussion groups have not met for many months  
• WhatsApp and WiseChat are primary means of dissemination |  |
| Kannadiga and Madiga | • TL provides a detailed description of content creation process (order can vary)  
  o Local Leadership Team (LLT) discusses problems LLs or the community face and then choose a problem  
  o LLT members search for relevant Bible story; all can make suggestions and discuss  
  o LLT members choose a Bible story  
  o TL facilitates discussion; TL sometimes teaches and admonishes the LLs  
  o LLT members seek relevant local proverb (local wisdom)  
  o One piece of content is determined (Problem + Local Wisdom + Bible Story + Conclusion)  
• LLs give examples of sharing content with DMs and in their community |  |
| Madiga and Hakkipikki | • Both TLs frequently interrupt and/or cue their LLs’ and DMs’ responses about the Spoken process  
• All leaders include teaching or admonishing during discussion time  
• LLs’ and DMs’ descriptions of meetings are limited to repeating the Bible story  
• When/if discussion takes place, it is led by the TL |  |
### Table 5.2 Findings of Challenges Experienced by Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges Common to All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Content given on memory cards can be repurposed or lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dedicated audio players are preferred (but too expensive to purchase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges Distinctive to the Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kannadiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widespread LLT, so the team meets partially at rotating locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only one location is suitable for recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Madiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need greater variety of resources to solve community problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mother tongue is not always the best medium due to mixed marriages and mother tongue language loss due to extended time in boarding school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hakkipikki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitated discussion is challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kannadiga and Madiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finding local wisdom is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Madiga and Hakkipikki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some LLs do not own technology (phone) capable of playing the content using the memory chip nor can they access the content via WhatsApp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.3 Benefits Experienced by Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Common to All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing content results in positive responses with Receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking local wisdom and a relevant Bible story to felt needs was helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content sharing communicates well to uneducated (and educated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leader(s) enjoy sharing content (At least 1 Hakkipikki and 1 Madiga LL shared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leaders personally benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leaders report some Receptors are impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solutions to problems are communicated through the Bible story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uneducated benefit because the content is easy to understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Distinctive to the Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kannadiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals who identify as radically opposed to Christians, respond positively to content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village elders consider LL presenter wise and as one who is responding to their problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Madiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sunday gatherings become more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uneducated gain confidence to share their opinions and give insights about Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kannadiga and Madiga</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LLs gain respect, honor when sharing through story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Madiga and Hakkipikki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team Leader learns from Receptors during discussion time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings Related to Content Created

Findings from Content Reviewed November 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2019

During the final group TL session on November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, I TLs evaluated content from each language group. The Kannadiga and Madiga groups each had three samples. Due to an audio problem, we could only review two of the Hakkipikki samples. The transcribed content is Appendix M. I was pleased to hear how expressive the audio recordings were; it was clear the leaders were not reading the content they created.

All three groups had one well-aligned story in all three elements (Problem+LocalWisdom+BibleStory). About half of the content pieces were fairly well aligned in two areas: Problem+BibleStory, but the proverb did not seem to relate well. I was unsure if this was a translation problem or a true alignment problem because proverbs can be difficult to grasp fully, and our time was limited. The Hakkipikki TL was quick to suggest several other potential proverbs!

The two Hakkipikki Bible stories appeared to be accurate. We could not listen to the third Hakkipikki sample due to technical difficulties. The Madiga stories were greatly paraphrased. In one sample the Madiga team chose the story from an entire chapter, but it was not summarized well. There was data added that was not in the Bible and omissions of important information (I noted this TLs tendency to mix Bible stories during the interview. He conflated the story of Jesus walking on the water with Jesus stilling the storm\textsuperscript{36}). The Kannadiga team created an interesting mix. The TL had updated the Good Samaritan\textsuperscript{37} to a modern setting by having the Samaritan take the man to the hospital. But

\textsuperscript{36} Jesus walking on water – Matthew 14:22-33; Mark 6:45-52; John 6:15-21.. Jesus Stills the Storm – Mark 4:35-41; Luke 8:22-25;
\textsuperscript{37} Luke 10:30-37
he also included Bible jargon—like Levite. All three Kannadiga stories aligned with the problem.

The Madiga and Kannadiga groups chose to add a one- to three-sentence moral at the end of each piece of the content. Several of these morals were problematic. The Madiga used, “Your good has saved you” for the problem of “revenge and envy” and told the Good Samaritan story. Not only is this a poor fit, but his explanation was about getting good because you have done good. This is a common belief but more akin Hindi karma than Gospel grace. The Kannadiga content of “unbelief,” + a proverb + Peter walks on the water with Jesus\textsuperscript{38} finished with the moral: Bad things happen when you doubt. These samples appear childish and overly simplistic when written. However, the context is dynamic and insight-filled when done through facilitated discussion!

Transcribed Content Received October 4\textsuperscript{th} 2022

Due to a miscommunication, the Director sent transcriptions completely different content rather than the content reviewed on November 2\textsuperscript{nd} audio files. The newer content is in Appendix N. Now, all three groups are finishing the stories with a moral. The alignment of the Madiga content (Problem+LocalWisdom+BibleStory) and all the stories have improved but most of the Bible stories are extremely short and almost boring (Maybe their audio presentations breathed life into them). Accuracy is only fair.

What is evident through these samples is leaders do not understand the importance of accuracy in the story portion of the audio content. This is not critical when the leaders are all literate and able to access the written Bible, but it becomes crucial when seriously considering using the Spoken method to mentor nonliterate leaders. They

\textsuperscript{38} Peter walks on water with Jesus- Matthew 14:22-33; Mark 6:45-53; John 6:15-21.
must always be given an accurate rendition of the Bible passages. This is a fault of a short training without follow up. We will also address the issue of adding a conclusion or application in Chapter Six – Discussion.

**The Role of Mutual Respect, Life Experience, and Modes of Communication**

In this section I address the research sub question, *What role did mutual respect, life experience, and mode of communication play in implementing the Spoken process?* This question was examined through the four Connected Learning Framework constructs: relationship, oral modes of communication, relevance, and mutual respect. Life experience was addressed through the constructs of relationship and relevance. Oral modes of communication included written and oral practices (written practices in an oral setting do not take a primary role and are not mandatory for participation). There is a section for each of the four Connected Learning constructs. The fifth section is a summary.

**Relationship**

On returning from the six weeks of interviews in India, our overriding impression was, “Relationship is everything!” Relationship was foundational; it was the hinge that opened or shut every door.

There are four parts in this unit. The first part delineates the central role of relationship. Relationship was essential to access, to being heard, and to sharing with others. The second part shows how the leader’s relationship to his Receptors—as either an insider or an outsider—determined specific communication strategies. The third part explains how leaders strengthen their relationships with Receptors by spending time
together. The fourth part indicates how these leaders of minority status as Christians saw Receptors being impacted by community elders’ and/or the larger group’s approval.

**Not What You Know, But Who You Know**

This concept became increasingly apparent through observation and was confirmed by hindsight. From the beginning, the Director was our “hinge.” Our mutual friendship with him over the prior 13 years was essential to being able to return to do this research. The men came to the interviews *because of the relationship they had with the Director.* Normally, when Indian Christians meet with a foreigner, the expectation is to receive training, advanced education, or financial assistance for their ministry. The interviews ran three to six hours, but when transportation was included, these leaders spent four workdays to participate by answering questions without any benefits other than lunch and transportation costs. The PD spent six days with us. The amount we could renumerate for lost work was not large and only a few of the lowest wage earners took compensation. We were humbled by the sacrifice involved in their collaboration. The TMs made this sacrifice of time *because of their relationship with the Director.* We were impressed with the level of trust between the Director and these men in ministry, and the honor they showed him by complying with an unusual request to interview them. The Director is not their boss and does not provide financial remuneration for their ministry activities. They all work independently. We inferred that it must have been a significant favor that he requested of these leaders to spend so much of their time *and their team’s time* to be interviewed but he never indicated to us that doing so was a burden. The same principle applied to the LLs and DMs. The LLs came *due to their relationship with their*
Three of the nine LLs spent two days with us. The six DMs came to be interviewed because of their relationship with the LL.

Another example of the importance of relationship surfaced during the first focus group with the three TLs. After the interview questions, we settled the exact days for each LLT focus group session. We mutually decided each LLT would be interviewed on Saturday. We naively suggested each LL could return with one or two of his DMs on any of the following weekdays, Tuesday through Friday, as convenient for their schedules. We assumed the LLs would be comfortable returning because of the following: 1) They had met we two investigators at the 2018 four-day training. 2) They would be familiar with the questions and flow of the interview because we would repeat the same focus group format and questions they had experienced among their LLT on Saturday. And 3) They were familiar with our location. The Madiga TL immediately responded, “But if their leader [the TL] does not come, why would they [come]?” We were shocked by the reality that the TL would have to be present for the LLs to return, let alone bring additional DMs! Relationship was far more important than we realized. We quickly changed plans to have the LLs, DMs and TLs all return together on the following Friday.

When we examined with whom they shared content, once again we noted the key role of relationship. Family—which always includes extended family in India—and friends were mentioned frequently. Students in boarding schools shared with other students. Neighbors were also a point of contact. They shared in their home churches, constituting another ring of significant relationships. Kannadiga DM2 said,

Usually, when people are visiting outside and speaking this and that, I go and share these things [content]. …I really like this way of sharing it. And whenever I get the opportunity, I share. My house, we have prayer meetings, whenever we have prayer meetings, I share. (KAN DGM1, 50677-50826)
All the TLs and many of the LLs reached beyond their family and immediate neighborhoods. They did this by working through networks of relationships. They spoke to friends of family members, to their friends’ family members, or to friends of friends. The Madiga TL made a point of saying he was free to share with other Christians not normally open to him because of his caste when he was given an introduction by the PD.

TL ONLY: What I have experienced, is that if I go myself, telling my caste name, they’ll oppose me. But if the PD’s staying in one village, and I go to that community, if I go and preach and share gospel, through him I can reach these other people as well; [because of the PD] they’ll accept me.

RM: Whereas just to walk in as a stranger, they are not going to be very open to your message?

TL ONLY: Yes. (MAD GL1, 22086-23438)

Relationship is so central that it determines the ebb and flow of with whom to share, where to share, and can even trump traditional rules of who is able to share.

**Insider Versus Outsider Strategies**

In most contexts, the leaders were linguistic insiders. The Hakkipikki and the Madiga TLs spoke the same MT as their LLs and their community. The Kannadiga group were highly proficient in Kannada even though it was the MT of only two of the five that made up the LLT. Most of their Receptors were Kannada speakers. About half of the Kannadiga interviewees had previously been gang members. When sharing content, they spoke primarily of meeting with fellow believers, sharing with believers, with their friends, friends of friends, or neighbors. This occurred in homes, on the street, and in regular church gatherings (which took place primarily in homes) in their community.

Even in the context of being considered an insider, their minority status as a Christian could cause significant friction. When the interviewees shared about their culture, becoming a Christian, their ministry, or how they shared the gospel before the
2018 training, what they mentioned with greatest frequency was the negative response of the community toward them, their family, and/or the Christian community. Kannadiga DM1 commented:

So, in our community so many people, they speak against us./ So, they will mock us./ They want to get rid of us and they will keep away from us./ So, in our community, being a Christian is very harsh. (KAN DGM1, 05812-06022)

Perhaps because of these negative responses from the community, the DMs shared primarily with family, friends, and other Christians who they knew would be receptive to their messages.

Despite negative responses from their local community, most leaders spoke of outreaches to other groups as well. The TLs and most LLs were intentional about sharing with people beyond their community at least once a month. The usual points of contact were friends or extended family members of someone who was part of their Christian group, although not exclusively. The Hakkipikki used business to develop relationships with others. Hakkipikki LL1 shared content with some unknown Hakkipikki when he traded in a neighboring state. The Hakkipikki TL was learning several tribes’ languages. The Madiga TL does not live in the Madiga ghetto. He is ethnically and linguistically an insider but culturally somewhat of an outsider due to his life experiences. He is now excited to spend more time investigating the Madiga culture. He said, “So, nowadays [because of these interviews], I’m being encouraged, and I really want to make a search in our Madiga community, and about their language and their culture. I want to go in deep.” (MAD DM2, 05104-05318, emphasis in original)

The Kannadiga team is diverse. They unify around a similar cause to reach gang members and others for Christ rather than through the bond of a shared MT. When
working as outsiders they tried to meet felt needs. For example, the TL and LL1 taught computer skills. They were involved in providing computer training to youth in several communities whose MT was unwritten. (The youth they teach must be bilingual since instruction and computer skills are in Kannada.) These relationships eventually opened doors to share their faith which they did this using the Spoken method and/or their personal stories. Other strategies will be explained in the following unit.

**Spending Time with the Receptors to Show They Cared**

In addition to working in familiar contexts and striving for clear and relationship-aligned communication in cross cultural contexts, spending time with the Receptors was also a priority. The leaders demonstrated their care by spending time with their teams, time with their DMS. They also spent time with others who had never heard the gospel message. As an example, Madiga DM1 shared about a man whose leg was morbidly infected, “He had nothing in his body and was almost dead.” (MAD DGM1, 22727-22777) DM1 shared content and encouraged the man to believe Jesus could heal him. He also visited the man regularly: “So two months passed. Now every week, we used to go [and] we used to pray for him.” (MAD DGM1, 20932-21018). Kannadiga LL1 told a similar story of how he and his mother reached out to help an angry, tense man whose oozing sore had worsened over three years. The man’s extended family had stopped visiting him, but LL1 and his mother took the man to a doctor in Bangalore who diagnosed leprosy. Afterward, LL1 continued to visit him:

So, every day, morning and evening, I used to go and share the word of God with him/ how the Lord has healed Lazarus and how [the] Lord has healed leprosy,/ for I had faith. I used to share with him./ I used to pray for the food also, and I used to apply this oil also./ He used to take medicine also./ So, within six months he was healed. (KAN LL1, 35153-35504)
The Madiga TL also visited his leaders in their homes at least monthly. Sometimes, he spent an entire day with a leader and the leader’s group when it was necessary to address problems concerning the entire church community. Th TL works a full-time job, so this extended involvement in the Madiga church is after work hours.

These leaders’ time often focused on meeting the needs of their Recipients because when they did so it could open opportunities to share their faith. But when the leader was not a member of the group he was targeting, it required more time to develop a relationship of mutual trust where the Receptors would be comfortable sharing their problem(s). The Kannadiga TL’s conversation with staunch Hindus politically opposed to Christians was an example of working to identify felt needs. He explained,

> For example, take my friends,/ they are RSS people, they don’t like Jesus./ I tell them, “Tell me a problem./ In your family, is there a problem? You can share with me.” I ask them./ So, for that problem, I created local wisdom… (KAN PD2, 01551-01784)

Next, the TL described another friend from a gang who was an alcoholic. These outreaches to people in anti-Christian groups and the gangs all required investing time to build relationships of mutual trust. Like the Madiga TL, the Kannadiga TL’s activities also take place after his job teaching at a computer center.

Whether it was to show Receptors they cared, or to conduct work with their team, spending time with people to develop deeper relationships was a high priority demonstrated by the leaders.

**Receptors Are Influenced by Elders’ or the Group’s Opinion**

Interviewees shared stories of people becoming Christ followers, but many leaders also spoke of Christ followers who returned to their group’s traditional beliefs due to the influence of others, either from the community elders or from extended family
members who were angered by their abandonment of their gods in preference of Jesus Christ. This is worth discussing in the relationship component of the Connect Learner Framework because it is related to two characteristics of oral communities described in Chapter Two (pps.32-38). First, oral communities are conservative and traditional, so they are slow to adopt new ideas. Second, the group prioritizes maintaining harmonious ingroup relationships so new ideas and practices are seen as disruptive and potentially threatening to the group.

One Kannadiga example of a Receptor being influenced by others is the wife of the healed leper. The wife had also experienced a miracle. After operating on her thyroid, her doctor declared she would have chronic pain for the rest of her life but Kannadiga LL1 shared the gospel and prayed for her. When she put her faith in Jesus, she was completely healed. Despite these experiences, the couple continues to vacillate whether to commit to following Jesus who commands exclusive loyalty. They attended church regularly for a while. Later, to avoid confrontation with their Hindu family, they celebrated the Hindu festivals and continued practicing the Hindu traditions.

Similarly, other participants relayed that the Receptors they are trying to reach must “count the cost” before choosing to be Christ followers. They must consider the opinions and possible punishments from the extended family or the larger communal group. The interviewees gave examples of first-generation Christians suffering

39 Jesus claimed to be equal with the Father (John 10:28 I and the Father are one.); the only access to God the Father (John 14:6 “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father but through Me.”); and the only way to have eternal life (John 3:16 For God so love the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life. John 5:21-22 For just as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, even so the Son also gives life to whom He wishes. For not even the Father judges anyone, but He has given all judgment to the Son [NASB]). These statements of exclusivity are a point of contention between Christianity and other religions.
ostracization, exclusion, threats and/or financial restrictions when they publicly acknowledged following Christ and stopped worshiping other gods. This may occur through a public, verbal confrontation. Hakkipikki LL4 spoke of financial pressures:

There are some people who come to Christ, and they want to live for Christ, but because of the pressure that is in the community, like lands—[they’ll say] “You should not work the land because you have become Christian.” So, the pressure is there, so some of them leave their faith and they live as like before./ ....And there are so many other benefits also from the community that they will not allow these people [the Christians] to get those benefits also. (HP DGM1, 14271-14886)

When a believer chooses to be baptized in water (even when it is a private ceremony, it becomes a publicly known event), this act becomes a significant point of contention and is usually followed by severe persecution and/or excommunication from the community. Kannadiga LL1 shared one way their community responds:

So, if they are baptized, and they are good believers coming to the church and a family member dies, the community won’t allow them to bury the body in the community burial place, the cemetery./ They will not allow it./ So in this way, our community they have done./ So, because of those things, those who want to believe, they don’t want to believe. They are backsliding./ … seeing all these things, they are offended, [thinking] that “If we die also, this is going to take place.” (KAN LL1, 09450-10248)

And Hakkipikki LL1 explained that being a Christian made it more difficult to find a spouse:

So, if a man wants to get married, [the future in-laws] will not look for property/nor things, or knowledge [what education he has]./ They [check to] see within his house if there is an idol or not./ [They believe] that’s why they will be happy, and [then] they will give the woman to that house. (HP DGM1, 38814-39104)

All three groups shared similar difficulties that resulted from being a Christian because relationships within these ethnic communities are highly communal. Even though the groups were living within the outskirts of the megacity, Bengaluru, social interactions in the Madiga and Hakkipikki groups were far more like living in a very
small town in rural America where there is little anonymity—everyone knows everyone’s business. It is normative in highly collectivistic societies, for the good of the group to take priority over the preference or good of an individual. In the case of these communities, traditional and/or Hindu ways were practiced by the majority and seen by the majority as being better for the group than Christianity.

In summary, relationship building was prioritized by CAs. This was accomplished by meeting felt needs and spending time with Receptors. The leaders’ status as insider or outsider their communication strategies but they usually networked through relationships of extended family and friends. The relationships within the communities themselves also impacted how Christianity was received. Christians frequently encountered forms of rejection from the Hindu or traditional majority in their community. The dominant group exerted pressure—particularly on new believers—to conform back to the community’s traditional ways.

**Oral Modes of Communication**

Oral modes of communication coded most frequently relative to the other constructs and were observed in many ways. The groups also used written communication because the Bible was an important resource but it was employed in a supportive role. Communication was almost exclusively verbal-visual—sharing face to face. In the two parts that follow, I will show how storytelling, using the MT, and local wisdom in the form of proverbs were important to the interviewees. Next, I will discuss how social-oral ways of learning were occurring during content creation, when sharing content with DMs, and when sharing content in the community.
Storytelling, Local Language, and Local Wisdom Honored

Storytelling was the predominant mode of communicating. When asked how they witnessed about Christ before learning the Spoken process or to describe their culture, and, when explaining how they became a Christ follower, each interviewee shared “their story.” Storytelling was a key component in the Spoken process. Many of the responses to the content creation and sharing content questions were also predominantly given as narratives.

Storytelling was honored because educated and uneducated, old, and young alike, enjoyed hearing stories. Kannadiga LL3 commented, “OK,/ so when we share the story; people they like that. They say, ‘Yah, I like the story.’ In that way they accept and receive it, I like that part.” (KAN LL1, 46134–46217) The Hakkipikki TL said, “Sometimes, we come to know about family problems/ and their group problems – community problems./ So using that [information], we share with them comforting words, and we use stories.” (HP GL1, 01884-02054). And later, the Hakkipikki TL’s his son (LL3), commented, “So in telling stories, we share the message of God, that I like. (HP LL1, 36869–36947). Kannada DM2 said that switching to storytelling during a home church meeting recaptured the attention of his audience.

Sometimes people are disturbed, and they are distracted by people [outside] who are walking there and here. But when I share this story, they all will be seeing me, and they will all observe, and they will hear my words./ So with an eagerness they hear me. (KAN DGM1, 55843-56123)

The Hakkipikki TL shared how story remains central even as the Hakkipikki youth become educated. He explained:

TL: In our community there have [been] a lot of changes, like speaking out to one another./ So, what we are sharing orally, they’re [the youth] searching and
reading about that and they’re learning./ So, they are getting change while they are hearing the stories also. And again, they want to hear stories.

RM: Can you give me an example of what that change might look like in someone’s life?

TL: So, every man has to make [an] idol, that’s their tradition. ….So, that tradition they [the youth] have broken. So, the youth, when they are 18 or 20, that day will come up in their 40s, in that way they act. So, in this new generation, they are not eager to do those things.

RM: So, they’re not practicing that so much now? Okay.

TL: So, while they’re sharing the stories, they’re getting change. And they are not giving their heart to those traditions. (HP GL2, 06265-07456)

Fourteen of the 18 interviewees shared an example of Receptors responding positively to stories. Storytelling was primarily face-to-face, but sometimes technology played a role, such as listening to content on a cell phone or hearing it from the internet via WhatsApp.

In addition to storytelling, using the MT was another important mode of communication. Kannada was the only MT that was written. Obviously, communication in the unwritten MTs was always done orally. Prioritizing the MT, especially in instances where the it was a minority language such as with the Madiga and the Hakkipikki, drew on deep emotions of identity. As explained in Chapter Two (p. 20); the message feels like that of an insider. This is one reason the Spoken method prioritizes the MT, so that the stories of Jesus will communicate that God speaks their language and knows them intimately.

All the TLs communicated in their MT and the LLs also prioritized using their MT when speaking to their family and community members. But each group had a unique set of language dynamics. For example, the Hakkipikki all speak the same language, Vaagri Booli, which the TL said he always uses when working with his
community members. Community members responded positively to this aspect of the Spoken content. Hakkipikki LL5 commented, “So hearing [the content] in our own language makes them really happy.” (HP DGM1, 47156-47227)

When the Madiga spoke publicly in their MT, they were disdained. Madiga DM1 explained, “So if we use our own tongue, then the upper caste people will not accept us.” (MAD DGM1, 32144-32220) In addition, all the Madiga leaders with home churches said they used Kannada in their gatherings. In part, this is due to the Bible being written in Kannada. After hearing how prevalent Kannada usage was within this group, we as investigators, wondered whether it was worth the hours of work required to create content in the Madiga MT. The TL heartily responded, “Yes!” He was also proud of a committee among the Madiga Christians that had begun translating the Bible into their language. He lamented that if they’d have done the translation earlier, they would’ve been able to save “many things [from] their heart language” (MAD GL2, 13934-14113). So, the Madiga MT continues as an ingroup identity marker. DM1 said, “So when we speak with our people, we use our language. And with others, we use their language.” (MAD DGM1, 32041-32141)

The Kannadiga group worked in the state language of Kannada. Only the TL’s MT was Kannada; all the LLs spoke different MTs. To work collaboratively, they used Kannada and created their content and audio recordings in Kannada. We inferred most of the communication with their target group of gang members took place in Kannada. But the LLs and DMs switched to their MT when their audience was MT speakers. Kannadiga LL3 (who was a ST but not a Hakkipikki) translated the content to his MT when working in the villages. DM1 commented, “Telling story like this is very effective/
using our own language” which was a Kannada-Telegu mix. (KAN DGM1, 53940-54018) It appeared these leaders routinely adapted the Kannadiga content to their MT. Further, two of the TLs who worked beyond their community were also acquiring proficiency in other languages to communicate in the Receptors’ MT. For example, the Hakkipikki TL spoke eight languages and was currently working on learning four other languages. He explained, “When I meet them [other STs], I use their language.” (HP GL1, 07062-07117)

There were six unwritten MT represented by those interviewed. When using these languages, all communication was exclusively oral. When the Bible was read in Kannada in Christian gatherings, it was read out loud—no individual member had to master reading to participate.

