Sabda: Jurnal Teologi Kristen
http://jurnalsttn.ac.id/index.php/SJT
p-ISSN 2722-3078, e-ISSN 2722-306X
Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Nusantara, Salatiga
Edisi: Volume 7, Nomor 2, November 2026

Mutuality In Interchurch Mission Partnership: Gereja Isa Almasih And Presbyterian Church Of Korea

Goenawan Susanto Hadianto[1]*, Kim Young Dong[2]
Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Abdiel Ungaran & Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary, Seoul, South Korea
Email correspondenci: gunawan64@gmail.com

Article History

Submit:
2026-04-15

Accept:
2026-10-06

Published:
2026-11-02

Abstract

Global mission partnerships continue to face challenges related to power imbalance, paternalism, dependency, and unequal distribution of resources. Although these issues have been widely discussed, less attention has been given to how mutuality develops through concrete interchurch partnerships, particularly within South–South relationships among Asian churches. This study examined how mutuality developed in the mission partnership between Gereja Isa Almasih (GIA) and the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK). Using a qualitative case study design, the study analyzed synod documents and field observations from Abdiel Theological Seminary in Indonesia and Kimhae, South Korea. The findings indicate that the partnership developed from an initially asymmetric sender–receiver relationship toward more reciprocal and complementary participation. This development was expressed through respect for local leadership, complementary resource sharing, reciprocal missionary participation, cross-cultural exchange, and joint mission engagement, including GIA's later role as a sending church to Korea. The study demonstrates that mutuality can develop within an initially asymmetric South–South interchurch partnership without requiring the elimination of differences in resources and roles. It thus contributes to missiological understandings of mutuality as a dynamic process through which differentiated roles become reciprocal and complementary participation in God's mission.

Keywords: Mission Partnership; Mutuality; Interchurch Cooperation

Abstrak:

Kemitraan misi global terus menghadapi tantangan yang berkaitan dengan ketimpangan kekuasaan, paternalisme, ketergantungan, dan ketidaksetaraan dalam distribusi sumber daya. Meskipun berbagai persoalan tersebut telah banyak dibahas, masih terbatas perhatian ditujukan kepada bagaimana mutualitas berkembang melalui kemitraan konkret antargereja, khususnya dalam hubungan antar-gereja di Asia. Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana mutualitas berkembang dalam kemitraan misi antara Gereja Isa Almasih (GIA) dan Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK). Dengan menggunakan desain studi kasus kualitatif, penelitian ini menganalisis dokumen sinode dan observasi lapangan di *Abdiel Theological Seminary*, Indonesia, serta Kimhae, Korea Selatan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kemitraan tersebut berkembang dari hubungan awal yang *asimetris* antara pengirim dan penerima menuju partisipasi yang lebih timbal balik dan komplementer. Perkembangan ini terlihat dalam penghargaan terhadap kepemimpinan lokal, pembagian sumber daya secara komplementer, partisipasi misioner yang timbal balik, pertukaran lintas budaya, dan keterlibatan dalam misi bersama, termasuk peran GIA yang kemudian menjadi gereja pengutus ke Korea. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa mutualitas dapat berkembang dalam kemitraan antargereja yang pada awalnya bersifat asimetris tanpa harus menghilangkan perbedaan sumber daya dan peran. Penelitian ini berkontribusi pada pemahaman misiologis tentang

mutualitas sebagai proses dinamis yang mentransformasikan peran-peran yang berbeda menjadi partisipasi yang timbal balik dan komplementer dalam misi Allah.

Kata kunci: Kemitraan Misi; Mutualitas; Kerja Sama Antar-gereja

INTRODUCTION

The concept of mutuality has become increasingly important in contemporary discussions of mission partnership, particularly in response to concerns about power imbalance, dependency, and paternalism. In reality, global mission partnerships still face various problems, especially in terms of the imbalance of resources owned by the partners. According to Christopher Little, partners with strong resources often take a dominant position and impose their interpretation of Christianity on their partner churches in different situations (Little, 2012 p. 487). Charles Van Engen says that paternalism in mission is always a risk, and that it is hard to avoid when one party imposes ideas or takes decisions without fully taking into account the context, wisdom, and points of view of the others (van Engen, 2019). Consequently, mission partnerships necessitate continuous critical thought to maintain their health, equity, and authentic representation of the unity of the body of Christ.

As the two authors above have indicated, recent studies show that issues of power and control are still obstacles to mutuality in global mission partnerships. Studies on ecumenical resource sharing over the last twenty years, according Jonathan S. Barnes, show that there are still problems with power and control, especially when it comes to money while though mission partnerships have made a lot of progress (Barnes, 2010). These are related to the fact that partners have different capacities. Odesola and Audi assert that as contributions in partnerships cannot invariably be anticipated to be equitable in all facets of ministry these disparities necessitate meticulous examination (Odesola & Audi, 2019). Samuel Alawode also notes that partners who collaborate always come with different resource strengths, making it difficult to achieve a balanced partnership (Alawode, 2020). In a different sense, Mike McAteer says that in Western culture, people who give the most money generally take charge of making decisions and defining the agenda. This led to the re-emergence of paternalistic relationship that were common in missions during the colonial period (McAteer, 2013). Therefore, theologians and mission practitioners increasingly emphasize the need for collaboration in mutuality. In line with this, Üllas Thankler said that true partnership is more than just cooperation in mission, but walking

together while learning from each other to understand God's vast mission (Tankler, 2022).

This study uses the concept of *missio Dei* to understand mutuality in mission cooperation. Samuel Cueva said that in the past partnerships in global missions were seen from the perspective of the relationship between the sending church and the receiving church. However, during the International Missionary Conference in Whitby in 1947, this idea changed to "partnership in obedience" (Cueva, 2007). The concept of mutuality is profoundly embedded in the theology of the *missio Dei*. David J. Bosch contends that mission is not chiefly an endeavor of the church but rather emanates from the Triune God; hence, the church is summoned to engage in God's mission in the world (Bosch, 1991). Christopher J. H. Wright supports this idea by saying that God has a church for His mission in the world, not the other way around (Wright, 2006). Lesslie Newbigin also talks about the church as a sign and tool of the kingdom of God, saying that it is an important part of its mission to testify God's mission in the world (Newbigin, 1989). From this viewpoint, the relationships among churches engaged in mission should be perceived as collaborative involvement in God's work rather than as hierarchical *relationships* between sending and receiving entities.

The theological concepts mentioned above are often difficult to realize in global mission cooperation due to resource imbalances. According to Luis Bush and Lorry Lutz, the root of this problem is the economic disparity between churches in the global South and those in the West. This has created a "donor mentality" among Western churches, often leading them to act as decision-makers, while the churches receiving donations lose their autonomy (Bush & Lutz, 1990). Even Graham A. Duncan criticized the idea of partnership itself, stating that, despite