The Spoken process included the use of proverbs—what Spoken calls local wisdom. Oral communities have strong preference for this indirect form of communication; it is both intuitive and implicit, requiring a significant understanding of the culture to fully understand. Our finding was that using proverbs made a dramatic impact. Similar to employing the MT, using proverbs cued a sense of identification in two of the three groups. The Kannadiga TL who worked with a wide variety of minority ethnic groups where there was no Christian witness was cognizant of how powerful proverbs can communicate. When discussing his cross-cultural ministry, he shared a common audience response to hearing content in their local wisdom:

If there are no Christian believers, then we are using this story method. We say proverbs [or] sayings / They think, ‘This is ours! This is our proverb!’ They think like that when we say that local wisdom. Then we seek for the problems—the trouble they have, the problems they have. / In that problem, [we choose] what is the bible story. / We explain that story. / So, in that [story] time, they will easily understand. / We are not directly producing [talking about] Jesus with them,
because they will get angry./ With the using story, we are telling them./ Then they
listen. (KAN PD1, 20455-21611)

Likewise, Receptors who were publicly hostile to Christians responded positively
when the Kannadiga TL shared content. This was shared in “Benefits experienced by the
Kannadiga leaders” (pps. 192-194). In both settings, the Kannadiga TL adapted the Bible
stories to a modern setting and used local wisdom. The Hakkipikki TL also commented
that his community members responded positively to the Spoken formula of Problem +
Local Wisdom + Bible story: “They can understand much easier [when] that problem and
local wisdom and the Bible story, when all this goes together; [there is] really powerful
interest.” (HP LL1, 38439–38605) We inferred that proverbs were an important mode of
communication among the Hakkipikki. The TL provided the Hakkipikki proverb for six
of the eight content examples he shared. As mentioned previously, using proverbs was
more challenging for the Madiga. The leaders did not mention whether that aspect of the
Spoken process was helpful.

In sum, storytelling was the most frequent mode of oral communication. The
leaders preferred employing the MT of their Receptors if they spoke that language. Both
use of the MT and local proverbs cued identification in the Receptors. According to the
Kannadiga and Hakkipikki TLs, the combination of story and proverbs were seen to be
particularly impactful.

Social-Oral Ways of Learning Implemented

Oral communities have a high reliance on oral communications so social
interaction is central when most learning takes place. Three examples of social
interaction related to learning were observed in this research. The first was the use of
dialog and discussion. The second was repetition in a social context. The third was an
appeal to empathetic participation which, when responded to positively, was followed by the Recipients experiencing having their needs met. These will be further discussed below.

The social learning dynamic of dialog and discussion was a key component of the Spoken process. The Kannadiga team employed this the most. The TL and LLs led discussions while making content with their individual groups. In addition, every layer of participant—TL, LL, and DM—gave examples of leading discussion through open-ended questions. Kannadiga DM1 shared the following examples of questions he asked his listeners after he shared the content:

So, you have heard this story, what is your opinion?…Did you understand about God?/ So, God has created us, can we create God?/ If we ask questions like these, they will understand we cannot create God./ God has created, they will come to that knowledge. (KAN DGM1, 44136-44449)

The Madiga TL was pleased to see uneducated Madiga begin to share their thoughts publicly in church gatherings due to the new Spoken format. He mentioned both learning more about them and being surprised by the spiritual insights they shared (pps. 203-209). With respect to the Hakkipikki, the PD confirmed observing discussion, and Hakkipikki LL3 twice mentioned discussion occurring in church gatherings where content was shared. Unfortunately, the Hakkipikki leaders did not describe the session in detail nor how learning took place as a result.

We inferred that learning through dialog was a primary mode of communication used by the leaders when they reached out to understand the felt needs of their Receptors when working in the community. The Kannadiga TL mentioned the importance of this step several times. “Then we seek for the problems—the trouble they have, the problems they have.” (KAN PD1, 20455-21611) The dialog process of discussing problems within
the LLT was described by both the Madiga and Kannada TLs and the Kannadiga DMs. No one mentioned researching the internet or reading books to find this kind of information. Face-to-face, social interaction was the principal context where the leaders learned about their Receptors’ needs. It occurred both firsthand and in discussions about their families, their circumstances, and about what was occurring in their communities.

Repetition was important and was often practiced in a social context. Since none of the DMs received a memory card, if they wanted to share the content after the LL departed, they had to learn it through listening to the recording or by having their LL repeat it. This would take place in the social context of the LL’s discussion group. In the following dialogue, two Kannadiga DMs from different discussion groups said they enjoyed listening to and repeating the Bible stories and/or the content:

RM (to LL2): So, does he [DM1] get a copy of the story? Does he copy it?
LL2: They [the DMs] do not have devices to do it./ When I share, they keep it in memory, and they will organize it and review and review.
DM2: Only seeing if the tastes good! [meaning only if he likes the content]
(Laughter)
RM: How many times do you need to hear the story to remember it?
DM1: More than ten times I want to hear it. (KAN DGM1, 56934-57326)

The Kannadiga TL enhanced learning by combining repetition with several forms of group participation. First, he presented the content by repeating the story twice. Then he provided two ways for the audience to participate:

So, they [a volunteer] will share the story./ To those who are sitting, I’ll ask, “Is this story right? Is it correct?”…So, if there’s anything wrong, they correct it./ Or if it is correct, they will say, “Yah, it’s good.” (KAN GL1, TH 05174–05497)

Madiga DM1 also mentioned the importance of repetition.

…hearing it—often hearing it—will refresh our mind and we can add some more things in that. It is so useful. Sometimes we forget also. [When] we hear that
again and again, we can have good memory and we can serve our Lord. (MAD DGM1, 29234-29466)

Hakkipikki LL2 who described sharing the content did not have a memory card. He said he shared whenever he got a chance to do so. He did not mention exactly how he memorized the content. Perhaps participating in the content creation session was sufficient repetition.

The third aspect of social learning was appealing to empathetic participation. A good story appeals to both the intellectual and emotional sides of our humanity. The process includes the following aspects of narrative logic which occurs concurrently, and operates somewhat intuitively. Listeners ponder what is going on in the story and evaluate how it aligns with their experience with the world. They identify with the characters and vicariously experience the drama of the story. They evaluate the truths stated in the story and choose whether to act on them wholly, partially, or not at all.

These leaders wanted their Receptors to move from considering the rational aspects of the information in the story to participating empathetically by acting on it. They often challenged their Receptors to trust that Jesus will act in a miraculous way to meet the Receptor’s personal need today the same way he acted in the Bible story 2,000 years prior. Some Receptors who responded in faith experienced miracles of healing or answered prayer. An example of empathetic participation happened when Kannadiga LL1 shared content with a woman who was in pain and chronically ill. She put her faith in Jesus to heal her. LL1 reported, “After three or four days after that, I saw, and that lady is working, and she’s healed.” (KAN LL1, 37129-37214) Hakkipikki LL2 also gave an example of a woman who was sick with a “blood issue” but who responded to the content
with faith. “Then she believed. She prayed with fasting. Oh, did she get cured!” (HP LL1, 35592-35613)

To conclude this unit, the most frequent mode of communication was storytelling. Using the MT and local proverbs had a powerful impact on many Receptors. Leaders prioritized learning in social contexts. Dialog and discussion was an oral mode where information flowed bi-directionally, and the face-to-face interaction would include rich, nonverbal cues. Repetition was practiced in a social setting and encouraged. When Receptors seemed open, the leaders would appeal to them to participate actively and empathetically by trusting Jesus Christ. These aspects of oral communication allowed for deeper understanding. They also resulted in fruitful relationships and opportunities for sharing their faith.

Relevance

Relevance was coded in the data almost as often as oral modes of communication. Relevance functions as a motivational aspect because it is the ability to address the physical, emotional, social, and/or spiritual needs that were important to the Receptors. Relevance was evident in this research in two ways: first, when the leaders addressed the needs of the community, and second, when the leaders personally identified with the Receptors’ problems.

Addressing Needs of the Community

The Leaders addressed the felt needs of the Receptors most frequently by connecting a relevant Bible story to help with the Receptor’s current problems or challenges shared by most community members. For example, the Hakkipikki LLT recognized that their community struggled with envy. There was constant striving over
the possession of household idols; the more idols one has, and the older the idols, the
greater honor they receive in the community. In response, the LLT created content
beginning with a Hakkipikki saying, “What is in our heart, it will come on your lips.”
(HP DGM1, 49658-49710) They followed this with the story of Mary anointing Jesus
with very costly perfume. The TL explained how Jesus’ disciples responded with
indignation,

“Why you don’t sell this and give to the poor?”/ “Why are you pouring all the oil
on him?”/ They were thinking, ‘She will become big in the sight of Jesus./ We are
no one.’” In this way, they were envious./ Christ said, “Why she has done good
work. Leave her alone./ You should also do these things.” (HP DGM1, 50186-
50512)

The TL reported this was a popular story among the Hakkipikki with whom they shared.

Another example was when Kannada DM1 shared the story of Hannah40 with a
couple who had no children. He commented, “So they came to the knowledge that the
Lord will do a miracle in my life also.” (KAN DGM1, 46286-46371) As a result, this
couple first adopted a child and then they also had a biological child.

A third example from the Madiga team, was in response to casteism that pervades
every aspect of a SC’s life. The TL explained how he responds with the story of Jesus’
interaction with the Samaritan woman.

I share the story of the Samaritan woman. Jesus went to the Samaritan woman,
and he shared the gospel. So, Jesus went to the low caste lady, so we need to learn
how to fight this casteism. … They have felt powerless. Not in a particular
person, but they as a group. They [are] broken down by this [the cast practices].
… With Jesus and his stories, they can come out of this casteism. So, they can
meet, do [interact with] anybody, any people they can meet. (MAD GL1a, 51425-
52933)

40 Hannah was barren. When she poured out her soul in prayer at the altar, the priest, Eli, accused her of
being drunk. When she explained her anguish, Eli then blessed her. Hannah bore a son, Samuel, whom she
dedicated to the Lord.
Madiga DM1 also told a story of meeting needs by sharing the story of Jesus healing a man who had been lame for 38 years\textsuperscript{41} with a couple where the husband had been ill for many months. The wife responded, “If my husband gets well, we all will come to the church.” DM1 continued to visit and encourage them weekly for two months. He reported, “Now the husband’s healed./ They have taken all the idols and the photos [out of their home]./ Now they have believed in Christ. (MAD DGM1, 21121-21243).

The leaders also shared stories of Jesus acting personally on their behalf. Madiga LL1 shared his family’s story. His parents, prior to believing in Jesus, were living in “slavery”. When he was 12, he was deathly ill with both chicken pox and typhoid fever. As a last resort, his parents went to a Christian pastor who wept over the boy as he prayed. He was dramatically healed. As a result, his father, who was the village priest, and his mother became Christ followers. Gradually, they prospered and could “stand on their own.” Now, he and his parents have freedom to associate with others beyond their caste and they no longer remain in subservience to the upper castes. Two Kannadiga LLs were also marvelously healed. They continue to share these experiences with others who are ill. LL3 shared his story in 17 villages. He explained,

\begin{quote}
I use both the word of God, and my testimony to share with them./ There are so many other people also healed, so I share their testimony, my testimony, and the word of God. (KAN LL1, 38256-38476)
\end{quote}

In addition, Kannadiga LL3’s mother was the temple priest of their village. LL3 lamented, “She had no peace.” (KAN LL1, 28254-28541) When his father chose to follow Christ, his mom was also delivered from demonic oppression. The family went

\textsuperscript{41} John 5:1-9 Jesus heals a man who has been lame for 38 years. This takes place in Jerusalem at a pool called “Bethsaida.”
from a home of no peace to “Super, super peace!” (KAN LL1, 30745-30787) and have also prospered financially.

Besides sharing relevant Bible stories and/or their personal testimony, the leaders responded to meet felt needs in practical ways. They shared food and visited those who were sick. They also addressed emotional and spiritual needs. They prayed for the sick and anointed them with oil because these actions fostered hope. They invited Receptors to meet with their group of believers to be encouraged in the atmosphere of joy and praise common to the believers’ gatherings. Some had witnessed family members being delivered from demonic oppression and brought deliverance through Jesus’ name to others who suffered similar ways.

In sum, the leaders usually addressed needs by responding to a family’s or an individual Receptor’s felt need by sharing a relevant story of how Jesus’ acted on the behalf of others in the past in similar circumstances. Sometimes they told how they had experienced a miracle personally. They also met needs in practical ways, or by providing hope and encouragement either individually or through their Christian community gatherings.

Change Agent Identifies Experiencing the Receptors’ Problems

When working with Receptors, the CAs sometimes mentioned they, too, had previously encountered the same challenges the Receptors were currently facing. It was the Kannada TL, who often worked cross-culturally, who was most articulate regarding this identification process: He explained,

When we share the story,/ as we read the story from the bible,/ so they will not hear. / But when we take their problem in our mouth, / yah so it is our problem too, they understand./ And with the local wisdom,/ yah, they will smile hearing
the local wisdom. So, with the new people, we will not open our bible in front of them. (KAN LL1, 46309-46621)

The Madiga TL and DM1 were both working diligently to see their people find freedom from the physical and psychologically oppressive treatment of the upper castes. DM1 had experienced this personally. “We were so poor that we could not have good food and clothing. We were very poor and in a wretched condition.” (MAD DGM1, 04435-04559) He spoke of admonishing extended family and caste friends to “Come out and live your own life and stand in your own way.” (MAD DGM1, 08223-08287) While the Madiga TL had not personally experienced this life of slavery, it continued to be the reality of extended family members. He empathized with their condition by frequent visiting, communicating in his MT, mentoring those living in the community, and persistently sharing the freedom he has through his faith in Jesus Christ. He explained,

I can go anywhere now. I have that feeling [freedom] both in the community and in general [outside the community]. Yes, because if I believe in Christ, I can go anywhere. But the burden I have for my community, my people, is they have to come out from that bondage. And they have to believe in Christ and live for Christ. And they should be a testimony to others. Yes. These things I am praying for that. (MAD GL1, 54668-55149, without translation)

In summary, the leaders’ attention to relevance via targeted bible stories, acts of kindness, and personal identification with the Receptors’ problems increased receptivity among the Receptors to hear their message. CAs who were cultural outsiders are likely to face greater challenges before they can share their message in comparison to the CAs who were insiders.

Mutual Respect

Mutual respect was seen less often than the other components of the Connected Learning Framework. As discussed in Chapter Three (pps. 65-68), Indian society is more
hierarchical than American society. In highly hierarchical groups, the norm is obedience to authority without question. Some aspects of working in collegial and collaborative ways will be novel and somewhat foreign in such groups. An example of this perspective startled us as investigators. The setting was a conversation with the TLs about bringing their LLs to their group’s first focus group interview. The following dialog with the Madiga TL:

**TL ONLY:** Yes, ma’am. We will agree, ma’am. No problem. Whenever you call us, we will be available.

**RM:** Thank you. I appreciate your time.

**TL ONLY:** Because, as I only know our community people, they believe me, what I say. I mean, they have to believe. They should not say, “You are going the wrong way.” But they have to accept, no? Okay, I will also understand them. What is their things. And so, I will be available whenever it be required. Yes.

The bold statements, “they have to believe” and “they have to accept” stood out to both of us as investigators. The expectation seemed to be that since he was in authority, his LLs had to accept his request to come to the interview. He did not directly promise they would come; but the implication was they would42.

Mutual respect was seen in three aspects. The first was the two-way relationships that were seen at various times in the Spoken process. The second was being receptive of and responsible to the Receptors’ cultures. The third was the leaders receiving honor, respect, or appreciation from the Receptors. These aspects will be further discussed in the three parts that follow.

---

42 Another interpretation would be that his language skills made the statements seem more dramatic than necessary.
Two-Way Rather Than Hierarchical Relationships

The Kannadiga group most clearly demonstrated mutual respect because the TL implemented the Spoken method accurately and mutual respect is modeled throughout the method. The TL’s modeling was, in turn, repeated by his LLs with their DMS. The examples are in “Implementation by Kannadiga leaders” (188-192) but I will recap the specifics related to mutual respect. First, the group chose a problem the gang members were experiencing and the input and the decision for this came from the LLs. Next, all members of the team searched for local wisdom. The TL limited his interactions to helping when “there were issues” of the local wisdom or the story not aligning well (KAN LL1, 48358-49380). During the interviews, we observed that the Kannada TL never interrupted his leaders. He did not cue their responses or re-state anything the interpreter said before they could respond.

Due to logistical problems, the content creation for the Kannadiga evolved to also take place at the LL-with-DMs level (rather than remain the exclusive task of the LLT as was taught in the 2018 training). The DMs described the process of going through the story “step by step” and mentioned all five of the 2018 training questions (the training questions were open-ended to encourage discussion). Even though the Kannadiga TL didn’t speak in detail about discussion, the details given by the DMs’ sessions with their LLs mirrored what was happening in the LLT sessions. The DMs talked about discussing with their leaders. The Kannadiga LLs were modeling the discussion that took place, originally, with the TL. The DMs did not mention the LLs teaching or admonishing. One DM even described tailoring stories in the community setting. This would indicate an ability to adapt to a situation “on the street” by creating content in the moment of contact.
This adaptability shows a high level of adopting the Spoken method and a responsiveness to receiving input from Receptors.

The Madiga TL included more teaching and admonishing than the Spoken process recommends but he also encouraged mutual exchanges. I will recap some of the samples that are in the “Findings specific to the Madiga team” (p. 188). The leaders actively participated in choosing a problem. The TL was dependent on the leaders’ input to find local wisdom because he had little knowledge of the Madiga local proverbs. And it was evident that discussion took place because the TL explained how he first, benefited from insights given by those who were uneducated and, second, how he learned both about and from the timid, nonliterate, Madiga congregants who previously had not spoken in public gatherings.

The PD’s receiving input from the TL and LLs as part of the final check before recording content with each team also demonstrates a two-way relationship. The PD did not dictate but rather engaged in conversation. The Madiga TL described how he, the LL, and a congregant from the community discussed issues with the PD before recording.

Note the two instances that say “and again we will explain to him”:

When he [the PD] comes, we will discuss with him, the problem, the proverb, the storytelling. He [the PD] will explain to me, and we again will explain to him./ So, the PD corrects some things if there are some mistakes or problems, he corrects./ So, he asks the problem, if it is really happening or not, “Oh in your communities [are these] things going on?” he asks. / So, we say that yah it’s happening. It happened here [and] here [and] there and, and we share with him and tell him./ So sometimes he shows us the correct Bible passage./ And again we have to explain to him./ After talking, we record it. (MAD GL3, 27506-30124)

As we were transcribing this and reviewing the video, we investigators both had the impression that these phrases meant the Madiga LLT was explaining cultural differences to the PD in a sense of the group and the PD having important parts of the
puzzle necessary to construct the final content. We did not think this was a situation of justifying their choices to a higher authority. In addition, the PD admitted that he had difficulty understanding some of the Hakkipikki sayings because the culture is far more distinctive in comparison to the Kannadiga and Madiga cultures which are toote in the same language family.

Outside the content creation process, other Receptors also provided input to leaders. The Spoken method of fostering dialog and discussion was a novel experience to the village communities where a normal Sunday gathering would be passively listening to someone teaching or preaching. Kannada LL3 shared the group’s response:

> There is a village far from my place. When we go there and we gather the people, I share these things with them—the stories—and I ask the questions: What [do] you like? What don’t you like? Who do you want to be [like in the story]?/ So there are so many families coming there./ So, they said, “Please, conduct these meetings every Sunday also./ You have not much age, but you are speaking like old people./ So, seeing our problems, nobody is there to speak there about these problem, but you are speaking to [it]. You are responding to our problems.” They like [that]./ So, most people are like that. They love to hear the stories. (KAN LL1, 57115-57825)

Overall, the Spoken method fosters mutual participation, collaboration, and respect for one another’s opinion, which is unusual in the hierarchical, high Power Distance Indian culture. Mutual participation and collaboration were most evident among the Kannadiga team, but also seen in some Madiga gatherings as well.

**Change Agent Respected the Receptor’s Culture and Adapted**

A sign of mutual respect was seen when the CA not only attempts to impact the Receptors’ life and culture, but also becomes willing to be personally changed by the Receptors’ culture by adapting to it. The CAs were frequently working as insiders in their groups, however, there were instances in which the leaders were also working as
outsiders. In the outsider role they demonstrated respect and/or attempted to adapt to the Receptors’ culture in a variety of ways. For example, the Hakkipikki TL demonstrated respect by learning the languages of many tribes with whom he has outreaches. The Kannadiga TL avoided the Bible becoming a stumbling block to those who oppose anything “not Hindu” by adapting the Bible stories to modern-day story equivalents so he could communicate biblical principles and address spiritual issues. And Madiga LL1 showed discretion and respect by not preaching directly against idol worship. He explained, “We teach truth, not about those idols./ [The] Lord will work in their hearts, and they will [eventually] separate—take out idols./ Yah, Lord is working through this.” (MAD LL1, 19072-19237)

Finally, the Madiga TL was part insider and part outsider; there were many things he did not know about his culture due to decades of living outside the community ghetto. Yet, he valued the culture and was committed to learn more about his language and culture. As mentioned before, He now wants “to go in deep.” (MAD DM2, 05304-05318)

**Receptors Appreciate or Respect the Change Agent**

Once again, unlike more egalitarian societies, mutual respect is not the normative way of operating in India’s rigid caste society. In this hierarchical setting, those who are of a higher caste and those who are in charge as leaders, take charge. They are waited on and not to be left waiting. The Madiga TL stayed late after the TL focus group interview to ensure we knew how much he appreciated the PD43.

Whenever the PD is visiting us, sometime[s] we [are] not available and he needs to plan here and there [well ahead] because my place is so far from that area [where the PD lives], and he needs to plan. Sometime[s] we plan for three

---

43 The translation is a bit rough because the Madiga TL insisted on speaking English rather than allow our interpreter to translate from Kannada.
o’clock, and he gets [up] at six [a.m.] traveling here and there, gathering with me and others. He spends a lot of his time traveling every time, [to] my place, to the Hakkipikki TL’s place, and all the areas. And he’s lot of doing—good job. Because whenever we say, “PD come,” he’s ready to come [to do] the recording and all. Sometimes we say, “Today, we’re not available,” which means he has to postpone things and all. But when we plan, okay, he’s coming, he’ll COME! He’s always [faithfully] there. This man is working very hard. (KAN GL1, 01218-01911)

This articulated the PD’s willingness to respond and serve two groups that are, in Indian social structure, below his social standing. Additionally, in this project they are also under his authority. The PD remained flexible to the SC and ST groups’ availability, rather than mandating they conform to what was most convenient for him. He did not react when plans changed even though it cost a day of his time. This was confirmed by the TL’s response to what he found challenging with the method. He frequently mentioned, “Timings,” an Indian English word that meant things often don’t go as planned and one is left waiting!

Two LLs also spoke of being honored or gaining respect when employing the Spoken process. Kannadiga LL3 shared a compliment he received from the villages where he was seeing transformation. The people responded,

So, you have not much age, but you are speaking like old people,” they said./ “So, seeing our problems, nobody is there to speak about that problem, but you are speaking to [it]. You are responding to our problems. (KAN LL1, 57497-57717)

Similarly, Madiga LL1 commented, “The way they hear the word—they hear the story—I like that. And after that they will give more respect to us. That I like.” (MAD LL1, 18669-18797)

**Summary of the Four Constructs in Implementing the Spoken Process**

In answer to the question of what role mutual respect, life experience and mode of communication played in implementing the Spoken process, we divided the life
experience component into the constructs of relationship and relevance from the Connected Learning Framework. As investigators, we discovered that relationship was the fundamental principle to both access and influence. We, as outsiders, had access to these leaders because of our relationship with the Director, and in previous years, we had influence through the Director who invited us to do trainings. The TLs, LLs, and DMs also participated primarily because of the relationships they had with their leaders. The leaders who were normally operating as insiders also worked along lines of relationships by first sharing the content with family members, church members, and friends within their own community. When they worked cross-culturally, the connections were made similarly—through friends of extended family members and family members of friends in other areas. The leaders prioritized spending time with Receptors to develop deeper social bonds and gain their Receptors’ trust. Relationships could also negatively impact these leaders’ influence with Receptors because of the interconnectedness of oral communities. The Christians are a small minority in all these communities. The community elders’ restrictive judgments against Christians and/or the majority’s negative opinion of Christianity deterred many Receptors from accepting the Christian message or becoming serious Christ followers.

Second to relationship, the leaders activated the motivational aspect of relevance in Receptors by addressing felt needs. Leaders did this by first, seeking to understand their Receptors’ current challenges, and second, by addressing those needs in practical ways. Some leaders expressed how they personally identified with their Receptor’s needs by having experienced similar struggles. Relationship building took place by spending time with the Receptors. Meeting needs also deepened trust.
Frequently, the leaders addressed Receptors’ felt needs by sharing relevant stories of hope. These were either Bible stories or their faith story. This was done through the most common mode of oral communication—storytelling. Social/oral learning was also an important aspect of oral communication. It occurred in dialog and discussion, repetition in a social setting, and challenging the Receptors to empathetically participate actively trusting Jesus to act on their behalf. Using the MT and using local proverbs both engendered a positive sense of identification.

Mutual respect was embedded in the Spoken method where facilitated discussion follows the Bible story. The Kannadiga and Madiga groups provided several examples. When the leaders as CAs were outsiders, they also demonstrated mutual respect in a variety of ways: learning language, adapting to culture, and tailoring communication in ways that avoided offense. In response, some Receptors were openly appreciative of these CA-leaders and honored them in return. In Chapter Six, these findings will be discussed considering the literature on orality, learning differences between oral preference and highly academic learners, and the Connected Learning Framework.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

This research began with a quest to explore dynamics between highly literate Change Agents (CAs) working with adults in communities with an oral preference for learning (Connected Learners). In 2018, we trained leaders in the Spoken method which is designed to introduce new ideas in oral communities. In 2019 we returned to learn about the experiences of the leaders of three groups who had implemented the Spoken process for 13 months. This chapter has three sections: discussion, conclusions, and implications.

Discussion

In this section the findings will be discussed with respect to the literature related to orality and literacy, Hofstede’s (1980) four dimensions of culture, and the education and communication principles fundamental to the Connected Learning Framework. This section has four units covering the importance of relationships, re-valuing oral communication practices, mutual respect, and relevance. The fifth unit will explore the relationship between the leaders’ familiarity with oral learning practices and implementation.

Relationships as Door Hinges

We recognized relationship as a key principle in this research because strong relationships opened the door to access and influence whereas, limited or negative relationships closed doors to access and influence. For example, more important than what we investigators knew, did, or what titles we held, was who we knew – the Director
– a trusted leader respected in the Christian community of Karnataka. Our 15-year relationship with the Director opened the door to access Christian leaders with whom he had collaborated over many years. As mentioned in the previous chapter, being interviewed by a foreigner was a highly unusual activity. Nevertheless, the three Team Leaders (TLs) spent four days with us in group interviews for this research because of their relationship with the Director. In our setting, the Director acted as proxy for the relationship we investigators did not have with the TLs. Earlier, the Director’s endorsement gave us access and influence on them in the 2018 trainings. A year later, he coordinated access and days of collaboration for the interviews which included the TLs agreeing to come with their Local Leaders (LLs).

In contrast, while we informed the Director of our plans to interview the LLs’ Discussion Group Members (DMs) and anticipated each LL returning with two or three DMs (about 30 DMs) to be interviewed over a three-week period, we seriously underestimated the level of relationship required to secure the interviews. The key to access this third tier of men was dependent on the LLs. However, the DMs did not know or work with the Director and most had never met us either. Consequently, we averaged only one DM per LL. Likewise, our original hopes for independent checks of the leaders’ stories by interviewing the DMs was also unrealistic. We learned that the LLs would not consider returning to a second interview without their TL present.

The importance of relationship was also evident in the findings by examining where and with whom the leaders shared the Spoken method. The leaders always began with known individuals. In the Hakkipikki and Kannadiga groups, family members held leadership roles. They shared with family members, believers, friends, and neighbors.
Those who were in boarding school witnessed to fellow students. The places they shared were in their homes and neighborhoods. The leaders also worked through familiar networks. When the leaders reached beyond their community, they gained entrance, once again, by connecting with friends of friends, or extended family members who were networked in the target community. The Hakkipikki used their networks as traders to build relationships and then share content with others outside their community. The Madiga TL’s relationship with the PD opened doors of acceptance to preach and teach to Christians beyond his social network and above his caste. Kraft (2000) emphasizes the importance of working through familiar social contexts for clear communication whereas Box (2014), Thigpen (2016), and Thompson (2015) point to the significance oral learners place on working with known individuals.

There was also a negative effect connected to this relational aspect due to the leaders’ minority status as Christians. Leaders in all three groups experienced mild rejection to severe persecution. They were discouraged that many who were receptive to their message experienced social pressure not to convert to Christianity. The interviewed leaders gave examples from the past of community elders imposing serious restrictions on them or family members for converting, and how today, the community leaders continue to dissuade any in their group from becoming serious Christ followers. Going against the wisdom of the elders (e.g., to remain Hindu or to continue to honor the Hakkipikki idols) was financially costly and socially restrictive. The fact that conversion to Christianity would be difficult for most Indians could be anticipated through three aspects of orality mentioned in the literature. First, the conservative and traditional characteristic of oral communities indicates that respected community leaders would have
significant influence (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 2007; Goody, 1977, 1992; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015). Second, oral communities prioritize harmonious intergroup relations (Finnegan, 1988; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015). This also aligns with characteristics of highly collectivist groups; members believe what is best for the group should be given priority over individual needs or desires (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al, 2010).

Community members recognized that practicing a different religious belief negatively impacts group solidarity. In response, family members, friends, and other community members threaten to ostracize those who consider conversion. And third, this relates once again to the high value placed on relationships which is supported in the literature (Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2015). Just as relationships can open doors, the strong community bonds of relationship can also shut the doors to access and influence.  

Prioritizing relationship impacts how Connected Learners learn. The Kannadiga TL used the Spoken method as a mentoring tool and this TL’s Local Leaders also worked with their DMs in the same way as they were mentored by the TL. Thompson (2015) and Thigpen (2016) mention how important relationship is to teaching and to learning in oral groups. Klem (1982) notes the learner’s relationship to the presenter is an important factor in accepting the presenter’s message. Several scholars explain that apprenticeships and mentoring are common methods employed for learning skills in oral communities (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2015).

---

44 As an outsider, looking at these incredibly difficult social obstacles, I once asked the Director why Indians converted to Christianity. He answered, “They are disillusioned by their gods, or they encounter the person of Jesus Christ who responds to their prayers.” (Personal conversation with Director on September 20, 2014)
All the TLs and many of the LLs spent a significant amount of time with those they wanted to influence. The Madiga TL visited his LLs in the leader’s community context every month. The Hakkipikki TL visited his LLs in the community. In addition, all the leaders spent time developing relationships with unbelievers to share the gospel both in their communities and in outreaches beyond their communities. Kraft (2000), Klem (1982), Box (2014) and Steffen (2018) point out that communicators must share life experiences among the Receptors and in their community.

The importance of relationship aligns with the literature. Oral learner communities foster interdependence. They rely on internal, social relationships (rather than texts) for learning, for storing information, and for meeting most of their needs (Box, 1992; Finnegan, 1988, 2007; Ong, 1982; Sample, 1994). Relationship underscores credibility within groups of oral communicators (e.g., Ong, 1982; Sample, 1994; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2013, 2015). We noted that we, as westerner researchers, were far more impacted by the importance of relationship than the interviewees because we had underestimated its centrality to access and influence. What surprised us seemed to be understood intuitively by the Indian interviewees. These differences are supported by the USA’s high Individualism index (IDV) in comparison to India’s low IDV (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al. 2010); relationships are of great importance in collectivistic cultures.

Interacting with known individuals, or relationship, is the social aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. It can be summed as follows: Relationship underscores credibility among communities of Connected Learners so the CA must prioritize participating in life with the Receptors, working through the families and friends of those
who come to trust him, and then extending influence through their social networks. Most learning is through apprenticeship or mentoring in social contexts. The CA understands most Connected Learner communities are highly collectivistic. One way this is evident is their cautious approach to adopting new ideas. Members prefer ingroup wisdom and defer to the community elders’ counsel. The wise CA strives to develop positive relationships with those of good reputation within the community—the higher the level of influence of the Receptors who come to accept him, the greater the potential for access and influence he attains.

Re-Valuing Oral Communication Through the Spoken Method

The Spoken method is predicated on oral communication principles so implementing the method impacted the leaders in this research to rethink the efficacy of familiar practices, such as the use of story and proverbs. This unit describes common communication practices the leaders experienced in new ways. Part one is about the power of story. Part two covers using proverbs and the mother tongue (MT). Part three describes how repetition influenced replication.

Story Moves to Center Stage

In western academic environments, literacy is an essential tool, books are the norm, and instruction is often didactic. In communities of Connected Learners, oral communication is essential, proverbs and the MT key identification, and stories teach indirectly. In this research, the leaders’ primary mode of communication was oral and face-to-face. The leaders in this study valued reading, but it was peripheral to most of their communication with their leaders and in their outreaches. The leaders had all utilized stories before the 2018 workshop in the form of their own testimonies or Bibles
stories. But while implementing the Spoken method they rediscovered the power of story because the method presented the Bible story as the primary vehicle for content. They did not use notes, nor did they reference authoritative opinions or outside research. In addition, when the leaders adhered to the Spoken model, they did not preach or teach. This contrasted with the leaders’ prior methods where they used the Bible story as a springboard for teaching or preaching and their message constituted the primary source of information for the Receptors. This reliance on story and making it the center of curriculum was a radical shift.

The leaders were impressed by the effectiveness of story, first, because they received positive responses from all ages and all levels of education when they shared them. The stories captivated the Receptors’ interest. Leaders noted even unbelievers and individuals who were normally hostile to the Gospel responded well. There is ample literature addressing the universal appeal of stories. (Box, 1992; 2014; Bruner, 1990; Denning, 2001; Steffen, 2015). Fisher uses the term, homo narrans, meaning “narrative people” since we are inherently drawn to, and impacted by story (1987, p. 62). Many scholars speak of how stories captivate people’s attention and ignite the imagination (Denning, 2001; Gottschall, 2012 1b; Haven, 2007). Extensive research shows the human brain is wired for story (Bruner, 1990; Haven, 2007; Pinker, 2000). According to Gopnick et al. (1999) babies can discriminate faces at birth; so almost immediately they begin focusing on characters and their behavior. Bruner (1990) and Filmore (1977) note very young children are sensitive to understanding events via story structure. Another explanation for the impact of story is its holistic nature addressing both our intellectual and emotional elements. Oral communicators prefer holistic presentations involving both
the head and the heart (Box, 2014; Moon, 2012; Steffen, 2005). When delivered in person, stories are presented using a wide range of sensorium, communicating a volume of inferential and affective information (Fidler, 2012; Haven, 2007). These sophisticated, artistic presentations of stories are highly valued by oral communities (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 2007; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015; Steffen, 2005).

In addition, these literate leaders were surprised how clearly the stories communicated complex ideas, such as spiritual principles, related to their listeners’ current problems. Their Receptors encountered new ideas or answers to their problems via a simple story. This ability of story to communicate powerfully is consistent with the literature despite the literate world’s general preoccupation with the written word being essential for learning (Box 2014, Thompson, 2015). What follows is not a comprehensive list but some of the reasons stories are a powerful form of communication. Consider the following:

- People of all ages and levels of education enjoy stories. In fact, Gottschall (2012 1a) rightly says, “People crave stories.”

- Stories can be persuasive. Uncle Tom’s Cabin had a significant impact on the American populace before the Civil War. People are moved by story far more than they are motivated by sets of statistics, PowerPoints, or academic research (Bruner, 1990; Denning, 2001; Finnegan, 2007; Fisher, 1989; Haven, 2007; Steffen, 2005).

- People intuitively use narrative logic to evaluate the complexities of life by comparing their lived stories with other’s stories (Fisher, 1989). Everyone employs narrative logic without formal training.
• Narratives encompass complex ideas aptly and better than empirical and propositional logic. Roth (1985) uses the example of the story of Jesus Christ. The gospel stories present Jesus as being both God and man without ceasing to be God—a logic of contradiction. Unlike propositional logic, this ability to employ other forms of logic helps people make sense of our complicated world.

• Most of our thought processes are metaphorical according to Lakoff and Johnson (2003). Metaphors, like love is war and he’s a shooting star, express complex, abstract thought by using what is familiar and concrete. Steffen (2005) says good stories communicate profoundly because “stories are metaphors for life” (p. 38). According to Meyers (1999), Jesus’ metaphor of the kingdom of God has been a powerful tool used by Christian CAs working with poor communities; it has enabled groups to envision a better future. Narrative and metaphor take discourse to a higher level than mere words and sentences per Ricoeur (1983).

To summarize, making story the primary source of content is a radical shift for most trained in years of formal schooling—an environment that dismisses stories as simplistic. But communicating through story has always been a powerful, preferred mode of communication and has held a central place in oral communities.

The leaders’ surprise regarding the effectiveness of story reveals a literate bias. Previously, we addressed some of the myths about story (Haven, 2007; Steffen, 2005). Authors who advocate for the use of story in a variety of fields such as science, business, and Christian mission have experienced significant resistance from scholars and others.
who are highly literate (e.g., Box, 2014; Denning, 2001; Haven, 2007). Steffen (2010) chronicles his own bias as a seminary graduate during his first years of mission work among the oral Ifugao community in the Philippines. It was encountering the Ifugao’s oral communication preferences and practices that initiated his ongoing discovery of the importance of oral modes of communication for both literates and nonliterates. Likewise, these literate leaders experienced new appreciation for the power of story because the Spoken method makes story the primary vehicle for content. They had begun their own journeys in adopting and adapting to Connected Learner practices.

Proverbs and Mother Tongue: Fast Tracking Identification

Proverbs, another aspect of orality, were impactful in the Kannadiga and Hakkipikki groups. When the Kannadiga TL worked cross-culturally most of his communication was in Kannada, but, when possible, he would use the group’s proverbs in their local, unwritten language. This caused excitement and positive identification. When they heard the proverb portion of the content in their language, they exclaimed, “That’s ours!” Proverbs cue insider identification (Klem, 1982; Steffen, 2018). Proverbs are implicit, intuitive, and indirect. This manner of communicating is highly prized by most oral communities (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015). Kraft (2000) points out that the Receptor of the communication is the ultimate determiner of the final meaning. Therefore, scholars emphasize the importance of learning to communicate through the local culture’s oral modalities to minimize confusion in transmitting the message to Receptors (e.g., Kraft, 2000; Klem, 1982; Steffen, 2005).

In this research, the Madiga group was an exception. The Madiga only used proverbs for chastisement. Even though they had created 32 pieces of content, none of the
leaders could remember the proverb connected to any of the examples of content they spoke about in the interviews. It is possible that proverbs did not cue a positive response for the Madiga. Box (2014) and Finnegan (2007) emphasize the diversity of forms that cultures employ in their oral modes of communication. Because every culture is distinct, one strict formula will never work for all. Perhaps the “local wisdom” should be dropped from the Madiga content. For this reason, Steffen (2018) advises the cross-cultural CA to examine key narratives (such as beginnings stories), rituals, and key symbols as clues to discovering the core beliefs and values of a community’s worldview. Proverbs, likewise, often signal important values and beliefs (Horton, 1967; Klem, 1982; Steffen, 2005).

Six MTs were represented in this study. The Spoken content was recorded in three languages and sometimes leaders also interpreted content into other languages. Three leaders noted that having the content in their MT was effective, received positively, or was understood better than the Language of Wider Communication (LWC). These multilingual leaders always prioritized communicating in the MT if they could speak the Receptors’ language. Like proverbs, speaking the MT positively cues identity at a deep level (Kraft, 2000; Pinker, 2000). Kraft (2000) and Klem (1982) both recommend cross-cultural workers use the MT as much as possible and to diligently learn the local language rather than depend solely on the LWC. Many scholars point to language as the best vehicle to communicate a culture’s worldview (e.g., Kraft, 2000; Pinker, 2000; Steffen, 2018).

Repetition Results in Replication

The Kannadiga was the only team to report repeating the story or practicing the content by listening or repeating it multiple times. The TL delivered the story followed
by interactive repetitions occurring in an entertaining interchange. Three Kannadiga leaders talked about how the story or the content was repeated by others beyond their discussion group. This indicated there was some repetition of the content moving through the community. The literature showed repetition is not only enjoyed but highly valued by oral learners; it is part of their learning process (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2014). This practice is usually embedded in social activities (Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016).

Oral modes of communication represent the delivery and performance aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. Oral modes of communication are normative in Connected Learner communities where the spoken word is highly esteemed. Story is one of the most powerful communication modalities. Artistic presentations of story enhance learning and life; these creations take distinct forms according to each culture and may be expressed through drama, poetry, song, dance, music, art, architecture, to name just a few modalities. Connected Learner communities prefer intuitive, implicit, and indirect communication, like proverbs and stories. Learning is frequently a social, participatory activity. The CA, who is an insider, should learn to communicate well using stories in all his cultural’s forms of expression. When the CA uses proverbs in the MT this is likely to positively impact his Receptors (Madiga group being the exception). The CA, who is an outsider, must also actively learn the MT and the cultural norms to interact with Receptors appropriately. Attending to key narratives, proverbs, symbols, and rituals will help the outsider CA discern underlying beliefs and values held by the community.

Mutual Respect: Discovery Through Dialog and Discussion

Facilitated discussion is a key component in the Spoken method. The leader-storyteller does not assume an authoritative role, but humbly comes alongside as a co-
learner. He demonstrates confidence that the group—through their individual and collective life experiences—is sufficient to discern the meaning of the story and how to apply the story’s lessons to their lives. He ensures a safe, participatory environment because everyone, potentially, has something important to contribute.

This unit describes how the leaders experienced the discussion portion of the Spoken process. In the first unit, I address what we inferred from each group’s discussion dynamic. In the second unit, I describe the leaders’ excitement about Receptors making changes because of the discussion. In Unit Three, I tell about the unbelievers and nonliterates’ greater understanding of spiritual principles. In Unit Four, I delineate how the Madiga TL became a co-learner. In the fifth unit, I explore areas where the research findings do not agree with some aspects of Adult Learning Theory.

Inferring Group Discussion Dynamics From the Interviews

All three groups mentioned discussion taking place, but we were unable to personally observe the content creation or sharing processes. However, what we observed during the focus group sessions provided clues about what happened during the leaders’ group discussions in their contexts. Saldaña (2009) and Janeswick (2011) address the importance of qualitative researchers interpreting and uncovering information from astute observation and analysis of the interviewees’ interactions. For example, the Kannadiga TL remained silent during the question and answer time with his leaders. The Kannadiga LLs also allowed their DMs to answer freely. The Kannadiga interviewees could describe the discussion process or share questions that their leaders had asked. From this, we inferred that facilitated discussion was functioning well in the Kannadiga Local Leadership Team (LLT) and continued to be employed in the LLs’ community groups,
even though the DMs mentioned there was some teaching. The Madiga TL was also respectfully silent when the leaders responded to questions about their culture and their testimony. However, he interrupted the Madiga LL twice and the DMs almost every time they were asked about the Spoken process. We inferred that the TL could listen attentively when he was not nervous about the subject matter. In contrast, the Hakkipikki group had 25 eruptions of conversation during the two focus group sessions that could not be translated. The Hakkipikki TL answered first, cued, or interrupted the respondents 49 times when the Hakkipikki interviewees were asked about the Spoken process. We noted LL3 and DM1 also interrupted the leader, and it was not uncommon for the interviewees to interrupt one another. We deduced that dialog and discussion is challenging in the Hakkipikki culture.

Leaders Note Receptors’ Response to Discussion

While the quality of the facilitation could not be determined, what was clear is the leaders observed an impact on the Receptors from the discussion time. The Kannadiga LL3 shared that there was transformation in four villages and mentioned specifically that the villagers enjoyed their time discussing. They honored this LL as “wise beyond his years” because they felt he was understanding their problems. Kannadiga LL2’s DM said the discussion caused the story to go deep into his heart. There were stories from all three groups about Receptors responding by putting their faith in Jesus Christ and experiencing what they considered miraculous healing or deliverance from depression or oppression. The literature supports the importance empathetic and participatory forms of communication among oral learners (Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2015) and the importance of relating in a dialogic manner that promotes discovery learning (Kraft,
2000; Steffen & Bjoraker 2020; Vella, 1995; 2002). Steffen and Bjoraker (2020) and Vella (1995) address the motivational force of story + dialog to change people’s lives or beliefs. Vella (2000) says those who work with adult learners must be prepared to relate to their spiritual perspective and needs.

Unbelievers and Nonliterates Understand Spiritual Principles

Unbelievers usually enjoyed listening to stories and sometimes after the storytelling, they became open to discussing spiritual issues. This can be explained by human nature. Most people respond positively to a lesson given indirectly through story because it allows them to discover the answer for themselves. In contrast, few people respond positively to being told directly what is wrong or what they should do (which is more likely to occur with teaching or preaching). Vella (2000) addresses this aspect of indirect, discovery learning when she says, “all learners are taught by the spirit”. She admonishes teachers to step down from the sage-on-the-stage role and to become a guide-by-the-side when working with adult learners.

Leaders from all three groups mentioned how beneficial the method was for nonliterates; through story, those who were uneducated were able to understand spiritual principles. For example, Jesus’ interchange with the outcast Samaritan woman made an impact on the Madiga. The Madiga Receptors began to reflect on the implications of Jesus’ actions which represented how they are seen by God (a radically different perspective than the upper caste Hindus who consider them impure). The TL quoted their response: “Oh, the Lord of lords, Jesus Christ is the highest of the Jews. He came from the Jewish community, and he went to the lowest caste people [spoken with emphasis], okay? That is interesting for our community, that story.” (MAD GL1, 36073-36264). The
TL pointed out how everyone can participate and also how differing opinions are shared and mutually accepted during the post story discussion time.

While discussing, everybody is speaking. Everybody shares their own opinion. Whatever they understood, they share. So when we preach, people simply hear. But when we discuss, all will speak and they will share their opinions and [what] everything is. And, um, some hidden things also—things we [referring to the leaders] didn’t know. Then [when they share], we know it. (MAD LL1, 14809-15668)

The prior Madiga quote is also an example of reflection. This began as the Receptors listened to the story and identified with one or more characters. In the Spoken method, reflection is iterative during the discussion and the group concludes by deciding how they will apply something they learned from the story and the discussion to their lives. Knowles (1990) and Vella (2002) note reflection and discovery learning have an important role in adult education. Learning through interactive, social exchanges is also a characteristic of orality (Ong 1969; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2014) and Receptor-Oriented Frame-of-Reference Communication Theory (Kraft, 2000).

**Madiga Team Leader Sees Change and Becomes a Co-Learner**

The Madiga TL spoke of an amazing transition that had begun in the lives of the nonliterate Madiga—they began to speak and share their opinions. Previously, they had always remained silent if there were educated Madiga present. This transformation indicated the Madiga TL had created a supportive environment of mutual respect among the Receptors where discussion could take place freely45. In Indian culture with a

45 The following guidelines for creating a safe environment for dialog were mentioned in Chapter Four and taught in the 2018 training. 1) All opinions are welcome. You can disagree with an idea, but you must always show respect for the person. 2) The story (Bible story or other content) presented is the highest authority. No other authoritative voices or sources can be referenced. (When working with an ongoing group, all the stories that were previously presented to the entire group can be referenced and used to sustain your point.) 3) If it is important to come to an agreement about an issue, “truth” is that which the entire group agrees the story (or series of stories/content) clearly demonstrates.
high power distance, it was natural for the Receptors to respect their leader (Hofstede, 1980). But this was counter cultural for a highly educated Indian leader to create a space for the uneducated Madiga to share freely while he facilitated discussion as a co-learner. His previous practice was to be the teacher explaining Scripture. As a result of these discussions in the community, the Madiga TL was excited that he was learning many new things about the lives of his Receptors. The literature addresses the importance of recognizing that every adult comes with a reservoir of life experience to be valued and utilized (Knowles, 1980; Vella 2002).

The Madiga TL also learned these nonliterates were capable of identifying spiritual insights related to the story–insights that he, the Bible school graduate, had not had. These experiences shared by the Madiga TL were evidence that the method was working according to the way it was designed: The nonliterate were able to contribute as equals with the literates and the leaders were also learning from their Receptors. Vella, (1995) emphasizes the importance of this respectful attitude on the part of the facilitator who understands the learners are taught by the spirit (and each has a piece to contribute to the puzzle of their community life). Other scholars have also noted the importance of dialog and discussion where the presenter takes a facilitative role rather than an authoritative role (Steffen & Bjoraker, 2020; Thompson, 2015).

**Leaders Lack Interest in the Roles as Collaborators/Evaluators**

We noted that none of the leaders mentioned attributing any particular importance to being co-collaborators or co-creators of content. When asked what they liked, they focused on the method’s utility. They either spoke of the positive response from Receptors or excitement seeing the content change the lives of the Receptors. There was
no mention of valuing being a decision maker of the content. This contrasts with Knowles’ (1980) emphasis that adults desire to be recognized as autonomous, self-directed decision makers involved in the evaluation of their instruction. In fact, when I asked *What did you not like about the method*, the question startled the interviewees. I quickly changed it to *What did you find challenging about the method?*

We were anxious to extend respect as collaborators in evaluating and exploring whether the method should be adapted to their specific context. However, we noted that the Madiga and Hakkipikki TLs were overly anxious to show that they had been compliant to follow the method as they were instructed. This reflects cultural differences between India and the USA. Hofstede (1980) and Hofstede et al. (2010) note that because India is much higher on the power dimension, workers characteristically defer to authority. In this paradigm it is *never* appropriate to criticize your boss or those of higher status. We, as foreigners from the USA, have higher social status and as trainers we are also seen as an authority, so the Indian leaders felt uncomfortable when we asked them to critique the method. (In cultures on the lower end of the power dimension, such as in the USA, workers would be more comfortable with giving negative input where necessary and collaborating in making changes.) In addition, the conservative and traditional nature of oral communities also align with this reluctance to critique what was given by an authority figure (Finnegan, 2007; Goody, 1977; 1992; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015).

Mutual respect is the psychological aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. The CA involves the Receptors in planning and creating content; delivering it; then evaluating the effectiveness of the content created and recreating more content. Reflection is occurring during the entire process. The CA, in humility, shows respect to
the Receptors by laying aside his teacher/preacher role and facilitating discussion as a co-
learner. He anticipates the spirit speaking to, and through, all the participants. The CA
provides a safe environment where everyone’s opinion is respected—but active where
ideas are also challenged\textsuperscript{46}. Everyone is learning—both the leaders and the Receptors.
Everyone commits to applying lessons learned from the story to their lives and to sharing
the story with others. In response, Receptors also express honor to and appreciation of the
CA.

Relevance Must Be Receptor Specific

The importance of relevance was not new to the Indian leaders. It was key to how
they related to Receptors before the Spoken process as well as after the 2018 workshop.
Beforehand, their own testimony and prayer were more prominent activities when sharing
with Receptors.

Spoken content is developed around recognized needs of the community so
relevance is always in the center of the content creation process. The LLTs were made up
of community leaders. Most lived in their community so they were intimately familiar
with their community’s problems and challenges. They designed each piece of content to
focus on a current problem either they as a group or the community was facing. The
literature indicates learning for adults is best when it is problem-centered (e.g., Knowles,
1970, 1980; Kraft, 2000; Thompson, 2015; Vella, 1995; 2002). The importance of
addressing what is relevant to the Receptor(s) is evident in the literature about Adult

\footnote{\textsuperscript{46} After the group is functioning well at the level of mutual respect where everyone is comfortable sharing,
the step that follows is the facilitator encouraging respectful challenges of opinions. This is where critical
thinking skills can develop among the group. This would not be expected in the first year. It is mentioned
here to give a proper perspective regarding Spoken’s three-year program for training nonliterate and oral
preference leaders.}
Learning Theory (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 1995; 2002), in Receptor-Oriented Frame-of-Reference Communication Theory (Box, 2014; Kraft, 2000), and also a characteristic of orality (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015).

Before the 2018 training, Bible stories were used occasionally to witness. The primary difference in the way the leaders shared after the workshop was by always pairing a local proverb and a relevant Bible story to the problem. During the interviews, the leaders provided 20 examples of content created for different challenges. Kraft (2000) notes the importance of understanding the Receptors’ life situations. Knowles (1980) and Vella (2002) likewise, indicate learning should be relevant to the Receptors’ job, personal life, or community issues. Whereas Ong (1982) indicates that oral learners are preoccupied with what is close to the human-life world. By insisting that LLs be the primary creators developing content, the Spoken process utilizes and honors the leaders’ life experiences (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 2002). This ensures a higher degree of relevance than would likely occur if content were created by outsiders.

All the leaders spent time with Receptors to understand their needs. The Kannadiga TL who worked cross-culturally mentioned that when he was working cross-culturally he would identify as having experienced the same problems as his Receptors. Gaining understanding and the opportunity to be heard by Receptors is a greater challenge for CAs who are outsiders. These CAs gained the right to share their testimony by first meeting the Receptors’ needs in very practical ways such as caring for the sick, providing skills training, or taking the time to develop relationships. Then, later they could share Bible stories related to the Receptors’ needs. Kraft (2000) and Steffen (2018) point out there is no substitute for sharing life with the Receptors and in their community.
Relevance is the motivational aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. The CA must take time to understand the Receptors’ needs and challenges. The CA also should identify having experienced similar needs whenever possible. He earns trust and appreciation by meeting the Receptor’s needs either by providing relevant stories for insight and discussion; by meeting needs in practical ways; or by providing spiritual resources for spiritual problems. When Receptors respond positively, this gives the CA the opportunity to share his message. If the CA is an outsider, he must examine his motives to check any tendency he may have of putting his own agenda or plans above the felt needs of the community.

To summarize, relationship was the Connected Learner construct mentioned first because the western CA, due to his tendency toward individualism, is more apt to overlook its importance. The CA’s relationship with, or lack of relationship with, respected, known individuals in the community will determine to a great degree his access and influence in the target group. Of the other three aspects, relevance was mentioned last because it is the most important. If the new idea or whatever is presented by the CA is not specific to the Receptors’ felt needs, no amount of relationship, story, or dialog will have much effect. The CA’s message must be relevant to the Receptor’s needs and be suited to the Receptor’s context.

Implementation

Thirteen months of Implementation began two months after the 2018 training. To review the way the Spoken process was implemented see Table 5.1 (p. 220). Most of how the leaders implemented the Spoken process relates to the literature has been covered in the previous four units. In this final unit, the first part will discuss some remaining
highlights about implementation group by group. The second part will delineate some Connected Learning principles the leaders missed. The third part will employ the three TLs as examples of literate CAs in transition from an academic, formal learner paradigm to a Connected Learning paradigm.

Discussion of Implementation by Each Team

Production of content went well with the Hakkipikki team; they created slightly more pieces than the others. Most of the 2018 four-day training was spent on content creation so this leader demonstrated that he could produce the product—content—even we could not confirm how much of the methodology he employed to create it.

Unfortunately, implementation of the method was difficult to confirm because the two Hakkipikki focus group sessions were characterized by frequent eruptions of untranslatable conversations and an insecure leader who chronically interrupted or answered for the team members when they were questioned about the Spoken process.

What we surmise happened is something like the following: The group began in October 2018 intending to follow the method, but facilitating discussion was difficult within the LLT. The leaders began to meet with discussion groups in the community, but they too found it difficult to facilitate discussion. As a result, the LL groups soon stopped meeting and the LLT slowly disbanded. Nevertheless, the TL faithfully continued putting together content. He may have done this informally as he went about his ministry in the community. Sometimes he would present content in church groups followed by some discussion. When he finished four pieces of content, he would call some of those who participated in the workshop to meet and help record. He relied on his family members
(LL1 and LL3) and a close friend (LL2) to help. He used the content frequently because he found it effective when working with his people.

This scenario may explain why the Hakkipikki TL benefitted from and appreciated using the content both in church and when visiting Christians in the community but would not let the other Hakkipikki interviewees share anything regarding the process. He was very concerned about losing face for not having followed the model given at the training. Hofstede (1980) and Hofstede et al. (2010) explain that in high power distance cultures, the role of those under authority is to support and honor the authority figure without question. Every effort is made to please the boss/leader. Innovation, brainstorming, critical thinking is not encouraged. We tried to minimize the power dynamic and make it easier for the interviewees to be candid about sharing what did not work with the method by calling them “the context experts,” asking them to teach us about their culture and situation and expressing our need for their input regarding the where the Spoken process worked and did not work. Unfortunately, our perceived status as higher-class westerners trumped our attempts to be recognized as co-learners regarding their experience using the process.

Another possible scenario is the TL did not have enough skill to facilitate discussion and was therefore not able to train his leaders to overcome cultural obstacles to facilitate discussion in their groups. In addition, the literature is replete with studies about the difficulty teachers have adopting new teaching skills. (Forest et al., 2019; Thornberg, 2014; Wickersham & Wang, 2022). What is apparent is that the Hakkipikki TL was the one who was most impacted by implementing the Spoken process. There was
little evidence the other leaders were utilizing the method. Unfortunately, we interviewed only one of his four leaders.

In comparison, the Madiga team had a communication breakthrough—for the first time, the nonliterate believers were sharing openly in Christian gatherings. This is evidence that implementation was slightly more effective in the Madiga group. The literature about narrative logic (Fisher, 1989; Steffen, 2022) and the facilitator providing a safe environment (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 1995; 2002) explain how the Spoken method optimizes adult learning.

On the negative side, the Madiga TL mixed facilitation and teaching during his leaders’ meeting. This confused model made it difficult for the Madiga LL to learn the importance of facilitating dialog with his DMs. There was no report of the content moving through the Madiga community. This issue of partial implementation is a topic that is common in literature about teacher training; oftentimes it is difficult for educators to adapt to new ideas or to adopt new ideas only partially (Carstensen & Klusmann, 2021; Thornberg, 2014; Wickersham & Wang, 2022). Like the Hakkipikki TL, the Madiga TL, was also nervous about how his LL and the DMs would answer questions about content. The Madiga TL’s responses for the DMs are supported by Hofstede’s (1980) high power distance dimension of Indian culture. In addition, Hofstede et al. (2010) note that the lower down the social scale a group is, the greater power distance and collectivist tendencies increase. This means the Hakkipikki and Madiga groups will be more likely to do everything they can to “save face” rather than see themselves as equals who can

47 It is likely that the changes occurring among the nonliterate continued to be shared in their social networks, but to have a significant impact in the community, all the LLs would need to be effectively facilitating discussion, not just the TL.
dialog about possible improvements or changes to the Spoken process. There will be a tendency to answer questions in ways that the Madiga and Hakkipikki perceive would please us since we were perceived to be of a higher class as westerners, if the truth of the situation could be dissatisfactory to our expectations (Hofstede, 1980).

On the other hand, the Madiga TL and his leaders were unique in their decision to field test the content before calling the PD to record. This showed the TL’s thoroughness and how highly he viewed the principle of relevance. We felt adding this extra step to the process was a healthy sign of adapting the process to their context. Many scholars point to the importance of relevance when working with adult learners (e.g., Box, 2014; Knowles, 1980; Kraft, 2000; Ong, 1982; Steffen, 2018; Thompson, 2015; Vella, 2002).

One of the Madiga TL’s responses provided a clue about why the Hakkipikki and Madiga leaders could not describe the content creation process. When asked how long it took to make four pieces of content, the Madiga TL’s initial response was 35 to 45 minutes. He stated this answer twice. Perhaps because I reacted with a facial expression of surprise, he then changed his answer to 45 minutes for each piece of content. If the first response was correct—that the team made 4 pieces content in 30-45 minutes—then there was very little time for post story discussion. It follows that the Madiga LLs would likewise teach after presenting the content rather than facilitate discussion with their DMs. The Hakkipikki TL mentioned making content sometimes with a few people and sometimes with the entire church group. It is possible he created content ‘in the moment’ during a variety of ministry contexts was not explicit about when he was creating content. His LLs may have forgotten about the content creating process because they only participated in making the recording when the PD came. If this was the situation, the LLs
could not report because the process was truncated by the Madiga TL and the Hakkipikki TL created the content in the process of other ministry rather than meet with a group of leaders to work on it explicitly.

The Kannadiga group implemented the method closest to the model given at the 2018 workshop. *All the leaders and DMs were excited about using the method* and had stories to share about the impact the method had in their lives or in the lives of their Receptors. The Spoken method is designed for oral communities. The literature speaks of the positive response of Oral Learners when their communication style is recognized and the communicator (CA) aligns himself with their cultural norms (Box, 2014; Kraft, 2000; Steffën, 2005; 2015; Thompson, 2015). We noted that Kannadiga TL made no mention of what he learned from the dialog and discussion time with his Receptors so we could not discern if the Receptors’ dialogue was an important source of information to him. This omission may be explained in the following ways: First, the Kannadiga TL was a man of few words, and our interview questions were simple. Or second, we did not have sufficient time for this level of detail. (In comparison, we spent almost two additional hours talking one-to-one with the Madiga TL.) The Kannadiga TL was effectively mentoring through the method well enough for his leaders to mentor others using the same method. Mentoring is a common way to learn in oral communities (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2015). The Kannadiga TL also had a good grasp of the importance of making storytelling interactive and participatory (Box, 2014; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2014).
Blind Spots Indicate Paradigm Shift in Process

The Kannadiga and Madiga groups added an additional section named, “Conclusion” to the end of the audio content. (Note that in the November 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2019 final interview, the Hakkipikki content did not finish with a conclusion. See Appendix M. Whereas, the transcribed Hakkipikki content sent October 4\textsuperscript{th} 2022 in Appendix N did end with a conclusion.) The conclusion section was two or three sentences long. This was not part of the Spoken model. The decision to add the conclusion revealed the PD’s and the TLs’ lacked confidence in the Recipients’ ability to discern what was important from the story and bring it into the discussion. The need to be explicit is a common practice in western formal schooling. (Box, 2014; Moon, 2013b; Steffen & Bjoraker, 2020; Thompson, 2015). The format in which this research is written is a good example. First, I begin each section with a heading that states the topic, and give titles to the points within the section. Next, I write in detail about the points, following the same order. Then to end the section, I summarize my points and conclude the main idea of the section. In contrast, oral communities value the more indirect forms of story and proverbs to communicate (Ong, 1982; Thompson 2014). Klem (1977) and Horton (1967) give examples of African communities where one uses explicit speech only for teaching young children. Articulate adults are expected to use proverbs. Adding a conclusion also assumes one of two things. There is only one lesson from the story, or the lesson chosen by the content designers is the most important lesson. Narrative logic operates with a greater tolerance for ambivalence. (Fisher, 1989; Steffen & Bjoraker, 2020). Finally, a consequence of finishing the audio content with a conclusion is it discourages discovery learning and nips curiosity in the bud by concluding. This gives the impression that the authoritative
presenter just gave the final word. This has the effect of shutting the door to discussion before it has begun! Despite these negatives, these leaders still had many successful encounters employing the content. Those who followed by facilitating group discussion (or attentive dialogue with a few individuals) saw Receptors impacted positively.

A second blind spot was the lack of nonliterate participants in the LLTs. The ten leaders were literate. The range of their formal schooling was 6-14 years. Even the eight DMs who attended the focus groups were all literate. This is a common bias of literates— _they limit their training to literates_. Thompson (2015) and Box (2014) speak of the attitude literates hold that _literacy is essential to learning_ so only those who are literate can get trained. (Sadly, many literates also equate literacy with intelligence and nonliterate with lack of intelligence (Box, 2014; Thompson, 2015) The colliery to this assumption is, literacy is also essential for leadership, so expertise in the technology of reading and writing trumps character when choosing who to train as leaders.

**Implementation and Experience with Connected Learner Ways**

We noted a relationship between the success of implementing the Spoken process and the amount of exposure the three TLs had regarding oral learning methods. Moving from traditional ways of teaching and adopting new methods is a journey that takes time and practice. Learning new principles is an important beginning. Understanding how to apply them in multiple settings and circumstances comes only with practice and experience. The following examples show how the three literate TLs are at different places on the continuum of adopting new Connected Learner practices. Each one is moving from their familiarity with highly literate modes of learning toward implementing new oral modes of learning.
Example 1: The Power of Story and Learning to Facilitate

The Hakkipikki TL is a good example of a highly literate CA transitioning toward using and valuing Connected Learning ways of learning. Of the three TLs, he had the least exposure to oral methods of teaching and learning in his Christian context. This is important because, as a child he was taught his history and culture from the elders’ stories. That was a completely oral context. Later, he experienced Christianity orally but became committed to studying the Bible in a literate-structured framework. The 2018 training was the first time he observed learning through story and discussion—Christianity presented in an oral-centric methodology. The 2018 Spoken training focused primarily on the content creation process, dedicating less than eight training hours to the skill of storytelling and facilitating discussion. The Hakkipikki TL saw storytelling and facilitated discussion modeled twice but he had only one opportunity to practice that part of the method.

The CA has created content with a group and begun experiencing how powerful stories are for communication. His people respond positively whenever he shares a story. His Receptors really like this new way of talking about problems by beginning with a familiar proverb and then presenting a relevant story. The TL notes they start making connections right away when he lets them discuss! Before, when he taught and preached, he felt in control of the communication process because he determined what to present. The Receptors were mostly silent, so he had assumed they were understanding his message. With new input from the oral curriculum training, he has begun to realize that

48 Storytelling and discussion workshops run three to five days to allow extensive time to practice the skills and to *personally experience* the power of learning through the group discussion. The skill is more “caught than taught.”
without dialogue and discussion, he has little understanding of how the Receptors are interpreting his teaching or preaching. This is a slow dawning, but he has seen the Receptors come alive with excitement sometimes during the discussion; almost everyone starts to participate. The downside of discussion is that it is challenging with his group because everyone wants to talk at once. He is new at facilitating. Sometimes the audience gets off track or the youth start making wise remarks, so he goes back to preaching. The task given at the 2018 training was to create four pieces of content a month and he has found that he can create it faster by himself than waiting for the LLT to talk it through. He’s completely forgotten about some of the storytelling steps and a lot of the questions from the training. Nevertheless, he’s amazed by how well stories are helping his people gain spiritual insights related to the problems they are having.

This first phase is often the most difficult phase because the CA must shift from control of delivering the message and begin to trust the story to carry the content. In addition to no longer being the prime determiner of the message, as a new facilitator sometimes the discussion feels random and inconclusive; different viewpoints are being presented and the facilitator cannot control the direction of the conversation. One of the skills the CA must learn is how to graciously deal with challenging “characters” in the audience—the chronic talker, those who don’t talk, the jokers, the ones who act as experts by referring to literate knowledge which will effectively shut down those who are nonliterate, to name just a few!

The new-to-orality CA uses story as content but is struggling with the facilitator role. He is still excited by the positive results with many of the Receptors, but he’ll need someone to come alongside to help him learn to become a better facilitator, to remind
him of the importance of repeating the Bible story so his audience can retell it easily when they are with others, and to point out that the primary value of making content comes through the mentoring that occurs during the discussion process with the leaders who make up the Local Leader Team. Follow up training is essential.

Example 2: Gaining Confidence; Becoming a Co-Learner

The Madiga TL represents the second scenario of transitioning toward using and valuing oral ways of learning. The Madiga TL had experience with Bible storytelling and discussion because he had attended a storytelling workshop about five years prior. He’s been using Bible storytelling and discussion sometimes when he visits his leaders’ church gatherings. When he attended the 2018 training, he could focus on the new skill of creating oral content.

The CA meets with his leaders once a month, so he has added the task of creating content to that meeting. He facilitates discussion about the problems they are facing but when he shares a Bible story, he gets so excited that the leaders understand his spiritual insights that he teaches and admonishes. Other times he uses leading questions to make sure they see what is important. There is a lot to cover in the leaders’ meeting, so they create the required four pieces of content during the last 30-45 minutes. When his leaders share the content, they too mostly preach. However, the CA wants to be sure the content is helpful to the community before making a permanent recording, so when he visits his leader’s church group, he presents the content and then facilitates discussion. By requiring that everyone stay focused on discussing the content (the proverb + Bible story) and how it relates to their problem(s) and their lives, the CA has discovered the nonliterate are now comfortable sharing their opinions. This is a wonderful, new
development! He does not live in the community, so the CA is learning a lot about the Receptors’ lives and how they understand Scripture. Several times he has been personally impacted by the insights shared by those who are nonliterate. People really enjoy participating in the discussion time. He’s seen some of his people deeply moved by the story and, most importantly, applying what they are learning to their lives.

This CA uses the skill primarily in only one context—the community—and does not use the method consistently. He is not comfortable giving up the teaching-admonishing role with his leaders. But when he is in the community, he is better at facilitating and being a co-learner than the CA in Example #1. He is less preoccupied with managing the group and more able to attend to the thread of what the spirit is speaking through the Receptors. He needs to add review to his story model so the Receptors can continue spreading the content. He needs to become confident about using the model to mentor, allowing the story and the spirit to teach in his leaders’ meetings just as he has seen the method work effectively in the community. When he starts modeling the method consistently with his leaders, he will see greater application of spiritual principles. By including more repetition the content will be more likely to move through his community.

Example 3: Training Leaders with Connected Learner Ways

The Kannadiga TL represents the third scenario of transitioning toward using and valuing the ways Connected Learners learn. The Kannadiga group was most consistent in implementing the method as presented in the 2018 training, and it is significant that the TL also had the greatest exposure to oral learner practices. The TL’s father, the Director,
had used storytelling and discussion as an integral part of monthly training for his leaders’ network for 15 years49.

The CA is always improving his storytelling skills and learning new ways to encourage his leaders to *remember* the Bible story (not memorize word for word). He consistently models facilitating discussion with his leaders. He is confident the story can teach and that his leaders can be taught by the spirit because he regularly sees the leaders learn through the group without him teaching or preaching. When someone gives an idea that is off, no one loses face when correction comes from a peer in the group. When the group comes to erroneous conclusions, he presents a story in the following session to bring balance. But sometimes the group misses something he considers important about the story, so he had decided to add the conclusion portion to the end of the content to make sure this was covered. The CA uses the method to mentor and leaders. He meets monthly with some leaders, but they are so spread out that he meets with some every other month. In response, this CA delegates his leaders to make content with those they are mentoring in their community. His LLs are modeling the same method with the men they are mentoring in the discussion groups. (As each level matures and gets grounded, the team will start another tier of leaders and discussion groups. For example, the DMs will become group leaders.) As a result, the method is beginning to replicate formally through the LLs creating content with the leaders in their discussion groups, and informally, through community members who are talking regularly about the content with one another. The CA also uses the method for outreaches in cross-cultural contexts.

49 The Director has a few nonliterates in leadership roles in his network. In my decades of experience working with Christian leaders overseas, the Director was the first person I encountered who permitted nonliterates to fill roles of leadership such as pastor or teachers.
This leader represents a CA who is confident in applying the Spoken method in a Connected Learning context and is using it in multiple contexts. He still needs to grow in confidence of Spoken’s efficacy as is evident by having added the conclusion portion to the end of the content. Particularly when the CA is in a cross-cultural context, he is in the process of learning and finding new ways to master communicating clearly in each Connected Learner community. This is because every community is distinct so there are many community-specific ways of communicating that he needs to attend to.

**Conclusions**

The four constructs of the Connected Learning Framework were important to each stage of implementing the Spoken process. This section will explain which constructs will be of particular importance depending on the relationship of the CA to the Receptors—either as insider or outsider, and the country of origin of the CA—either as a western CA or as an Indian CA. The first four units explain conclusions related to each construct: relationship, oral modes of communication, mutual respect, and relevance. The fifth unit addresses lessons learned from implementation.

**Relationship is a Priority for Western Change Agents**

Relationship, or interacting with known individuals, is the social aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. This needs to be of particular concern to the western CA as he comes to appreciate that learning in Connected Learner communities comes through people who have proven to make wise decisions. Courses and degrees are irrelevant to most of the community. Outside experts and strangers, regardless of their titles, are suspect until they have been vetted by a trusted community elder. The CA will need to become an astute observer to understand how these characteristics manifest in the
Receptors’ society. Relationship building needs to be one of the outsider CA’s highest priorities and he should commit a significant percentage of his time to this activity. The CA should strive to befriend the highest and most respected members of the society. *Once strong relationships are established, access and influence will follow.* The CA from the west must attend to the importance of relationship. Culturally, he is likely under-estimate its value. Figure 6.1 visualizes the Connected Learning Framework constructs prioritized for the western Change Agent.

![Figure 6.1](image)

**Figure 6.1** The Western CA’s first priority is relationship, then relevance

**Oral Communication: The Power and Place of Story is a Paradigm Shift**

Oral modes of communication are the delivery and performance aspects of the Connect Learner Framework. To be effective in the Connected Learning context, the highly educated CA must learn to value story and its power to communicate. Starting with an interesting story *with any audience* will capture the Receptors’ attention and the Receptors will be positively primed to listen to the message that follows. For the
Connected Learner, story is not a springboard for thought—*the story is the message*. These learners appreciate oral presentations that are skillfully delivered and tailored to the audience. Of course, every culture has distinctive modes of delivery so the highly literate CA must hone his storytelling craft appropriately. He should include repetition or interactive review so that the story will be easily remembered. If the CA is also an outsider, he must work on learning the MT. (*The importance of learning the community’s MT cannot be over emphasized* for the western CA coming from a predominantly monolingual society such as the USA.) This demonstrates both respect and honor toward those whose language is not the LWC. Proverbs can become expressways to understanding culture quickly – besides being fun to learn and use.

**Mutual Respect: From Teacher to Co-Learner is a Paradigm Shift**

Mutual respect is the psychological aspect of the Connected Learning Framework. Facilitating discussion with adults requires a firm conviction on the part of the highly literate CA that each Receptor can hear and respond to the spirit—he does not need to teach them. Since every Receptor comes with valuable life experience, the entire group becomes a wealth of *living resources*. The literate CA should encourage sharing but never lead the conversation nor drive to make his own point. He should be an attentive listener, learning more than leading. This transition is particularly difficult for the highly educated teacher-preacher who is used to being in control of the message and being seen as the source of wisdom. This transition is even more challenging for CA’s from groups with high power distance dimension. The benefit is giving honor rather than receiving it, learning about the Receptors, watching participants discover or develop answers to their community’s problems. This all comes together with each Receptor providing “a bit here
and a piece there” during the discussion process. In addition, when the group solves problems themselves, they are more likely to act on their solutions. Figure 6.2 shows mutual respect as the Connected Learning Framework construct that should attended to by the CA who comes from a society with a high power distance (PDI) (the authority figure is to be obeyed without question).

![Figure 6.2 The CA from a high PDI society must attend to mutual respect](image)

**Relevance: Making the Receptors’ Priority Top Priority**

Relevance is the motivational aspect of the Connected Learning Framework; it is essential and must not be overlooked. The CA prioritizes the Receptors’ felt needs or challenges and does not put his agenda before what the community deems important. This principle is of particular importance for the western CA who arrives thinking *they have the solution to problems even before they are familiar with the Receptors’ culture or community*. The outsider CA must establish reliable sources from the community to get
accurate information. Relevance + story + discussion constitute a powerful trio for transforming a community if engaged in regularly.

Lessons From Implementation

By the way three groups implemented the Spoken method we concluded it takes time and experience to transition from literate models of learning to Connect Learner models of learning. Highly literate CAs will benefit by understanding the values that support both the literate and oral learning paradigms. The highly literate CA must take time to develop and trust oral communication modes for the CA to become fully effective in using the skills as designed. Storytelling, reviewing the story, facilitating discussion, creating content around the community’s felt needs, delivering in the MT, understanding local proverbs, all need to be practiced and eventually mastered. In addition, even though the Spoken content spread broadly through the Christian community via WhatsApp, when storytelling and discussion was not modeled well by the CA, the method’s effectiveness remained limited primarily to the TL’s usage among the Hakkipikki and the Madiga. In contrast, familiarity with oral principles resulted in the Kannadiga TL modeling the method well, resulting in his LLs and DMs all effectively using the method in multiple contexts.

We also concluded that the four-day training was insufficient for the new attendees (who had not attended previous workshops) to understand how to implement the Spoken method properly. The Spoken method requires the foundational skill of storytelling and facilitated discussion which alone merits a 5-day training to provide sufficient time for attendees to practice the skill and to experience that dynamic of participatory learning multiple times. Then, a four-day follow up workshop focusing on
the oral curriculum development would be ideal. If there is no local coaching in the
method available, the Spoken method should be presented in a minimum of two trainings.

**Implications**

This section addresses implications from this research. The first unit provides
practical advice for the CA who recognizes their need to adopt and adapt to Connect
Learner practices. The second unit suggests further areas to investigate related to CAs
working with Connected Learner communities. The third unit closes the section with
some final words.

**Moving From Literate Practices to a Connected Learning Paradigm**

In this unit I will provide four practical suggestions related to the Connected
Learning Framework for the CA to consider. The Connected Learning Framework is an
active process the literate CA can utilize as he navigates transitioning the paradigm shifts
required for functioning comfortably in oral communities. It doesn’t abandon literate
practices but helps the CA recognize and implement oral methods when he is working in
an oral community.

**Relationships: Spend Time and Aim High**

Strive to develop relationships with the most influential or most respected
individuals in your target community. While you do so, treat every individual with
dignity and respect, regardless of their position. Expand your social networks through
your existing friends and family, then amplify these networks by asking your current
friends, business associates, and family members to introduce you to their friends of
friends and family. Concentrate on those who are open to your message, but do not spend
all your time with outliers even if they are the most receptive. Strive for relationships with those who are respected by the majority of the community and are considered wise.

**Oral Modes of Communication**

Oral modes of communication, mutual respect and relevance are all interrelated, and you will be honing them concurrently. We begin with oral modes of communication because they are often the more neglected skills. Develop your storytelling skills. Everyone enjoys stories! Practice a lot. Practice with all ages. Start a group or invite friends to a meal. Tell stories and discuss during this social gathering. Study how influential news moves through your group. Are there key people involved in transmitting? Do people use technology? Are there special places, times, or official performers involved? How does the group respond to new ideas? Analyze successful communication practices and learn from previous successes and failures. Keep alert to potential mentoring opportunities, both you as mentor, and your being mentored by someone you admire in the community.

**Mutual Respect**

Learn from other discussion groups; note how the conversation moves. Be prepared with a few, clear and simple guidelines for the group you will facilitate. Creating a safe environment is essential. Confidentiality is important. (You might start with one and keep asking the Receptors to bring a friend.) If you have started a storytelling group, add a time of discussion after the storytelling. Practice facilitation skills. Keep silent about your opinions and be a good listener. Learn to ask questions that
draw others out\textsuperscript{50}. Learn to wrap up the session before the energy diminishes so people will want to come back. Research other forms of participatory learning. Community development trainings often have good ideas.

**Relevance**

Always be attentive to the needs of your Receptors and strive to meet them in culturally appropriate ways. Be a good observer. Be a good listener. As a facilitator, reflect what people say rather than add to it.

Practice all the constructs and reflect on what works what doesn’t. Reflect, make changes and try again. Practice with friends in your group or family members in your home. Keep notes.

The next two subparts offer insights for the CA who is venturing to learn from and live in a cross-cultural context.

**Before Going to Another Culture**

- Note similarities and differences between your country and your future Receptors’ country on each of Hofstede’s four dimensions of culture. Analyze possible implications. Read their history. Read about current political issues. Or course, the smaller the group, the less likely you are to find any of this information in print. However, even smaller groups within a nation carry many of the mindsets characteristic of the nation they live in.

\textsuperscript{50} StoryFire Manual for Leaders (Manley, 2014) has resource pages of open-ended questions that generate discussion with any story. It also has suggestions for dealing with some of the challenges new facilitators face when trying to develop guidelines with a group of adults. Other authors with tips are Harry Box, Tom Steffen and Jane Vella.
• Develop relationships with people from the group you want to reach if you are living in a large city (the Diaspora is sometimes larger than the number living in their original location); you may find that some live in your city. These immigrants/refugees are often very aware of cultural differences and can help you with cultural insights before you go. Ask about foundational stories (beginnings per their religion) and favorite stories, differences in architecture (house shape, orientation), important objects or structure (totem poles, monuments), their history and hero stories, expected roles (men, women, children, elders).

• If you can find a storytelling group, begin practicing storytelling and facilitation skills before you go. The dynamic is the same with highly literate groups as it is with the nonliterate groups. Everyone enjoys stories and group discussions are full of surprises! The more you practice, the more comfortable you will become.

**Now That You Are Living In Another Culture**

Understanding fundamental differences in culture is helpful but just the tip of the iceberg. Living in a culture is where one begins to experience the myriad ways different beliefs and values manifest in daily life. Even when cultures share many of the same values, what makes each group unique is the different ways they choose to acknowledge the similar values.

1. Become a keen observer of others and journal your observations. What surprises you? What baffles you? Also, become cognizant of your emotional reactions.

---

51 There are online groups with a worldwide audience that practice Bible storytelling and discussion on a weekly basis.
What new things are you enjoying and why? What irritates and why? How are all the above related to assumptions, values, and beliefs (both yours and theirs)?

2. Continue learning key stories, symbols, rituals, and frequently used proverbs. These fast-track learning culture.

3. Learn the language. If this is impossible due to time constraints, start by learning greetings, then familiar proverbs. Sometimes, understanding a proverb may take a considerable amount of conversation.

4. Find a bilingual, respected, available insider who will help you on a regular basis to learn about culture and practice language. NOTE: In cultures with a high-power distance, it may take a long time for this person to become comfortable enough to correct you. You may need to be a keen observer of the slightest nonverbal cue to understand when you are making cultural errors. Humility and a sincere desire to learn are your greatest assets.

5. A sense of humor is your next greatest asset because you will be making errors much of the time. If you can laugh at yourself, it lowers tension.

6. Be slow to judge, but don’t let misunderstandings build up. Remember, your understanding is limited and might be skewed by your unexamined cultural bias (you don’t know what you don’t know!). You might be missing important cultural communication cues. When you don’t understand, tactfully inquire, always leaving room for the benefit of the doubt.

Steffen’s (2005) book, *Reconnecting God’s Story to Ministry*, is a trove of advice about communicating in the cross-cultural context. It applies to those working in business, medical, agricultural, or other disciplines as well as the original audience of Christians in mission.
Further Research

This research explored how literate leaders in three different groups experienced implementing a curriculum tailored to oral learners. Each team of leaders developed a curriculum, called “content,” by choosing a problem, adding a local proverb, and telling a relevant, Bible story as a source of wisdom. They audio recorded the content in their MT and then each leader used the content to facilitate a discussion group in their community. The leaders, who had six to 16 years of formal schooling, learned the curriculum development process (the Spoken method) in a four-day training. The four constructs of the Connected Learning Framework played a significant role in implementing the oral curriculum. They were relationship, oral modes of communication, mutual respect, and relevance. Moving from a literate learning paradigm to an oral, or Connected Learning, paradigm was challenging; the leaders who had longer exposure to Connected Learner practices moved further down the continuum, but none operated fully in the Connected Learning paradigm.

Future research might investigate what it could look like if the men had more training or consistent in-country coaching. Additionally, it would be fruitful to explore how this oral teaching method could be implemented with other sources of wisdom for topics like health, community development, hygiene, microfinance, avoiding human trafficking, rape, and resolving marital conflicts. How could these resources be put in story format? Music format? Or other modes of communication that were familiar to the community? What other participatory learning activities would inform the CA to encourage the community to participate in discussion?
This research was limited due to the investigators coming from a western culture. Even though there were women in the 2018 training and Spoken encourages the Local Leadership Teams (LLTs) to be formed with both men and women, old and young, we observed there were no women on the three LLTs in this research. Because we could not enter the communities, we were unable to observe how, or if, the women participated in the discussion groups. The men did not report whether the content applied to the women. We wondered: Could a mixed team to develop content in India? Is it necessary for women to have a separate LLT? Why were nonliterate, the monolingual, and the older generation absent from the LLTs? How extensively does the content move through the community? In what way is the content impacting the community? Similar research conducted by an insider could explore some of these questions and may yield different results.

Another limitation was time. It would be informative to investigate implementation of the method after two years, and again, after three years. What is the impact on the leaders who have completed the three-year mentorship model? Are succeeding generations of leaders replicating? What does the model look like after five years?

The Spoken method frequently utilizes technology. Research would be useful to know how the availability of dedicated audio players impacts a project. Impacts sustainability? Impacts replication? How could the practice of sending content via WhatsApp or the Internet be enhanced so that Receptors could easily start their own discussion group.

In addition to Hofstede’s (1980) four dimensions of culture, research could explore other cultural paradigms such as: honor-shame, purity-impurity, chaos-order,
etcetera, inform the model. How do secular CAs unfamiliar with religious perspectives so common to most of the world navigate working among communities with different beliefs/worldviews? How well does the model transfer to other contexts of adult learners solving problems (the highly literate, the diaspora, the incarcerated)? Future investigations of which elements of the Connected Learning Framework apply to these different learner profiles would be useful when exploring alternative modes of learning.

**Final Words**

Most cultures in the world remain predominantly oral. In fact, over two-thirds of the world’s people are Connected Learners who prefer to learn from one another rather than by text. We can divide them into three groups. The first group represents those who have never learned to read; a large portion of this group are women. The second group is composed of those who learned to read in school but after leaving the school environment they never will read a book again because they prefer to learn orally. Due to technology like YouTube and wide-spread Internet access, this percentage is rising. And the third group is made up of the 6000+ groups who communicate daily in an unwritten MT (many of these speak the LWC). Two-thirds of the world represents a stunningly high percentage, but this is routinely overlooked by the highly literate who design training. Unfortunately, the educated teachers and trainers, molded by 16 to 20 years of academic learning, are so convinced literacy is essential for learning they struggle to envision

---

53 The National Endowment for the Arts report, “Reading at Risk” (Bradshaw, 2004) noted a dramatic decline of 10% in literary reading in the past 20 years among Americans of all groups, all ages, and all levels of education. The greatest decline is among the young. 62% of high school graduates and 33% of college graduates had not read a novel, a short story, a play, or poetry in the last 12 months. This extensive study of 17,000 adults documents our society’s shift toward electronic media for entertainment and information.
training that is not text-centered. This study explored the difference between these two learning environments and showed how an oral curriculum can have an impact both in the oral communities and among the educated oral-preference learners who speak and read the LWC.

Small Connected Learner communities with an unwritten MT are worthy of learning in ways that align with their culture and beliefs. In addition, these same oral communities have communication modalities worth exploring because of their capability to enhance text-tethered academic instruction. Most importantly, Change Agents who will be guided by the constructs of the Connected Learning Framework and become receptor-oriented communicators, will find open doors to their message and their own lives enriched through the journey of mastering Connected Learner ways of learning.
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APPENDIX A

US Basic Literacy 1993 and 2003
Figure A.1  Average American Adult Literacy Scores 1992 and 2003

Percentage of adults in each prose, document, and quantitative literacy level: 1992 and 2003

Figure A.2  Percentage of American Adults in Each Literacy Level: 1992 and 2003
Prose Literacy

- Below Basic:
  - no more than the most simple and concrete literacy skills
- Basic:
  - can perform simple and everyday literacy activities
- Intermediate:
  - can perform moderately challenging literacy activities
- Proficient:
  - can perform complex and challenging literacy activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14%    29%    44%    13%

Figure A.3  Number of American Adults in Each Prose Literacy Level
APPENDIX B

Foundational Concepts of the Connected Learning Framework
Table B.1  Foundational Concepts of the Connected Learning Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Learning Theory</th>
<th>Receptor-Oriented Frame-of-Reference Theory</th>
<th>Characteristics of Orality and Social Learning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As autonomous, self-directed decision-makers. They are involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction (Knowles, 1980) They are treated as collaborators and co-creators (Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator shares life experience with receptor and in receptor’s community (Kraft, 2000; Steffen, 2018)</td>
<td>Spoken word is powerful and binding (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 2010; Horton, 1967; Klem, 1983; Ong, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult learners come with a reservoir of life experience to be valued and utilized; there are participatory, multidirectional, social interchanges (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator understands receptors’ challenges and/or needs (Kraft, 2000)</td>
<td>Empathetic and participatory rather than objectively distanced (Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015) socially oriented (Thigpen, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning should be relevant to their job, personal life, or community issues (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator prioritizes using mother tongue (Kraft, 2000)</td>
<td>Close to the human life-world (Ong, 1982) Relevant (Kraft, 2000; Thompson, 2015) versus objectively distant (Ong, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning should be problem- or task-centered [not content-centered] and learners should practice reflection (Knowles, 1973; Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator understands and uses cultural mediums of communication: narrative, song, dance, (Box, 2014; Kraft, 2000) and key stories, symbols, artifacts, rituals (Steffen, 2005, 2018)</td>
<td>Conservative and traditional (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 2010; Goody, 1977; 1992; Ong, 1982; Sample, 1994; Thompson, 2015) Narrative logic (Fischer, 1989; Steffen, 2022) holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator provides a supportive environment of mutual respect (Knowles, 1980; Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator values building relationships and works through existing social networks (Kraft, 2000)</td>
<td>Artistic presentation important (Box, 2014; Finnegan, 2010; Ong, 1982; Thompson, 2015; Steffen, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator-teacher can integrate a spiritual perspective. Facilitator-teacher understands learners are taught by the spirit (Vella, 2000)</td>
<td>Communicator relates in a dialogic manner or in ways that promote discovery learning (Kraft, 2000; Steffen and Bjoraker 2020; Vela, 1995)</td>
<td>Intuitive, implicit, and indirect communication (Box, 2014; Fidler, 2012; Mehrabian, 1980; Thompson, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator-teacher establishes relationship with adult learners prior to the course or training (Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator understands behavior patterns and uses familiar social contexts (Kraft, 2000; Steffen, 2005)</td>
<td>Relationship underscores credibility (Ong, 1982; Thigpen, 2016; Thompson, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator-teacher fosters interactive, discovery learning (Vella, 2002)</td>
<td>Communicator entrusts positive responders to spread the message (Kraft, 2000)</td>
<td>Prioritize harmonious intergroup relations (Finnegan, 1988; Hofstede et al., 2010; Ong, 1980; Thompson, 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

5 Part Spoken Process
Figure C.1  The Spoken 5 Part Process

Figure C.2  The Spoken 5 Part Process Starter Questions

(Illustrations used by permission of Spoken Worldwide)
APPENDIX D

2018 Spoken Training Schedule
2018 Spoken Training Schedule

This workshop is designed in a repetitive manner; the first two days are repeated on days three and four. Four groups attended with 3-4 mother tongue (MT) speakers in each group during the first two days. They learn and practice a story-discussion model and the Spoken process of developing oral content. On the third day, additional MT speakers were added to every group. Then the entire process was repeated on days three and four. This allowed the core group to experience the models and practice their skills many times.

Table D.1 Presenter Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoI</td>
<td>Co-investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Regina Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>Trainee #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T#2</td>
<td>Trainee #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysuru Training</td>
<td>Bengaluru Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir PD</td>
<td>Dir PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col RM</td>
<td>T#1 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM Col</td>
<td>CoI T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM T#1 RM T#2</td>
<td>T#1 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoI T#1</td>
<td>RM T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM RM T#1 T#2</td>
<td>T#1 T#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col T#2 RM T#1</td>
<td>T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM Dir T#1 RM</td>
<td>T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM T#2</td>
<td>T#1 T#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Practice Practice Practice</td>
<td>Learning a Bible story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col T#2</td>
<td>T#1 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MT Practice Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysuru</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Day 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>T#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MT Practice Groups**

Practice | Practice | Practice | Practice | MT groups list 10 problems |

**Large Group**

Report | Report | Report | Report | MT groups report to the Large Group | Scribe takes notes |

RM | T#1 | RM | T#1 | Teach Part 3: Local wisdom | Teaching with 2+ examples and Large Group discussion |

Practice | Practice | Practice | Practice | MT groups list 10+ examples of Local Wisdom |

RM | RM | RM | T#1 | Teach Parts 2+3: Choosing a problem and finding relevant Local Wisdom | 1-3 examples discussed as a Large Group |

**MT Practice Groups**

Practice | Practice | Practice | Practice | MT groups connect LW with a Bible story | Part 2 + Part 3 |

**Large Group**

Report and evaluate | Report and evaluate | Report and evaluate | Report and evaluate | MT groups report an example. Large Group evaluates. Anyone can suggest an appropriate Bible story | Scribe takes notes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mysuru</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Bengaliuru</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>2nd and 4th Day Activities</td>
<td>Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening prayer and worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co1</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>Overview of today's plan, questions answered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Debrief and larger process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T#2</td>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>T#2</td>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>Review 5 parts of Spoken process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contextualizing the Gospel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT Practice Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>MT groups prepare content to present (steps 1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>Choose Problem+LocalWisdom+BibleWisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>Large Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T#2</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Each MT group presents to the Large Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>Present and evaluate</td>
<td>If time permits, presentations involve full Spoken Part 5 model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Day3 only: Review 5 parts of Spoken process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To evaluate participants' grasp of the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>T#1</td>
<td>Day 4 only: Record one piece of content in MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing activity in second half of the last day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>Explain larger process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>QandA: How this will work in their context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans to form MT local leader teams to develop content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>Listen to samples of content created today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants' comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>NotApp</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>Commissioning prayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Interview Schedule
Table E.1  \textit{2019 Spoken Interview Schedule}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Set up at apartment near Bengaluru, Karnataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2019</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Meet with the Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Director and Raj, the interpreter, meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Team Leaders’ focus group meeting #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/05/2019</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Hakkipikki Local Leaders’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Hakkipikki Community Discussion Group Members’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Madiga Local Leaders’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2019</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Madiga Community Discussion Group Members’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2019</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Kannadiga Local Leaders’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2019</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Kannadiga Community Discussion Group Members’ focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2019</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Meet with Raj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2019</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Team Leaders’ focus group #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Institutional Review Board Approval
Date: September 17, 2019
To: Regina Marie Manley
From: Social & Behavioral Institutional Review Board (58-IRB)
CC: Keith Thiele
James Manley


The Boise State University IRB has approved your protocol submission. Your protocol is in compliance with this institution's federal Wide Assurance (80000097) and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46).

Protocol Number: 101-5819-155
Received: 7/24/2019
Review: Expedited
Expires: 9/16/2020
Approved: 9/11/2019
Category: 6, 7

Your approved protocol is effective until 9/16/2020. To remain open, your protocol must be renewed on an annual basis and cannot be renewed beyond 9/16/2022. For the activities to continue beyond 9/16/2022, a new protocol application must be submitted.

ORC will notify you of the protocol’s upcoming expiration roughly 30 days prior to 9/16/2020. You, as the PI, have the primary responsibility to ensure any forms are submitted in a timely manner for the approved activities to continue. If the protocol is not renewed before 9/16/2020, the protocol will be closed. If you wish to continue the activities after the protocol is closed, you must submit a new protocol application for 58-IRB review and approval.

You must notify the 58-IRB of any changes to your approved protocol and the committee must review and approve these changes prior to their commencement. You should also notify the committee if your activities are complete or discontinued.

Current forms are available on the ORC website at http://gor.boisestate.edu/WEB/58-IRB

Please direct any questions or concerns to ORC at 426-5401 or humansubjects@boisestate.edu.

Thank you and good luck with your research.

Figure F.1 Institutional Review Board Consent Letter
APPENDIX G

Semi-Structured Interview Question Protocol
Semi-Structured Interview Question Protocol (English)

The following questions for this research were approved by the Internal Review Board:

1. How did you experience the discussion/content creation group?
   a. What did you like? (Or What were the greatest benefits?)
   b. What did you not like? (Or What were the greatest challenges?)
   c. Anything else?
2. What did you learn from participating in the discussion/content creation group?
   a. How did you use what you learned in your daily life?
3. What significant change took place, if any, due to your participation? What did that look like?
   a. What significant change took place, if any, in the lives of others you know due to their participation? What did that look like?
4. Why did you participate in the LLT?
5. What role did an environment of mutual respect, interacting with known individuals, relevance and oral communication modes play in implementing the Spoken process?
6. What were your goals for implementing the Spoken method?
7. Is there anything else you would like to add?
APPENDIX H

Learning Preference Survey and Code Key
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>See or Observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Doing or Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Interacting with Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LbyS</td>
<td>Learned by Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tec</td>
<td>Via Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>Formal Schooling or Take a Class (not online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP = Hakkipikki TL</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL1</td>
<td>LL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL2</td>
<td>LL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL3</td>
<td>LL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL4</td>
<td>Prev DM1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Hours/ wk on cell phone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP = Hakkipikki TL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Mags or newspapers in home? Kind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP = Hakkipikki TL</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL4</td>
<td>Reads ~10 at the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Languages learned in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP = Hakkipikki TL</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL1</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL2</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, (English - read and write only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL3</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL4</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL5</td>
<td>Prev DM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM1</td>
<td>Prev DM3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM2</td>
<td>Prev DM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD = MadigaTL</td>
<td>TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Hours/ wk on cell phone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD = MadigaTL</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Mags or newspapers in home? Kind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP LL5</td>
<td>Reads via Mobile phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM2</td>
<td>Reads at library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD = Madiga TL</td>
<td>Yes (Forerunner, Daily Bread)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group, Position</th>
<th>Languages learned in school?</th>
<th>How learned languages outside of school?</th>
<th>What language spoken in your home?</th>
<th>Something every ___ speaker should know?</th>
<th>How should they learn ___?</th>
<th>Something you would like to learn?</th>
<th>How do you plan to learn it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP LL5</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>IwO, Business</td>
<td>Vaagri Booli</td>
<td>&quot;Humbleness, forgiving, a holy life, obedience to the word of God/elders, so many things!&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;read the Word of God, and Holy Spirit&quot;</td>
<td>#1&quot;Bible,&quot; #2&quot;music and guitar&quot;</td>
<td>R, IwO, &quot;By reading,&quot; &quot;by a teacher/tutor&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM1</td>
<td>Kannada, English</td>
<td>LbyS, IwO, &quot;by myself and acquaintances w other people&quot;</td>
<td>Vaagri Booli</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>&quot;Bible&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;by Bible study, In this way I want to learn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP DM2</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, English</td>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Vaagri Booli</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>FORM, &quot;reading in school&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD = Madiga TL</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, English</td>
<td>IwO, AF12</td>
<td>Telegu and Kannada</td>
<td>&quot;leave superstition, have faith and hygiene, get good education&quot;</td>
<td>FORM, &quot;Get a good education&quot;</td>
<td>#1&quot;research about Madiga,&quot; #2&quot;help poor children get education&quot; #3&quot;orphanages&quot; #4&quot;bible knowledge&quot;</td>
<td>not answered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD LL1</td>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>MAD DM1</td>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>MAD DM2</td>
<td>DM2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>52 yr</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38 yr</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21 yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Years of schooling?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Years of schooling?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cell phones?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of cell phones?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of cell phones?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own a cell phone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own a cell phone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Own a cell phone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing and doing</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing others</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Learn to use that app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Favorite app?</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing others</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td>Learn to use cell phone?</td>
<td>By seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td>Kind of cell phone?</td>
<td>Flip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Hours/wk on cell phone?</td>
<td>3 most freq cell phone use (in order)?</td>
<td>TV in your home?</td>
<td>Hours TV/wk (anywhere)?</td>
<td>Radio in your home?</td>
<td>How listen to music at home?</td>
<td>Hours/wk listening to music?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD LL1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Calling, Praying, Music</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>NA, &quot;Prev - but now no SD card&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Calling, Messages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Call, WhatsUP messages, Videos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Mags or newspapers in home? Kind?</td>
<td>How access news?</td>
<td>Hours reading/wk?</td>
<td>What every (your people group) should know?</td>
<td>How will they learn this?</td>
<td>Languages spoken? (my count)</td>
<td>Languages NOT learned in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD LL1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;I have no access to news&quot; Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;Give Respect,&quot; &quot;Obey elders,&quot; &quot;Children need to know the Lord,&quot; &quot;Good moral life&quot;</td>
<td>S, &quot;By the fear of the Lord, watching others, parents, believers&quot;</td>
<td>3, (6)</td>
<td>Kannada, Telegu, Thamalu, English (some), Madiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;Leave the darkness things and come to the light,&quot; &quot;respect the people,&quot; &quot;good clothes and good manner&quot; etc</td>
<td>S, H, &quot;following the example of those who have been left bad habits (via their teaching and example&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;Telegu&quot; (home) (but the TL explained this is Madiga), English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;Discipline&quot;</td>
<td>S (good examples…&gt;) &quot;They should learn from their pastor&quot; (some only teach the word but have no discipline!)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hindi, Madiga, and?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Languages learned in school?</td>
<td>How learned languages outside of school?</td>
<td>What language spoken in your home?</td>
<td>Something every ___ speaker should know?</td>
<td>How should they learn ___?</td>
<td>Something you would like to learn?</td>
<td>How do you plan to learn it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD LL1</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Kannada and Madiga</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>#1 &quot;Keyboard, #2 guitar,&quot; #3 &quot;bongo&quot; (congo drum)</td>
<td>IwO, FORM, &quot;take training with a teacher&quot; (listed as both because it could involve formal classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM1</td>
<td>Kannada, English</td>
<td>IwO, &quot;at home and E socially &quot;from the masters&quot; (implied being tutor by me and Co)</td>
<td>Madiga &quot;Telegu&quot;</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>#1 &quot;learn the Word of God,&quot; #2 &quot;teach them using stories,&quot; #3 &quot;prayer&quot;</td>
<td>R, P, H, IwO, &quot;reading and by praying,&quot; &quot;by getting teachings from others,&quot; &quot;by the HS&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD DM2</td>
<td>Tamil, English</td>
<td>S, &quot;by seeing others&quot;</td>
<td>Madiga and Kannada</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>&quot;Human research&quot;</td>
<td>FORM, TEC, H, D, &quot;applying for a course,&quot; &quot;videos, hearing and doing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>Own a cell phone</td>
<td>Number of cell phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN = Kannada TL</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL2</td>
<td>LL2</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL1</td>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL3</td>
<td>LL3</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Hours/ wk on cell phone?</td>
<td>3 most freq cell phone use (in order)?</td>
<td>TV in your home?</td>
<td>Hours TV/wk (anywhere)?</td>
<td>Radio in your home?</td>
<td>How listen to music at home?</td>
<td>Hours/wk listening to music?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN = Kannada TL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Calling, &quot;book Ola,&quot; Photo, music</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>via mobile phone</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Calling, &quot;to know information&quot; (web), &quot;learning keyboard (piano)&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>via mobile phone</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Calling, WhatsUp, guitar class</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>via mobile phone</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Calling, &quot;know information,&quot; &quot;learning keyboard (piano)&quot;</td>
<td>No, (via mobile phone)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Mags or newspapers in home? Kind?</td>
<td>How access news?</td>
<td>Hours reading/wk?</td>
<td>What every (your people group) should know?</td>
<td>How will they learn this?</td>
<td>Languages spoken? (my count)</td>
<td>Languages NOT learned in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN = Kannada TL</td>
<td>daily Newspaper</td>
<td>Newspaper &quot;daily&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;read and write, K and gain technical skills&quot;</td>
<td>FORM &quot;school&quot; &quot;classes&quot; &quot;training school&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;Mobile&quot; &quot;TV9 Channel&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;Respecting others&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;reading the Bible&quot;</td>
<td>6.5, (7)</td>
<td>Hindi, Telegu, Tamil, Malaya, Marathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL1</td>
<td>Newspapers Magazines</td>
<td>TV, newspapers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;Oneness&quot; &quot;Unity&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;reading the Bible&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hindi, Telegu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;Giving respect to others&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;reading the Bible&quot;</td>
<td>6.5, (7)</td>
<td>Marathi=MT, Telegu, Maghali, English, Avaray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Languages learned in school?</td>
<td>How learned languages outside of school?</td>
<td>What language spoken in your home?</td>
<td>Something every speaker should know?</td>
<td>How should they learn —?</td>
<td>Something you would like to learn?</td>
<td>How do you plan to learn it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN = Kannada TL</td>
<td>Kannada, Hindi, English</td>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Kannada! (Even though everyone speaks Telegu in the home!)</td>
<td>caring for one another, &quot;grow in concern for one another&quot;</td>
<td>TEC, &quot;the media&quot; is being promoted</td>
<td>#1 &quot;Bible teacher&quot; #2 &quot;designer via Coral Draw&quot; (combines graphics and music)</td>
<td>IwO, TEC, &quot;with the help of my dad,&quot; &quot;via an app on his cell phone&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL2</td>
<td>Kannada, English</td>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>&quot;leading productive lives and being active&quot;</td>
<td>S, &quot;by seeing the good models of others&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Keyboard&quot; (piano)</td>
<td>TEC, &quot;YouTube class&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL1</td>
<td>Kannada, English, Urdu</td>
<td>IwO, TEC, &quot;friends&quot; &quot;news channel&quot;</td>
<td>Kannada and Telegu</td>
<td>&quot;obey the elders&quot;</td>
<td>S, D, &quot;by following good models&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Guitar, drums&quot;</td>
<td>TEC, &quot;Online class from YouTube&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN LL3</td>
<td>Hindi, Kannada</td>
<td>IwO</td>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>&quot;respect the language&quot;</td>
<td>S and FORM, &quot;observing others and in school&quot;</td>
<td>#1 Keyboard, singing</td>
<td>D, &quot;by practicing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Diss Code</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Years of schooling?</td>
<td>Own a cell phone?</td>
<td>Number cell phones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM1</td>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM2</td>
<td>DM2</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Hours/ wk on cell phone?</td>
<td>3 most freq cell phone use (in order)?</td>
<td>TV in your home?</td>
<td>Hours TV/wk (anywhere)?</td>
<td>Radio in your home?</td>
<td>How listen to music at home?</td>
<td>Hours/wk listening to music?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Call, Learn, Text? &quot;Calling, to learn the Word of God and to send messages (via WhatsApp)&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SD card in phone</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Calling, collect information and prayer requests (come via WhatsApp and messenger)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SD card connect to speakers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>16 hr/wk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 hr/wk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Mags or newspapers in home? Kind?</td>
<td>How access news?</td>
<td>Hours reading/wk?</td>
<td>What every (your people group) should know?</td>
<td>How will they learn this?</td>
<td>Languages spoken? (my count)</td>
<td>Languages NOT learned in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAN DM1</strong></td>
<td>Yes, (names 4 subscriptions, Daily Bread, etc. all spiritual)</td>
<td>&quot;Going to neighbors' shops to read&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;how to live life a good life&quot;</td>
<td>D, &quot;by our experience&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Telegu, Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAN DM2</strong></td>
<td>No, (reads at neighbors' shop)</td>
<td>&quot;listens to politicians' speeches&quot; &quot;by hearing from others&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Care for others, &quot;our people are selfish, they don't care for others&quot;</td>
<td>R, &quot;by the Word of God,&quot; &quot;Reading the Bible&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Telegu, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Participants</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td>12 hr/wk</td>
<td>12 hr/wk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group, Position</td>
<td>Languages learned in school?</td>
<td>How learned languages outside of school?</td>
<td>What language spoken in your home?</td>
<td>Something every ___ speaker should know?</td>
<td>How should they learn ___?</td>
<td>Something you would like to learn?</td>
<td>How do you plan to learn it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM1</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>IwO, &quot;from others&quot;</td>
<td>Telegu and Kannada</td>
<td>&quot;know the truth, leaving the superstition&quot;</td>
<td>S, R, &quot;by following wise sayings and leaving the bad things they can come to truth&quot; (states a local idiom, + Bible as a source)</td>
<td>&quot;English&quot;</td>
<td>TEC, &quot;Seeing YouTube&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAN DM2</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>FORM &quot;school&quot;</td>
<td>Kannada and Telegu mix (but now speaking only Kannada)</td>
<td>&quot;Have faith in Jesus Christ&quot;</td>
<td>S, Seeing believers live a life of faith</td>
<td>&quot;English,&quot; &quot;drive a car&quot;</td>
<td>D, R, FORM, &quot;speaking English and read English Bible,&quot; &quot;driving class&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Recruitment Scripts and Consent Forms
Informed Consent for Literate Kannada Speakers (English)

Purpose and Background
During October and November of 2019, Mrs. Manley is conducting research for a study titled “Evaluation of the Spoken® Method in Three Oral Groups.” This is a qualitative study designed to learn from the experiences of those participating in Local Leadership Teams in Karnataka, India. The purpose of the study is to understand good communication practices between literates introducing new ideas among communities that speak an unwritten language or among a group that prefers to learn through social interaction. It will include the LLT members’ evaluation of how the Spoken® method was implemented. The goal is to improve communication and mutual respect between cultures with different literacy practices.

Procedures
As a member of a Local Leadership Team (LLT) or a community discussion group, you have the opportunity to share your experience with the Spoken® process in an interview with Mrs. Manley. All interviews will be digitally recorded and take place at Mrs. Manley’s apartment in Bengaluru. Your public transportation costs will be reimbursed in Rupees.

For LLT members only: The first interview will be with your Local Leader Team. This group interview will take about five hours on __________ beginning at _________. Lunch will be provided.

As a member of a community discussion group (OR the LLT team), you will be interviewed individually at a time and day convenient for you and Mrs. Manley. The interview will last about two hours. You will receive a cash amount of ____ (Rupees TBD) for your interview time.

Interviews will be like a casual conversation using a question-and-answer format between Mrs. Manley and you/your team. A professional, Kannada-English translator will be available to provide immediate interpretation. Questions will be related to your experience participating in the discussion/LLT group.

LLT members only: You may be asked, but not required, to return to clarify your responses with Mrs. Manley after interviews have taken place and before she departs India mid-November. After departing India, Mrs. Manley will continue to send information back to the LLTs for reflection and comment via email communication through Naveen or Vijay Narasimuthappa.

Confidentiality and Risks
All personal information will be treated confidentially. What comes up during the interview will not be traced back to you or to your community. In group interview settings, confidentiality will be discussed. There is some risk that a group member could repeat information shared. No other significant physical, social or emotional risks are
anticipated. The professional interpreter will not share any information and has signed a nondisclosure agreement.

Digitized audio or video recordings will be stored on password protected hard drives and secured in a locked file cabinet in Mrs. Manley’s apartment. The drives will be kept secure in Mrs. Manley’s personal possession during travel. After returning to the university, the data will be stored in secure servers at Boise State University for three years (per federal regulations) and then destroyed.

**Participation is Voluntary**
Participation is voluntary. You may opt not to answer any question at any time. You may decline to have any of your responses included in the study. You may withdraw from the study at any time. If you withdraw, all of your interview responses will be erased.

**Questions**
If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, you should contact the Spoken® program coordinators: V__ or N__ (shortened intentionally for security) who will immediately contact Mrs. Manley, the principal investigator. You may also notify the Institutional Review Board of Boise State University by writing: Office of Research Compliance, Boise State University, 1910 University Dr., Boise, ID 83725-1138.

**Benefits**
This study, which includes an evaluation of the Spoken® process, may improve implementation for your community (or LLT) in future years. This study may also enable other LLTs in Karnataka and around the world to be more effective introducing Scripture or other new ideas in oral communities. In addition, it may provide understanding of better communication practices between literates and oral communities increasing mutual respect between different cultures.

Mrs. Manley, the researcher, plans to submit her research as part of a doctoral dissertation in 2020 or 2021. When published, anything you have said will be made anonymous by using pseudonyms so you and your community cannot be identified.

**Other Contact information**
Spoken® Program Coordinators: V…, Cell #: 9 (left blank intentionally)
N… Cell #: 9 (left blank intentionally)
Principle Investigator: Regina Manley, Graduate student, Boise State University, India Cell #:
Co-Principle Investigator: Keith Thiede, Assistant Dean of Education, Boise State University
Co-Investigator: James Rush Manley, Student, Boise State University

**Documentation of Consent**
I have read/heard this form and decided that I will participate in the project described above. Its general purposes, the particulars of involvement and possible risks
have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand I can withdraw at any time. I have received a copy of this form.

______________________________
Printed Name of Study Participant

______________________________  _________________________
Signature of Study Participant    Date

______________________________  _________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent    Date
Informed Consent for Literate Kannada Speakers (Kannada)

ನಾಮಗೊಳಿದ ರಚನೆ ಶ್ರೇಣಿ ದೃಢಬೋಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ

ನಾಮದ ಮೇರ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳು

ತನ್ನರವು ಸಂಖ್ಯಾ 2019ರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಪತಿಯಾದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಭಾರತೀಯನ್ನು ನನ್ನಾದರುವರು. ನನ್ನಾದರು ಸಂಖ್ಯಾಗಳು ಬಳಕೆಯಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಪರ್ಯುಷ್ಕರನಾಗಿ ನಡೆದರು. ನನ್ನಾದರುವು ಮೇಲೆ ತಂದರಿಂದ ನಾಮದ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕಲ್ಲು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು. ನನ್ನಾದರುವರು ಸಹಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು ನಾಮದ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕಲ್ಲು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು.

ನಾಮದಿಂದ ನಾಮದಿಯಾದರುವರು ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು. ನಾಮದಿಯಾದರುವರು ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು. ನಾಮದಿಯಾದರುವರು ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು. ನಾಮದಿಯಾದರುವರು ಜ್ಞಾನಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾದರುವರು.
ಬಣ್ಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು

ಅವರನು ಬಹುಪಾಲಾಂಕರಣಗಳ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಯೋಧನಗಳಾಗಿ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಬಹುಪಾಲಾಂಕರಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಬಣ್ಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು.

ಇದರ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿದೇಶೀ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕೀಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಧಾರಿಸಿ ಬಣ್ಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಬ್ಯಾಯುಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು.

ಇದರ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿದೇಶೀ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕೀಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಧಾರಿಸಿ ಬಣ್ಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಬ್ಯಾಯುಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು.

ಇದರ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿದೇಶೀ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕೀಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಧಾರಿಸಿ ಬಣ್ಣಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಬ್ಯಾಯುಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ವಿವಿಧ ಕ್ರಮಗಳು.
ಸಬಹುದು: 
ಸಂಪುಜು ಅನುಸರಣಕೆ, ಹಾಗೂ ಅಸ್ಯಷ್ಟು ಶಾಲಾ, 1910 ಮೊದಲ ಮ೅ಡೆಯ ಅರ್ಜಿ, ಕೃಷ್ಣಪುರ, 13 ವರ್ಷ, +1-83725-1138.

ಪರ್ಧಾಜನಗಳು ಮುಂದಾಗುವ ಇದ್ದವು ಅಧ್ಯಯನವಾಗಿ ಆರಂಭವಾಗುವವರು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾಗುವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಮುದಾಯಗಳು (ಹಾಗೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೈಕ್ಲ್ಸ್ ಶಾಲಾ), ಆರಂಭವಾಗಿರುವ ಕೌಂಟರ್ವಾಗಿರುವ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣದ ಕೌಂಟರ್ವಾಗಿರುವ, 1910 ಮೊದಲ ಮ೅ಡೆಯ ಅರ್ಜಿ, ಕೃಷ್ಣಪುರ, 13 ವರ್ಷ, +1-83725-1138.

ಪರ್ಧಾಜನಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ ಅಧ್ಯಯನವಾಗಿ ಆರಂಭವಾಗಿದ್ದವು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದಾಗುವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಮುದಾಯದವು ಮತ್ತು ಅಕಷ್ರಸಥ್ರು ಮತ್ತು (ಅನಕಷ್ರಸತ್ರ) ಸಮುದಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ವರೂಪಾಂತ ಸಂವಹನ ಅಷ್ಟಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರಹಗಳನು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಇದರ ಮತ್ತು, ಅಕಷ್ರಸಥ್ರು ಮತ್ತು (ಅನಕಷ್ರಸತ್ರ) ಸಮುದಾಯಗಳು ತನ್ನ ಉತತ್ಮ ಸಂವಹನ ಅಷ್ಟಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರಹಗಳನು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಮುಖ್ಯಪರ್ಶ್ಕರು:
ಪದಾರ್ಥಪರ್ಶ್ಕರು:
ಸಹಪರ್ಶ್ಕರು:
ಸಹಪರ್ಶ್ಕರು:
ಸಹಪರ್ಶ್ಕರು:
ಅಧ್ಯಯನದ ಮುಂದಾಗೊಂಡವು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧ್ಯಯನದ ಮುಂದಾಗೊಂಡವು ಸಂಚಯ ಇದ್ದವು, ಭಯಾನಕವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೈಕ್ಲ್ಸ್ ಶಾಲಾ, ಫಲಶಾಲಾದ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು, ಸಂತತಿಯ ಮಾರ್ಗದ ರಚನೆಗಳು, ಹಾಗೂ ಇದರ ಮುಂತಾದ ಪರಿಣಾಮಗಳು, ಕೌಂಟರ್ವಾಗಿರುವ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣದ ಕೌಂಟರ್ವಾಗಿರುವ.
Read by: N or V (Spoken® program directors [shortened for security purposes])

Where: At a monthly team meeting in August or September 2019

Regina Manley, the instructor of the Spoken® program who was with us for five days of training in July 2018, is returning in October 2019. Mrs. Manley is doing research about how local leaders experienced using the Spoken process to introduce new ideas, specifically Scripture, in their community (or local group) over the last year. She believes your unique perspective—the benefits and difficulties encountered, the lessons learned, the impact that has taken place in your or others’ lives, and your insights about improving the process—may help many other Local Leader Teams (LLT). In addition, it may provide understanding of good communication practices between literates and communities that speak an unwritten language and among groups that prefer to learn through social interaction. Mrs. Manley is a Boise State University student. Her research may be published and use direct quotes.

If you are willing to participate, we would like to schedule two interviews. All interviews will be digitally recorded and take place at Mrs. Manley’s apartment in Bengaluru. Bus transportation costs will be reimbursed. The first interview will be with the LLT as a group. The interview will take about five hours on the weekend. Lunch will be provided. The second interview will be with each individual LLT member and scheduled at a time and day convenient for you. The second interview will last about two hours. For the second interview, each interviewee will receive a stipend of 400 Rupees.

If any members of this LLT are interested, let’s talk about setting up a date and time to do the group interview. We can schedule individual interviews now or after the group interview. Mrs. Manley sends her sincere gratitude for your help!

NOTE: Review the Informed Consent for Literate Kannada Speakers after deciding on the group interview date and time. The consent form does NOT have to be signed at this time. LLT members will sign the Informed Consent before beginning the group interview.

Secondary Discussion with Participating LLT Members

It is not required, but will be greatly appreciated, if each participating LLT member can bring a community person who has participated in their discussion group to be interviewed on the same day as his individual interview. Understanding the experience of discussion group members will significantly improve the quality of the study. Discussion group interviewees will also be compensated for their expenses.

NOTE: There are two scripts LLT members can use to recruit community participation. The Informed Consent for Literate Kannada Speakers form should be read out loud to discussion group members who are literate. For discussion group members who are illiterate or low-literate (less than six years of formal education), please read out loud the Simple Informed Consent. For community members who do not speak Kannada adequately, please translate the Simplified Consent into their mother tongue. Be prepared to answer any questions they may have.
Interview Recruitment Script for Local Leader Team Members (Kannada)

ಸಥ್ಯಕ್ಯಾಯಕರ ಗುಂಪುಗಳ ಸಂದಶರ್ನದ ಸ್ಪುಟ್ಟು ಒಡುವವರು:

ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ವಾಸ್ತವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ (ಸರ್ಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಕಾರ್ಯ, ನುರಾರ್ವ ಕ್ಯಾಲ್ಷನ್ಗಳು)

2018ರಿಂದ 2019ರವರೆಗೆ ಸಂದಶರ್ನದ ಸಮಯದ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲಕ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಒಂದು ಅಂಕ (ಅಂದರೆ ಸಾಗಿದ ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ)

ಎಲ್, ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 102019 ರ ನಂತರ
2018 ರಿಂದ 2019ರ ಐದು ಸಾಲಗಳ ಸೂಚ್ಯ, ಸಾಗಿದ ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಆದ ಎರಡು ಸಂದಶರ್ನಗಳ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಗುಂಪು ಹಾಗು ಕೃತಿಞ್ಜೀವನ ಬದುಕು ಅನುಭವಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರ ಬದುಕು ಹಾಗು ಪರಾವಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಸುಧಾರು ಐದು ಸಾಲಗಳ, ಶುಲ್ಕ ವಿಭಾಗಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರ ಬದುಕು ಹಾಗು ಪರಾವಗಳು ಎಂದು ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಎಂಬತೆ.

ಅಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗದಲೇ ತನ್ನ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಸಮಯದ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲಕ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಒಂದು ಅಂಕ (ಅಂದರೆ ಸಾಗಿದ ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ)

ತಂಡದ ಸಂದಶರ್ನದ ಸಮಯದ,(ಸರ್ಕಾರಾತ್ಮಕ ಕಾರ್ಯ, ನುರಾರ್ವ ಕ್ಯಾಲ್ಷನ್ಗಳು)

ಕೃತಜೀವನ ಬದುಕು ಅನುಭವಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂದಶರ್ನಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರ ಬದುಕು ಹಾಗು ಪರಾವಗಳು ಎಂದು ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಎಂಬತೆ.
ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹಿತ

ನಿರ್ದೇಶಗಳ ಸ್ಥಾನೀಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲದ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ
ನಿರ್ದೇಶಗಳ ಸ್ಥಾನೀಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲದ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ. ನಿರ್ದೇಶಗಳ ಸ್ಥಾನೀಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲದ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ.

ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ. ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ. ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳ ಸಹಿತ.
APPENDIX J

Transcription Key and Samples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Type</td>
<td>Interviewee’s speech as interpreted by Raj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Uncertain about this word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...(?)</td>
<td>Could not transcribe several words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he/she(?)</td>
<td>Could have said “he” or “she”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He said, “Not here!”</td>
<td>Spoken with emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHUH</td>
<td>Interjecting commentary by someone other than the speaker (usually RM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(laughter)</td>
<td>Observed nonverbal activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LL3 looks bored)</td>
<td>Investigator and/or Co-Investigator insights from the videos during the transcription process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He shared [content] with her.</td>
<td>Used to explain vocabulary or context. Filling in missed words for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL ONLY</td>
<td>Team Leader <em>responding directly in English</em> and not using the interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:01:06</td>
<td>Time recorded from the audio (or video) during the transcription process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>Break (pause) followed by interpretation (usually followed by interpretation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RM: (To LL1) So have people responded to you, after receiving the WhatsApp? Have they ever called you, or made comments to you about the… what you produced, the content you put on WhatsApp?

(Raj begins to translate but MAD TL answers this before Raj finishes translating!)

TL: Only leaders know about that./ So, if uh through him, the content has gone, some people will call him./ So only people will like, share, “It’s good.”

RM (to TL): How many leaders do you have?

TL: Four leaders.

RM: Oh, I see. That’s your group. YES/ Have you ever had people comment to you about, excuse me. Have you ever taken the content on WhatsApp and sent it out to others?

LL1: I don’t have WhatsApp. [I have an] SD card.

RM: So, if you share, you are sharing it with the SD card?

LL1: Ya, I have chip.

RM: So how often do you share that content with the chip on your phone?

(There is some discussion between Prakasha and JP.)

TL ONLY: Means he not have sending option, RIGHT Sending option. Want to have phone to phone sharing, sharing. Uh sometimes he has to remove the card and

RM: Yah, that’s difficult YES And then having it on the cell YES phone, it’s not very loud. YAH So it is difficult for even the home group to hear it. So, if there if you’re sharing it with your phone, how many people can hear that?

(Again, the TL translates rather than Raj.)

LL1: 5 to 6 people can do.

RM: So, um you primarily share it in your home group meeting?

LL1: Yah

RM: And how many attend your home group meeting?

JP: 5 people.
Sample 2: Transcription from Hakkipikki Local Leader focus group (HP LL1 29569-31361)

CONTEXT: LL3 had given an example of content. He shared a Bible story about an ill woman who had suffered with an issue of blood for 12 years who’d been instantly healed after touching Jesus’ robe. Sample begins at “RM:”

RM: So, um, how does that story help you with the community problem of [dis]obedience? How does that story…

(Pause here. No response.)
RM: Okay, or where do you see obedience in that story? (I am speaking to LL3, but once again, the TL responds.)
TL: So they say that in our community, we have no faith. The ignorance, like that. So, so many people are after (?) idols …ignorance. This story helps them to have faith.
LL1: This lady had many, much money/ and she had lost everything but [spent] for the doctors…/ she had a feeling, if she touched [Jesus], it will help her./ So, in our community also people spend a lot of money and if they get sick, they go to witchcraft, and they do all sorts of things. And they spend more money to doctors and go, they go for different hospitals, and for… They do all kinds of sorcery and they will buy, buy some things in their eyes and in their body. They will take and they’ll make also tattoos and things. So, in our community that’s very much… it’s well known, this is.
TL: In our community, the people, if they get sick, first, they will go to the witchcraft. They will not go to the doctor./ After that, they will go to the doctor./ This is… This story helps our community.
RM: So, this story helps the Christian to know that um if they go to the Lord in obedience, they don’t need to waste all the money on the other…?
All: (Enthusiastic agreement by the older three after this is translated. LL3 is silent and looks somewhat bored.) Yes!

1:39:10
RM (to LL3): Do you remember the local wisdom that you connected?/ The wisdom story?
(LL3 pauses. The TL speaks, then LL3 responds.) (The TL probably told LL3 the local wisdom.)
LL3: So, there is a saying, they say, “If you eat salt, you have to drink water.”/ AH
RM: Okay. Thank you. (This makes no sense to me(!), but I have heard it in several workshops. The Hakkipikki use this idiom frequently.)
APPENDIX K

Samples of Original Transcription and Final Edit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Coding</th>
<th>Sub Coding (Child Code)</th>
<th>Theory Coding</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Edited Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b: What did you find challenging? (not like)</td>
<td>Technical: Device Limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP TL1: While we are sharing the stories some hear with interest, but some have no interest. So if we put it [the content] in a device and we present it in a device, then I am sure that they will hear it with interest. (HP GL2 1971-2185)</td>
<td>HP TL1: While we are sharing the stories some hear with interest, but some have no interest. So, if we put it [the content] in a device and we present it in a device, then I am sure that they will hear it with interest. (HP GL2 1971-2185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b: Tell me about when you shared your content with DMs.</td>
<td>Presented: By Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN LL2: [The content was on my] Mobil. Using phone. By his mouth. So the phone I have was disturbing. Then again I share with my mouth. RM: Because it was not loud enough KAN LL2: Yah, it was not loud enough. There are some outside noises also. A lot of problem. (KAN DGM1 48100-48339)</td>
<td>KAN LL2: [The content was on my] Mobil. I was using [my] phone. The phone I had was disturbing [not working so he shared] verbally. Then again I shared by mouth. RM: Because it was not loud enough? KAN LL2: Yah, it was not loud enough. There were some outside noises also [causing] a lot of problems. (KAN DGM1 48100-48339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: Tell me about the last time you shared content with others</td>
<td>Local Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAD TL1: So, like we are using the common wisdom also. Like there are so many sayings and proverbs also/ KANNADA ALSO?/ in Kannada also. (MAD DGM2 04804-04940)</td>
<td>MAD TL1: So, we are using the common wisdom also... like there are so many sayings and proverbs also. RM: Kannada also? MAD TL1: in Kannada also. (MAD DGM2 04804-0940)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

Code Log Examples
### Table L.1 Code Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Coding</th>
<th>Sub/Child Coding</th>
<th>Theory Coding</th>
<th>Description of Sub Coding</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your community....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like me to know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about your culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholism,</td>
<td>Resulting in</td>
<td>KAN DM2: He said about the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>neglected spouse</td>
<td>drunkenness and the alcoholism/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and/or children,</td>
<td>uh these fathers will drink, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>missed work,</td>
<td>they will not go to the job./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>So, they will drink, and they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will put that more and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and they will beat their wives/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>children also./ They'll not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>send their children [to school]./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So, wife must go outside [to]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work and she not/ so their family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and life will be in about/ And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so in some houses more husband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and wife both drink/ so their children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will be in the streets./ So, this husband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and wife they will drink every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and they will not go to the work. And [when] they will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have the money, and one day they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will go, and five days they will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be drinking./ So, every day they will fight and quarrel./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So, in our community, these kinds of people are living. (KAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM1 10172-10939)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems related to caste.</td>
<td>MAD DM1: We were in such poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Caste Issues</td>
<td>Breaking caste rules results in refusal to associate, loss of housing, no marriage partners given, ostracism.</td>
<td>[that] our father and mother they used to have to work daily./ They used to bring this ragi millet and they used to make a liquid with it [by] pouring so much water and boiling it and boiling it with salt. They used give us [this to] drink./ There were copper plates and silver plates. So they used to pour that in [the plates], and we would to drink, and then we went to sleep./ In this manner we were living our livelihood. So, somehow we got admission schools./ We were six children./ Two did not get educated/ but four of us we had learned in school up to fifth grade and sixth grade. (MAD DM1 05401-06091)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Restrictions</td>
<td>Dismissive of &quot;lower&quot; caste/subgroups; loyal only to their subcaste. Mistrust of all others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Practiced, encouraged, taught to deal with those outside their caste or group</td>
<td>KAN LL1: The people will teach them how to steal—how to be thieves in our community/ [how to steal] all kinds of things—not only money, [but] in every way they teach (laughter). Like going into gardens and taking those things./ They go [out] with empty hands from the house. So [everyone is welcoming [them when] they will be carrying in good things—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Deception,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arms full of things. The parents will all encourage the children saying, “Okay! Good! good! We [do this] like a family.”/ So, like that they will encourage [them]. (KAN DGM1 09378-09875)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Education Valued</td>
<td>The group values education because it leads to better jobs, better social standing, better health, and/or general improvement in life.</td>
<td>MAD TL: Previously, my people did not go to school like now. My age group of people, they may have studied up to ninth, tenth or eleventh year. And before my age, up to fifth grade. My father had no education. RM: Okay. So they’re becoming more educated?…getting more education? Prak ONLY: Yes. But they think, even if I have not studied, my children are supposed to be studying. If they cannot put them in English schools, Madame, they try to put them into Kannada schools—the government school./ OKAY But they feel, my child has to be educated. MAD GL1a 57020-57641)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Fighting, Violence</td>
<td>Fighting, quarreling, violence, revenge, bullying, extortion</td>
<td>KAN TL: In our community there’s a lot alcoholism. There are a lot of drunks./ They’ll eat and drink the whole night and the whole night there’s quarreling. (KAN DGM1 8931-9095) KAN TL: For example, one person will give 1,000 Rupees to another person./ So the lender will be asking, “Give me my money.”/ Those who are rowdies and gang members will be entering there/ and they will make the borrower pay the 1,000 Rupees to that lender/ otherwise they will beat you./ After they make the borrower to pay 1,000 Rupees to the lender, then they will get 100 or 200 Rupees from the lender. (KAN PD3 04923-05302)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Honoring Elders</td>
<td>In their community, a group of elders determines how infractions of communal rules are punished and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP TL: Why they have backslidden about Christ/ [is] because in marriages/ while they’re taking the woman in the community,/ the man has so many rules and regulations that he should follow in the marriage./ Those who give the women/ will not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Hypocrisy in Christian Community</td>
<td>Leaders do not practice what they preach</td>
<td>HP LL4: If there is a pastor in our community, he gets married, but then has, two or three marriages! And then in church, if one fellow doesn’t like the pastor, he’ll go out and so he’ll start another church. These type of things happen./ Before our eyes it’s happening. (HP DGM1 18323-18636)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Idols and Idol Worship</td>
<td>Respect, honor, worship, ritual sacrifices, activities related to idols are a primary concern of the community. Many traditions relate to honoring the gods represented by idols. These activities are rejected or considered as superstitions by most Christians</td>
<td>HP LL1: So if a man wants to get married, his future in-law will not look for property/ nor will they care if he is educated./ They [the potential in-laws] check within his house to see if there is an idol or not./ [They believe] that’s why the couple will be happy. They will only give the woman to the man who has an idol in his house. (HP DGM1 38819-39104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Immorality, Adultery, Unstable Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN LL3: They’ll play together. So, this man will have his other’s wife and this and that. (KAN LL1 12346-12426)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td>Pride in Christian Culture within Group</td>
<td>Christians within their group are living a better life, unite across traditional barriers of caste or tribe, and/or they are free of common fears/superstitions of the predominant group</td>
<td>MAD LL1: So, there are many groups and many different traditions that we have. Like one group use metal plates [in their ceremonies] and another uses bamboo plates [in their ceremonies]. There are many different traditions. But after coming to Christ, they are all one; and this oneness, I like that. (MAD LL1 19376-19656)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Rejection or Persecution</td>
<td>Experience rejection, criticism, physical attacks, being ostracized and/or restricted from communal benefits due to identifying as a Christian</td>
<td>KAN TL: So, the other people also who are like (names two political parties)/ so if they come to know that we are sharing gospel,/ they will create false accusations. So, we never blame their gods./ But they will say, “These people are blaming our gods. They were saying bad things about our gods.”/ And they will beat us and they will put us out./ So, if we speak anything more, they will fine us. They will charge money. (KAN LL1 15756-16279)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1:</td>
<td>Pride in Christian Culture within Group</td>
<td>Christians within their group are living a better life, unite across traditional barriers of caste or tribe, and/or they are free of common fears/superstitions of the predominant group</td>
<td>MAD LL1: So, there are many groups and many different traditions that we have. Like one group use metal plates [in their ceremonies] and another uses bamboo plates [in their ceremonies]. There are many different traditions. But after coming to Christ, they are all one; and this oneness, I like that. (MAD LL1 19372-19656)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Storytelling Valued</td>
<td>Stories are a significant manner of passing on information about the past and informing</td>
<td>HP TL: We use the Bible in our own mother tongue—language—and we share the stories with them./ Sometimes we come to know about family problems/ and their group problems—community problems./ So using that we share with them the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traditions and current practices. An important part of group gatherings.</td>
<td>comforting words, and we use stories. So, while we are ministering, we make sure our traditions and the bible teachings will put together and will share with them. . . . So, previously I used to sit with the elders of our community and I used to hear the stories about origins, and about creation, I used to hear. Before reading the bible, I would [learn from] the grandmas and grandfathers how creation happened, about the origin[s], and about how humans were created, how sin entered. They were all sharing this orally. There was no writing. And by hearing that, I remember those things still now. (HP GL1 01795-02796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Traditions (Not Related to Idol Worship)</td>
<td>Distinctive practices (other than idol worship) that characterize the community.</td>
<td>KAN LL2: When I serve the Lord in our community—when we go and share the gospel—they have their traditional way; their thoughts are in their traditional way. So, what the forefathers were doing and how the forefathers have the tradition, the reasons, and the background there, they're not able to understand. They just say, “Because they were doing [it this way], so we are doing [it this way] also.” So, when we share the gospel and the word of God, they accept it, but they are not coming out of their traditional ways. That’s a challenge. (KAN LL1 06560-07104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Business Profit or Work for Quick Wages (see HP for best examples)</td>
<td>Business Profit or Work for Quick Wages</td>
<td>RM: So why do they, why do they do business even though they get a good education? HP LL4: So they want to see money. RM: Yah. So they make more money in business than education. LL4: So youth people, if we are going to work, you see monthly once, salary. You get monthly once. So we, we have to see money every day. If we do business, we get money. AHH So they go from the business, they earn some 1,000, [or] 300, 100 rupees, they spend that day. (HP DGM1: 21532-21983)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: Culture</td>
<td>Envy and/or Gossip</td>
<td>Envy and/or Gossip</td>
<td>HP DM4: So envy is there. (ongoing discussion) No one will be... if someone is growing, they will make him to fall. (HP DGM1: 22276-22384)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Tell me about your ministry. Tell me more.</td>
<td>Activity: Bible Story Shares</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN TL: So previously we were telling only stories./ But we didn’t bother about local content and local wisdom/ the problem. We didn’t bother about those things./ So then whenever we told the story, they heard and then they left./ But now,/ with [connecting] the problem and the making content/ and [local] sayings,/ that touches their hearts./ So, they learn it nicely and they can share it with others also. (KAN GL1 05865-06254)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Ministry</td>
<td>Activity: Needs Met</td>
<td>Investigates and meets community's felt needs. Often meets some of these needs before sharing the gospel.</td>
<td>See Questions 4, Act: Needs Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Ministry</td>
<td>Activity: Prays</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Prays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Ministry</td>
<td>Activity: Preaches or Teaches</td>
<td>Tells others what the Bible instructs. Admonishes or explains the Bible. Shares the good news about faith in Jesus Christ (the gospel).</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Preaches or Teaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Ministry</td>
<td>Activity: Testifies</td>
<td>Shares his personal experience as a testimony. Explains how Jesus Christ meets needs in his or his community's life. (Note: These needs may be similar</td>
<td>KAN LL3: So I use the both the word, word of God and my testimony to share with them. KAN TL: Testimony. KAN LL3: There are so many other people also healed, so I take their testimony, my testimony, and the word of God I share. (KAN LL1 38261-38477)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>Presents: using Written Material</td>
<td>Mentions using the Bible as a physical book (not from memory) or other written materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 3: Read Bible…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>Presents: using Technology</td>
<td>Used technology such as cell phone, What's App, computer, internet, to communicate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 7b: Presents via Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>Rejection or Persecution</td>
<td>Experience rejection, criticism, physical attacks, being ostracized and/or restricted from communal benefits due to identifying as a Christian benefit due to identifying as a Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 1: Rejection Persecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>Setting: Christian Meeting</td>
<td>Sunday service, cottage prayer, house church, visitation, home meeting, church</td>
<td>KAN DM2: So we now in house, we have small room, and we are meeting there every Sunday morning. So, for three or four families they come and join with us. (KAN DGM1 26117-26262)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>Setting: Other</td>
<td>NOT a Christian meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 8, Setting: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>With Other Culture or Language</td>
<td>Works in a language other than his mother tongue. He is not considered a member of the group.</td>
<td>MAD TL: Okay. So what he [MAD LL1] experienced, he’s saying, “If I go in the name of Jesus, they’ll accept me. If I go telling my caste name and myself, they’ll oppose in that way.” (MAD GL1a 22880-23044)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 Ministry</td>
<td>With Own Culture or Language</td>
<td>Works mostly in his mother tongue. He is considered member of the group</td>
<td>KAN DM1: But now I am living in my own village and I am serving the Lord there./ We have a church building there. And I am working for the Lord there in my own village. (KAN DGM1 18302-18462)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Tell me how you became a Christ-follower/believer</td>
<td>Dedicated Life to Christian Service</td>
<td>A response to a miracle, healing, or an encounter through a dream. The dedication may have been done by the parents if the event took place during the interviewee's childhood.</td>
<td>KAN LL3: So, [after being miraculously healed] in 2001, I believed in Jesus./ So my mother told me, “You do the Lord’s work./ [The] Lord has done so many things for us.” (KAN LL1 38696-38820)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer Experience: Born in a Christian Family</td>
<td>Identifies as a Christian because he was born into a Christian family</td>
<td>HP LL5: My parents, they were Christians before I was born./ From my childhood I used to pray./ I’ve learned about Christ from many years before now. (HP DGM1 31796-31948)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer Experience: Dream, Spiritual Encounter</td>
<td>Identifies as a Christian because he received communication from God via a dream or an inner voice</td>
<td>KAN TL: I was in the bed./ I and my father were in the upstairs, up floor,/ in [the] dream./ So the second coming of Jesus, I am seeing./ So, everything is… outbreaks are happening and everything. Houses are destroyed./ So my father is saying to me, “Vijay you have to do ministry. You have to serve the Lord.”/ So uh I am asking my father, “But okay, I’ll do the ministry, but why are all these things are happening?”/ So he is showing, my father, he’s showing, Jesus is coming that’s why these things are happening./ So I kneel before him and I pray, “Lord, I will serve you.” (KAN GL2 02509-03077)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer Experience: Miracle, Healing, Deliverance</td>
<td>Interviewee or a family member experienced a miracle, being healed, received deliverance from hopelessness or demonic oppression</td>
<td>KAN LL3: So, my sister, she has tuberculosis, and we never visited hospital. We had no medication, medicine to heals. But she fasted 31 days; [the] Lord healed her. (KAN LL1 29966-30120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Became a Believer</strong></td>
<td>Heard Bible story</td>
<td>Someone shared with him or a family member a Bible story</td>
<td>KAN LL1: So, Sunday school, Sunday classes, uh children’s classes/ so I was attending that class./ So [I learned] why Jesus has come./ So, telling stories, telling, singing songs./ Why he has died on the cross./ How he has risen from the dead./ So, six months I attended the church. (KAN LL1 24474-24749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Became a Believer</strong></td>
<td>Heard Prayer</td>
<td>Someone prayed for him or a family member</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Prays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Became a Believer</strong></td>
<td>Heard Preaching or Teaching</td>
<td>Someone shared with him or a family member what the Bible teaches; encouraged him/them to believe in Jesus Christ would help his/their situation; explained the hope of the gospel message; or gave biblical counsel</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Preaches or Teaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Became a Believer</strong></td>
<td>Heard a Testimony</td>
<td>Someone shared their personal experience as a testimony. Explained how Jesus Christ met needs in their life</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Testified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Became a Believer</strong></td>
<td>Read Bible or Christian Material</td>
<td>Influenced to believe in Jesus Christ through reading written materials</td>
<td>KAN DM1: So, he is the true, living God./ So, when we go to church and when I read the Word, then I understood the real God./ So, from that, I understood that he’s the true living God and I left all the idol worship and the tradition types of things. (KAN DGM1 15826-16064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer</td>
<td>Rejection or Persecution</td>
<td>Experienced rejection, criticism, physical attacks, being ostracized and/or restricted from communal benefits due to identifying as a Christian</td>
<td>See Question 1: Rejection Persecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer</td>
<td>Heard via Technology</td>
<td>Heard a recording of the gospel message, portions of the Bible, or Bible stories. Listened to recordings in their mother tongue, or some presentation that required technology</td>
<td>HP LL2: So the word of God was in that CD and we used to uh slowly if we rotated, the word of God was coming out of it. (HP LL1 18205-18316)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 Became a Believer</td>
<td>Observed Changed Life</td>
<td>Noted those who became Christians lived a better quality of life: &gt; peace, &gt; happiness, financial prosperity, freedom from vices, etcetera</td>
<td>HP LL1: They stopped drinking,/ all bad habits,/ they were happy,/ so we observed that./ So there, we in our families, we were quarreling and so much fight. But in their life they have all good type of things./ They weren’t smoking, drinking and alcoholic./ So I was not able to leave all these parents and to accept Jesus./ So then we got enlightened about that and we wanted to accept Christ in our life, Jesus. (HP LL1 17205-17624)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Thinking back a year ago, share an example of how you shared the gospel with others. Please share.</td>
<td>Activity: Bible Story Shared</td>
<td>Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>Asked questions and/or gave evidence of interactive dialog. More than listening.</td>
<td>See Question 7b: Act: Facilitated Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Shared 1 Year Prior</td>
<td>Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KAN TL:** So previously we were telling only stories. (KAN GL1 05865-05908)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Coding</th>
<th>Sub/Child Coding</th>
<th>Theory Coding</th>
<th>Description of Sub Coding</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT preaching and/or teaching!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Shared local</td>
<td>See Question 8: Activity: Local Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared 1 Year</td>
<td>Local Wisdom</td>
<td>wisdom (proverb, song, story)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Meets individual or community's felt needs. Investigates individual or community's needs (May be active in this for some time before sharing the gospel.). Shares how the gospel will meet the need(s) of the individual or community.</td>
<td>HP LL2: So, once I was going on my bike and someone stopped me./ So, I gave a lift to him./ I asked him while going, “Why you have come here.”/ So He told [me], “I have come to (village name).”/ And I asked, “What is your village name?”/ “Call…[name of village]/ a 100 kilometers [away].”/ And I told him, “Oh! You are seeking god! You came so far—100 km./ But God is here not there./ You are coming seeking your god and you are coming here./ And there is one Person who is seeking you!/ And that is Jesus. (HP LL1 32655-33135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared 1 Year</td>
<td>Needs Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Shared his personal experience as a testimony. Explained how Jesus Christ met needs in his life</td>
<td>KAN LL3: So, I use the both the word, word of God and my testimony to share with them. There are so many other people also healed, so I take their testimony, my testimony, and the word of God I share. (KAN LL1 38261-38477)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared 1 Year</td>
<td>Prayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Told others what to do. Admonished or explained the Bible. Shared the good news about faith in Jesus Christ (the gospel).</td>
<td>HP LL5: There are youths who have backslidden,/ “So, the Bible it is written like this, you should not do like this, you should not do like this,” I have encouraged them./ “We have to be a witness and we should be a light and a good testimony.” (HP DGM1 42714-42959)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared 1 Year</td>
<td>Preached or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Shared his personal experience as a testimony. Explained how Jesus Christ met needs in his life</td>
<td>KAN LL3: So, I use the both the word, word of God and my testimony to share with them. There are so many other people also healed, so I take their testimony, my testimony, and the word of God I share. (KAN LL1 38261-38477)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared 1 Year</td>
<td>Testified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Shared 1 Year Prior</td>
<td>Presented: using Written Material</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentioned using the Bible as a physical book, a tract, or any other written material</td>
<td>See Question 3: Reads Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Shared 1 Year Prior</td>
<td>Presented: using Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used technology such as cell phone, What's App, computer, internet, to communicate.</td>
<td>See Question 7b: Presents via Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Shared 1 Year Prior</td>
<td>Setting: Christian Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday service, cottage prayer, house church, visitation, home meeting, church</td>
<td>See Question 2: Christian Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 Shared 1 Year Prior</td>
<td>Setting: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT a Christian meeting</td>
<td>See Question 8, Setting: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5 Did you attend the 2018 training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6a What do you like about the (Spoken) method?</td>
<td>Benefits the Uneducated</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAD DM1: So it help them that when we, when we make them aware of these things, they will live a good standard of life. So the upper caste people, they are already educated. So, if we educate them, and they come to the knowledge [of the Lord], then they can have their life changed. DM1: So there are people that will not take bath every day. They will not take bath. So no good clothing, they’ll not wear good clothing./ So when we share using the stories like this so they’ll also get the idea that we should have a good life—good clothing, good hygiene—they’ll also do that. (MAD DGM1 29541-30258)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6a</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>LL or DM learns new insights. LL enjoys or benefits from the content creation process or sharing with their DMs. DM enjoys or benefits from hearing the content and/or discussing it together.</td>
<td>MAD TL: But while discussing, everybody is speaking. Everybody shares their own opinion. Whatever they understood, they share. So when we preach, people simply hear. But when we discuss, all will speak and they will share their opinions and [what] everything is. TL: And um some hidden things also, what we didn’t know. Then [when they share], we know it. RM: I love that part about storytelling and discussion. TL: Yah, we never heard those truths, but someone will be telling those truths. (MAD LL1 15014-15575)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6a</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Leader or DM learns new insights. LL enjoys or benefits from the content creation process or sharing with their DMs. DM enjoys or benefits from hearing the content and/or discussing it together.</td>
<td>HP LL2: The local wisdom UHHUH and the Bible story, when it is linked together, it is very nice. Super nice! RM: What makes it… LL2: So using that, and saying to the people, they like. Now generation, if we see only telling about Jesus name, Jesus name, they will not believe. So that’s why we are linking wisdom, with local wisdom. (HP LL1 34029-34361)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6a</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Mentions that the audience they shared the content with responded positively. This is often with unbelievers but may include positive responses from believers also.</td>
<td>HP TL: And so some have called me and say, “It is very good. If you have some more, please share with me.” (HP DGM1 46971-47155)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Younger generation is less knowledgeable in mother tongue. Unfamiliarity.</td>
<td>MAD TL: So searching for a local wisdom is… I’ve had some difficulties with this. (MAD LL1 15818-892)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 6a**

*Like*

**Like**

**Linking Bible Story**

*Problem is Helpful*

**Mention that the audience they shared the content with responded positively.**

This is often with unbelievers but may include positive responses from believers also.

**HP TL:** And so some have called me and say, “It is very good. If you have some more, please share with me.” (HP DGM1 46971-47155)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Coding</th>
<th>Sub/Child Coding</th>
<th>Theory Coding</th>
<th>Description of Sub Coding</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>like?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAD DM1: So when we speak with our people, we use our language. And with others, we use their language./ So if we use our own tongue, then the upper caste people will not accept us. And they’ll not come to our [meeting], they’ll not invite us. (MAD DGM! 32041-32272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td>Complications</td>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Rejection,</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 1: Rejection Persecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>rejection,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Response of</td>
<td>mocking or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>verbal abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN TL: So we need a device that which will work with good recordings. So the timings, availability of the people./ Usually timing is not exactly how we prepare./ So adjusting time is a problem (KAN GL1 09678-09802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>meeting, no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Technical:</td>
<td>Content on</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN TL: If we do the chip, there’s a problem./ And carrying them here./ so they will hear two or three time/ after that they will delete the chip/ Then they’ll use it for their own use. (RM: So, the chip is to go in their cell phone?) Yes. But when we use the chip, there’s a problem. They will hear two or three times and after that they will delete the content and they’ll use it for their own use. (KAN PD2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td>Device</td>
<td>is deleted or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6b</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>repurposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Like?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Content played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on phone cannot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be heard. Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>everyone has a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cell phone to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hear content on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chip. High cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to buy dedicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audio players.</td>
<td>07567-07744)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6b Not Like?</strong></td>
<td>Technical: Recording Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noise, interruptions, multiple takes needed to get good copy.</td>
<td>KAN TL: So, recording, doing the recording is problematic. So, Sagar’s house is like a hut, The roof and walls are made with sheet [metal] and coconut leaves. We can hear a lot of sound coming from outside, like children in the street; there is so much noise. (KAN LL1 54731-54920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6b Not Like?</strong></td>
<td>Difficulty Facilitating Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion dynamic is difficult. People talk too much, respond negatively or quarrel, all talk at once, do not listen, etcetera. Or people are very reluctant to respond, are concerned of losing face, overly concerned about what other think, lack self-confidence.</td>
<td>HP TL: So making them to be spiritual, to grow in a spiritual way, that’s a challenging thing. We gather good stories and we share with them. So [when] hearing the stories they will not take them to heart. They make fun of them, but this is a very serious thing, to make them aware of this. That’s a challenge. (HP GL2 03876-04203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6b Not Like?</strong></td>
<td>Limited Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to address problems beyond the scope of this process, for example: health, community development, human trafficking. (This is addressed in Spoken's second training.)</td>
<td>MAD TL: . . . we made content, and he [LL1] had some problems. And we shared with you the problem. But they [their people] have many others things also. He [LL1] is asking, “Can we share everything [other things] also?” (MAD LL1: 16054-16210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>Activity: Bible Story Shared</td>
<td>Sought or discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 2: Bible Story Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td>Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>Activity: Local Wisdom</td>
<td>Sought, discussed, linked to a problem. Usually a proverb, song, or story in the mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 8: Activity: Local Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td>Activity: Need Identified/Dis cussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>Activity: Preached or Taught</td>
<td>Told others what to do. Admonished or explained the Bible. Shared the good news about faith in Jesus Christ (the gospel).</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Preaches or Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td>Activity: Recorded, Copied Content</td>
<td>Used technology such as cell phone, What's App, computer, internet, to recorded and/or duplicate created content for dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN TL: First, they do the recording. Previously were just using a laptop and using the microphone for recording. Audacity, that is software that we use to edit noise. So, we used to put [the content] in micro-card, chip, SD card. So, I also have given them SD cards. I'll give Bluetooth recorder to SA. And we use pen drives also. And recording is also done in pen drive. (KAN GL1 03314-03800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>Sunday service, cottage prayer, house church, visitation, home meeting, church</td>
<td>See Question 2: Christian Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td>Christian Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>NOT a Christian meeting</td>
<td>See Question 8, Setting: Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7a</td>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
<td>KAN TL: Monthly, four stories we do. So that's why we gather, monthly always. (KAN GL1 02387-02456)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Asked questions and/or gave evidence of interactive dialog. More than listening. NOT preaching and/or teaching!</td>
<td>See Question 2: Bible Story Shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about</td>
<td>Bible Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when you last</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met and listened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>KAN DM2: [After the story,] yes, LL2 did ask questions. RM: What kind of questions? KAN DM2: What do you understand?/ How will you share this?/ He said, “You not only have to share verbally, but you must experience it, and then, convincingly you will share./ That is good.” (KAN DGM1 49806-50063)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Facilitated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMs</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Shared local wisdom (proverb, song, story)</td>
<td>See Question 8: Activity: Local Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Local Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>DMs reviewed story (or content) many times so they could share by memory later.</td>
<td>KAN DM2: (So how many times did you listen to the story [content]? Oh, four to five times./ And sometimes I memorize and remember. KAN DGM1 48357-48505)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Memorized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Met or discussed individual's or the community's felt needs. Shares the content to meet the need of the individual or community.</td>
<td>See Questions 4, Act: Needs Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMs</td>
<td>Discussed or Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learns via the content how the biblical and local wisdom may meet their needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Told others what to do. Admonished or explained the Bible. Shared the good news about faith in Jesus Christ (the gospel).</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Prays See Question 4, Act: Preaches or Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Preached or Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presented:</td>
<td>DM heard LL present from memory. Team Leader said he delivered content from memory</td>
<td>KAN DM2: (After you listen to the story [content] several times, then what do you do?) So, I share with the believers. I call the village people and I go and spend time sitting or drinking tea; that’s when I share with them. (KAN DGM1 48510-48784)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Presented:</td>
<td>Mentioned using the Bible book, a tract, or any other written material.</td>
<td>See Question 3: Reads Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>using Written Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presented:</td>
<td>LL used or DM listened to content via technology such as cell phone, WhatsApp, computer, internet.</td>
<td>(How are you listening to it [the content]? By a recording with a small speaker. First, we three or four people will be hearing that, and if we go outside with other people, more will be hearing it. (KAN DGM1 NG 40227-40666)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>Sunday service, cottage prayer, house church, visitation, home meeting, church</td>
<td>See Question 2: Christian Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td>Christian meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>NOT a Christian meeting</td>
<td>See Question 8, Setting: Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7b</td>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 7a, When</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared with DMs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Activity: Bible Story Shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 2: Bible Story Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>Asked questions and/or gave evidence of interactive dialog. More than listening. NOT preaching and/or teaching!</td>
<td>See Question 7b, Activity: Facilitated Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Local Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared local wisdom (proverb, song, story)</td>
<td>KAN TL: If there is no Christian believers, this story method we are using then. We say proverbs [or] sayings. They think, “This is ours! This is our proverbs!” They think like that when we say that local wisdom. Then we seek for the problems—the trouble they have, the problems they have. In that problem, [we find] what is the bible story. We explain that story. So in that [story] time, they will get easy understand. (KAN PD1 21007-21448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Needs Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets individual's or community's felt needs. Investigates individual or community's needs (May be active in this for some time before sharing the gospel.). Shares how the gospel (via content) may meet the need(s) of the individual or community.</td>
<td>See Questions 4, Act: Needs Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Prayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Prays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Preached or Taught</td>
<td>Told others what to do. Admonished or explained the Bible. Shared the good news about faith in Jesus Christ (the gospel).</td>
<td>See Question 4, Act: Preaches or Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Activity: Testified</td>
<td>Shared his personal experience as a testimony. Explained how Jesus Christ met needs in his life.</td>
<td>See Question 2, Activity: Testifies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Presented: by Memory</td>
<td>Mentioned presenting content from memory</td>
<td>See Questions 7b, Presents by Memory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Presented: using Written Material</td>
<td>Mentioned using the Bible book, a tract, or any other written material.</td>
<td>See Question 3: Reads Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Presented: using Technology</td>
<td>Used technology such as a cell phone, WhatsApp, computer, internet, to communicate</td>
<td>See Question 7b: Presents: via Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Setting: Christian Meeting</td>
<td>Sunday service, cottage prayer, house church, visitation, home meeting, church</td>
<td>See Question 2: Christian Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8 Shared Post</td>
<td>Setting: Other</td>
<td>NOT a Christian meeting</td>
<td>MAD DM1: So I share this in the villages; wherever I go, I share this story. (MAD DGM1 26461-26544)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Coding</td>
<td>Sub/Child Coding</td>
<td>Theory Coding</td>
<td>Description of Sub Coding</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A question to ascertain if they observed changes related to creating, or listening to, or sharing the (Spoken) content.</td>
<td>Most answers were coded with Question 8 or 6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: Answers coded by how they related to the previous questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Communication Modes</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 172</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Respect</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 172</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interacting With Known Individuals</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p 173</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>See Table 4.5 on p. 173</td>
<td>S3e Table 4.5 on p. 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

Transcribed Content Interpreted November 2nd 2019
Translated Content Interpreted November 2nd 2019 and Comments

On November 2nd, 2019, the three Team Leaders (TLs) and the three researchers listened to content created by each Local Leader Team (LLT) via an audio recording on the TL’s cell phone. The content was in the mother tongue (MT). The Madiga and Vaagri Booli recordings were translated by the TL into Kannada. The TL’s words (as interpreted by Raj) are between quote marks. To save time most of the stories were explained via summary rather than a word-for-word retelling of the story so only the Bible story source is listed here. But we could infer from the audio recording whether it was the normal story length or a summary by the time it took to listen to the passage. We could also tell whether it was read or retold naturally and with expression. Sometimes the proverb had to be explained in detail to understand the connection. Together we evaluated how well the content connected (Problem+Prover+BibleStory). Most groups added a moral or application after the Bible story. The highlights of our commentary and evaluation follow each selection.

Kannada Content Sample #1

- Problem: “Not Having Mercy (Lack of Compassion)”
- Local Wisdom: “Put a burning rod on your wound” (Explanation: This comes from the custom of intentionally hurting (an ox) to make them fear you. Rather than responding to one who is hurting, you add to their suffering.)
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
- Bible Wisdom: The Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-37)
- Moral or Application: “So what we can learn from this story/ like the priest and the Levi, we should not avoid helping others. Like the good Samaritan, we should help them./ We should show compassion.”

Kannada Content #1 Evaluation Summary

- There was a mix of modern contextualization (hospital) and Bible jargon (Samaritan, Levite). We discussed becoming aware of Bible jargon. We discussed the importance of facilitating discussion so a multiple of applications can be considered and how adding a moral discourages creative thinking.
- The topic and story aligned well. The local wisdom was fairly close.

Kannada Content Sample #2

- Problem: “Laziness”
- Local Saying: “Its market day, but now he’s stitching his clothes.”
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
Moral or Application: “What we have learned from this story, we should not be lazy. So as he was punished, so we will also be punished if we are lazy.”

Kannada Content #2 Evaluation Summary

- Story was told with good expression; it was not read. There was another mix of contextualization. The storyteller had one man “bury his talent in the mud.” The visual is good context but once again, the use of the word “talent” rather than translating the amount into Indian Rupees (or a number of days’ wages) injects confusing Bible jargon. Discussed the thinking through their target audience and reviewing appropriate terms and vocabulary. Reiterated the point that adding a moral at the end dilutes impact. Reviewed basic questions to increase listener participation. Participation can build critical thinking and help the listeners learn directly from the story and the Holy Spirit even without attending Bible school.
- Problem, local wisdom and story align well.

Kannada Content Sample #3

- Problem: Lack of Faith / Unbelief
- Local Wisdom: “The rice should not run out and the guest should not be offended.” (Explanation: I want to have my cake and eat it too)
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
- Bible Wisdom: Jesus and Peter Walk on the Water (Mat 14:22-33; Mar 6:45-52)
- Moral or Application: “Like Peter, we should not doubt. If we doubt, anything [bad] can happen to us. We should not doubt.”

Kannada Content #3 Evaluation Summary

- Good audio quality. The story was told with expression. There were accuracy problems with the Bible story. Discussed the importance of mentoring (versus just meeting to create content as fast as possible). When they meet, they should take time and allow the leaders to “wrestle” with the Word—to figure out for themselves what it says and be willing to challenge one another’s insights. Congratulated the leader on how well the sections of content connected and for his example of facilitating discussion with his leaders.
- The problem fits well with the story. We did not see how the Local Wisdom aligned in this example, but we did not want to end on a negative note. Perhaps the proverb needed more explanation, or it was a bad fit.

Madiga Content Sample #1

- Problem: “Revenge, Envy”
- Local Wisdom: “If you get your hands dirty, you will get a mouthful of curd.”
  (Explanation: If you work hard, you will get good things.)
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
- Bible Wisdom: Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)
- Moral or Application: “Who was the person who was rejected? [The Samaritan] They say they [the ones who are rejected or ostracized by society] are not helping us, but that [rejected person] was the person who helped the beaten man!”

Madiga Content #1 Evaluation Summary (H4)

- Good tone and expression in the storytelling. Good contextualization.
- Poor alignment. TL commented, “The man who was beaten by the thieves, he had done something good previously, so he is getting a good thing.” And “Your good has saved you.” These are cultural beliefs that have nothing to do with the story! As a result, the TL changed topic to hatred, but this was still not a good fit. (RM comment: Disappointing to see the PD approved this content.)

Madiga Content Sample #2 (H3)

- Problem: “Idol Worship”
- Local Wisdom: “When people are afraid, they search for god.” (Explanation: They begin to search for god because they believe good things come from god).
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: “When Israel people came out of the mountain and they were seeking, okay nobody god [the invisible god] has saved us. Okay, let us go and make one idol and they planned to make an idol. They all together thought of making their own gods for their problem…”
- Bible Wisdom: Aaron and the People Make an Idol (Exodus 32)
- Moral or Application: When we get problems, we should not make an idol and worship another god. We should believe in one God; the true Almighty God is the only God. It is better to worship the living God than worshipping an idol.

Madiga Content #2 Evaluation Summary

- Good expression. The story is an entire chapter so summarizing was wise but the story was probably paired down too far. Also, accuracy suffered. They added dialog that Moses did not say. The Madiga TL responded, “I kept to the main thoughts about idol worship.” We talked about accuracy—not adding our thoughts and nor omitting important elements. Talked about the difficulty this group has finding Local Wisdom and informed them that they can use local stories in place of Local Wisdom.
- Good alignment of problem, Local Wisdom and Bible Wisdom.
Madiga Content Sample #3

- Problem: “Alcoholism, Bad Drinking Habits, Drunkenness”
- Local Wisdom: “Tying the stick to the dog’s tail will not make it straight.”
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: “What is a drunkard? If he drinks all his life, what is he going to face? Problems! We are going to face problems [if we drink]. In this story we are looking at that.”
- Bible Wisdom: Lot escapes but is debased by daughters when he becomes drunk (Genesis 19:23-38)
- Moral or Application: “We need to avoid drinking.” And “We learn from this, that if we don’t want to fall in sin, we don’t drink.”

Madiga Content #3 Evaluation Summary

- The story was presented in third person. We talked about the power of story dialogue. Important elements were dropped from the story; it did not make sense and it was inaccurate. (It is possible the TL was summarizing more than the actual recording. We will ask for a transliteration to check this). The preaching/moral at the end appeared to be longer than the story. We discussed how questions can have a more powerful impact than teaching/preaching/providing story explanations.
- Topic and story align but the wisdom does not.

Hakkipikki Content Sample #1

- Problem: “Lack of Understanding” or “Lack of Vision”
- Local Wisdom: (Placed at the end!)
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
- Local Wisdom: “So you should have wisdom or you should have debt.”
- Moral or Application: None

Hakkipikki Content #1 Evaluation Summary (H4)

- The story was acted, not read. Great expression. Good story accuracy. Did not finish with a moral or lesson.
- Problem, wisdom and Bible story align well. (Oddly, this content was paired differently on the PD’s report sent by email six weeks earlier.) No moral or application. (Yay!)
Hakkipikki Content Sample #2

*(Technical problems with second audio recording. Could not evaluate.)*

Hakkipikki Content Sample #3 (H3)

- Problem: “Not showing kindness, a Lack of Mercy”
- Local Wisdom: “If you serve your master, you will get good things from him.”
- Introduction or Pre-story Comments: None
- Bible Wisdom: Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30-37)
- Moral or Application: “If you do the master’s service, you’ll get good food.”

Hakkipikki Content #3 Evaluation Summary

- Very accurate story and good expression. (May have been read, but if so, it was done well.) We had difficulty seeing how the proverb aligned with the problem and story though. As soon as we questioned this, the TL began suggesting other proverbs. (We had the impression that the TL began giving us proverb options to choose from. We hoped he would start thinking critically about what would fit better, but he seemed to be guessing. An example of one of the TL’s alternates was Jesus’ words, “As you have done to the least you have done to me. Enter into my rest.” (Matthew 25:40 and Matthew 11:28). (Content was about four minutes long. This should be an easy length to remember without needing technology—just some focused review.
- Good problem and Bible story alignment. Local Wisdom was not a good fit. No moral or application. (Yay!)
APPENDIX N

Translated Content Received October 4th 2022
Problem: Lust for money
Local Wisdom: Too much desire spoils the peace
Bible Wisdom: Jesus Betrayed for Money (Mathew 26:14-16)

Beloved, let us tell a story through a proverb. See, too much desire spoils the peace. Yes, it is not wrong if we have desire, but we should not have too much desire. Desire is the natural tendency of this age. But if there is too much desire, men lose their peace.

There was a man in a town whose name was Judas Iscariot. He was a disciple of Jesus. He was with Jesus wherever he went. After seeing the teaching of Jesus, the power of Jesus, the miracles that Jesus was doing, he became a close disciple of Jesus. One day, because he was so greedy for money, he asked Jesus' enemies to give him money and he betrayed Jesus to those enemies. Then, he had no peace and went and hanged himself.
Kannada to English Transliteration

Problem: of money above desire

World wisdom: over desire pace got worse

Bible wisdom: Jude for money Jesus caught given. (Mathew 26:14-16)

Beloved we are one proverb by story lets see see more

Desire pace got worse yes to us desire if It doesn't matter

Desire Born of passion desire for man natural tendency but

Over desire if come man peace loses

One in town one man was his name Iscariot

Jude he of Jesus disciple he Jesus is where

Went along with was there Jesus was saying teaching

Of Jesus power, Jesus was doing miracle all see of Jesus
Dearest Became a disciple to this while there one day to him on the money

After peace without hanging surrendered.

Kannada Content #2

Kannada Script

Dearest Became a disciple to this while there one day to him on the money
**English Translation**

Problem: Craving for property  
Local Wisdom (World Knowledge): Money is Everything  
Bible Wisdom: The Lost Son (Luke 15:11-31)

Beloved, let's see a story through the proverb: Money is Everything. Yes, this is a good proverb for the present time, because we mean that money and property are more important than anything else in this world. People don't give dignity to human beings unless they have wealth and status at work. My beloved, let's see what happened to a young man who wanted property and no work.

There was a man in a town who had two sons. One day early in the morning the young son comes to his father and torments him saying that he wants the inheritance due to him—he says, “Give me my share.” So, the father distributes his property between his two sons. Then the son sells all his possessions, takes the money, and goes to another country to join his friends and become a reprobate (badmash). He spends all his money on alcohol and adulterers. When he is there [in the country far away], he spends all his money. All his friends leave him. In the end, he hasn't anything to eat and is forced to eat pig fodder. No one comes to his aid at that time. He misses his father and returns home. He goes to his father and apologizes. No matter about all the wrong he has done, the father forgives him.

See, that boy thought money was everything, but when the money and possessions were gone, he had a great need. We should also not think that money and possessions are more important than anything else. Money is not everything, Be respectful to elders.

**Kannada to English Transliteration**

ಸಮ್ಯ್:  ಆತ್:  ಅಂದಿನ  ಮನೆ  
Problem: Property above infatuation

ಇಂದುಂಡಿಕೆ:  ಮೆನೆ  ಎಲ್ಲಾದೇಶ  
World Knowledge: Money Everything

ಸತಯ್:  ತಪ್:  ಕುರ (ಲೂಕ ೧೫:೧೧-೩೧)  
Bible Knowledge: missout gone Son (Luke 15:11-31)

Beloved we are One Proverb by the story Let's see see

Money Everything Yes present Season This is good

Proverb Because This in the world Above all Money
And Property itself important That is Need. For money And

Property Give honour For humans Don't give

See Beloved There is bring money Property desire rank

One Younger pace what happened That is The story is

By Let's see

One Village one There was a man to him two children

Were. One day morning small son father near

Come father to me property want my part to me

Give That is torments. Therefore That

Father share gives. That boy all property

Sale money by taking different to the country go with friends

get together He becomes weak. For addicts to drink all money

Spending does. To this While there Money his

Nearby empty will happen. Friends him left
will go. Finally to him eat what without
of the pig fodder to eat Advances. That during
to him who to help did not come. to him his
Father remember cried home Will return. father's
Go to an apology He asks. He is whatever Injustice
had done father forgives
See That the boy money All That is know
Money and Property finished above to him the flow will come
We also Above all money and Property More
That is Don't know. Money Everything Shouldn't happen
For elders respect from should walk

Kannada Content #3

Kannada Script

ಸಮಯ್: ಕೃತಜಾತಿಯ ಇಲಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುದು.
ಹಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಮುಂಗಾತ್ತು.
ಆಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ತುಂಡು ಮಿದುರುಗುತ್ತದ್ದು.
ತಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಆ ಹುಡುಗನುದು ಎಂದು ಇದುರುತ್ತದ್ದು.
ತಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಎಂಟ್ೕಅಯ್ಯ Go to an apology He asks. He is whatever Injustice
father had done father forgives
See That the boy money All That is know
Money and Property finished above to him the flow will come
We also Above all money and Property More
That is Don't know. Money Everything Shouldn't happen
For elders respect from should walk

Kannada Content #3

Kannada Script

ಸಮಯ್: ಕೃತಜಾತಿಯ ಇಲಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುದು.
ಹಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಮುಂಗಾತ್ತು.
ಆಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ತುಂಡು ಮಿದುರುಗುತ್ತದ್ದು.
ತಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಆ ಹುಡುಗನುದು ಎಂದು ಇದುರುತ್ತದ್ದು.
ತಂಯತನುನ್ನು ಎಂಟ್ೕಅಯ್ಯ Go to an apology He asks. He is whatever Injustice
father had done father forgives
See That the boy money All That is know
Money and Property finished above to him the flow will come
We also Above all money and Property More
That is Don't know. Money Everything Shouldn't happen
For elders respect from should walk

Kannada Content #3

Kannada Script
ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಎದುರು 10 ಜನ ದೊರೆಯುವುದು ಏಳು ಹಳೆಯಿರುವ ವರ್ಷಗಳು, ದೊಡ್ಡಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಂಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಬಾಲ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅನ್ಯ ದೊಡ್ಡಾರದಲ್ಲಿ. 

ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಎದುರು 10 ಜನ ದೊರೆಯುವುದು ಏಳು ಹಳೆಯಿರುವ ವರ್ಷಗಳು, ದೊಡ್ಡಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಂಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಬಾಲ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅನ್ಯ ದೊಡ್ಡಾರದಲ್ಲಿ.
English Translation

Problem: Gratitude or Ingratitude?
Local Wisdom: He took everything and he left is village.
Bible Wisdom: Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11-19)

Beloved, look, when you need help in this world, you put your foot down, you put your foot on everything you get. Yes Beloved, if we ask for everything we need, then we will keep away from ourselves without thinking of favors.

In a certain town, ten lepers came and shouted to Jesus from a distance, “Lord, have mercy on us.” Jesus looked at them and had compassion. He said, “Go and show your body to priest.” They left and were healed as they went. But one of them returned praising God. He came to Jesus and fell at Jesus’ feet with thanksgiving and praise. Jesus asked, “Where are the other nine who had not come.” He said to the leper, “It is your faith that has healed you.” We, too, should be grateful to whoever helps us.

Kannada to English Transliteration

Problem: Gratitude Without there is

Beloved see This in the world help when needed a foot put

All

Got above crest put. Yes Beloved All that was needed

Take after a favor without remembering ourselves distance put They are

Forget. To this one in Village 10 People leprosy Patients of Jesus close to
Come, To Jesus Lord our above please That is shout out says
Jesus them see take pity you to the priests body show up
That is says. They are on the way On the go heal have
But In it one only God Praise of Jesus near come
With gratitude of Jesus to the foot fall down a favor praise does.
Other 9 people where They are did not come That is Jesus
Ask. That leprosy to the patient your Belief you heal made
That is tell me sends For that beloved to us who help
Did we are to them Be grateful should be.
Problem: Idol worship
Local wisdom: Like pouring water on a stone
Bible wisdom: The Golden Calf (Exodus 32)

Yes, people, no matter how much water you pour on a stone, it is wasted, it does not speak.

In this story, the people left the true God made a golden calf. Moses goes up to the mountain to speak with God and many days pass. The people say, “We need a god. We don't know where Moses has gone.” Aaron, Moses brother, is afraid of them so he makes a golden calf and everyone worships it. Then, Moses comes down the hill and scolds them in anger. He tells them, "If you want to be true to God, come to me!" Some come, but many don't [come]. And whoever doesn’t come close to Moses, God kills them with fire.

That's why my dear people I am saying that you should know who the real God is and worship him. Otherwise, the true God will get angry and (one day) he will kill (whoever doesn’t worship) him.
Kannada to English Transliteration

Problem: Idol worship would do

Local wisdom: Stone above water poured

Bible wisdom: Golden calf worship

Yes peoples stone above how much water poured

Waste that is not speak

Like that this story real God suppurred

People Golden calf they made one day

Moses with God to speak hill above will go

Want mosses where he went to us don’t know

That with Aaron will say but Aaron to them
Fear                 one                Golden                   Calf                         do                       gives

All                to that                 worship                 will do                       then              Moses

From hill       get off       came with anger them scolding

Rael            God           if you want on direction come telling

However some came still some did not come

Then           God whoever Moses with didn’t come them

That’s why peoples saying real God who that

Knowing worship should be done if not to God anger came

Killed.
Problem: Bad Character
Local wisdom: In anger, they cut their nose.
Bible wisdom: Cain Murders Abel. (Genesis 4:1-15)

Yes people, even if we cut our nose in anger, it doesn't grow back when we cool down. No matter how hard you try, you can't get a nose back. That is why I am telling you to be patient.

[This story is about] Two brothers who both gave a gift to God. One gave a bad gift and the other gave a good gift. God accepted the one who gave the good gift. But he who gave a bad gift, God rebuked him. Cain was the name of the one who gave the bad gift to God. Abel [his younger brother] was the one who gave Good gift to God. Cain became angry with Abel and he murdered him. God heard this matter. He cursed Cain and sent him out of his presence.

That’s why I am telling should not do anything with anger. And don't kill anyone. If you kill like Cain did, you will carry a curse and go to Hell.
Kannada to English Transliterated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kannada</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ</td>
<td>Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ಪರ್ಜೀಶಂಜೆ</td>
<td>Universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ಬುದ್</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ಬುದ್</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ಬುದ್</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ಬುದ್</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local wisdom: in anger cut nose

Bible wisdom: cain abel killed

Yes peoples in anger cuts nose peace

After that not came you how much thinking

Nose again did not come so telling

Peacefully should be that.

Here if you see to God two gift will give

One man bad gift gave another one

Good did give then God good praises

Bad one scolds Bad gift given name
Cain jealousy fall down his brother however

Abel killed this information God knows

Cain above curse given from there send him out

That’s why telling in anger nothing

Don’t do don’t kill if you kill cain like

The curse carrying to hell have to go
Problem: Cheating

Local wisdom: Believe and they cut your throat

Bible wisdom: The Snake Cheats Adam and Eve. (Genesis 3, parts)

Yes, people, if we trust [some people] too much, they will cheat us; they will kill us.

Here [in this story], God tells the woman and man to eat all the fruits in the garden, but they must not eat the fruit from one tree. Then, when God is gone, Satan comes and deceives all them by saying magic [deceptive] words and making [tricking] them to eat the fruit. Both the woman and the man eat that [forbidden] fruit. After they eat, then they understand they had committed a sin. Then God comes and casts them out [of the garden] and curses them.

This is why we should not deceive anyone or be deceived
Bible wisdom snake done cheating

Yes peoples we are some one heavy believe

Its enough finally they our throat cuts

That is they will killed.

Here God a woman man says all fruits

Eat but that one tree fruit shoul not eat

Then God after gone satan came them

Cheated magic words said them that fruit eat

Will do same that woman then man two eaten

After eating they sin did that is sense

Will happen then God came them kick out

Curse will give

Thats why we are whom cheat don’t do it

We are cheat should not go more be careful

Should be is
English Translation
Problem: Infatuation {for money or} property above all else
World Knowledge: Money is Everything
Bible Knowledge: The Lost Son (Luke 15:11:31)
Beloved, let's see a story through a proverb, “money is everything.” Yes, this is a good proverb for the present time, because we mean is that money and property are more important than anything else in this world. [And we] Don't give dignity to human beings [only their] wealth and status to work. My beloved, let's see what happened to a young man who wanted property for a job.

There was a man in a town who had two sons. One day early in the morning the young son comes to his father and torments him saying that he wants property, give me my share. So, the father distributes. The boy sells all his possessions, takes the money and goes to another country to join his friends and become a bad mash. He spends all his money on alcohol and Adulterers. When he is there, he lost his money. Friends leave him. In the end, he is forced to eat pig fodder without anything to eat. No one came to his aid at that time. He misses his father and returns home. He goes to his father and apologizes. No matter how wrong he has done, the father forgives him.

See, that boy thought that money was everything. When the money and possessions were gone, he will have a lack [a lack, become needy]. We should also realize that money and possessions are not more important than anything else. Money is not everything, [We should] Be respectful to elders.
Money property desire one younger pace what

Happen that is the story lets see

One boy village one there was a man to him

Two children were one day morning small son

Father near came to me property want my part to me

Give that’s is therefore that father

Share gives to me boy all property sale

Money by taking different to the country go get together

He becomes weak for addicts to drink all money

Spending does to this while there money his nearby empty

Will happen friends him left will go

Finally to him what without of the pig during

Fadder to eat advances thet to him who to help did

Not come to him his father remember cried home
will return father to an apology he ask he is

Whatever injustice had done father forgives

See that the boy money all that’s money

And property finished above to him the flow

Will we also above all money and property more thats

Don’t know money everything should not for elders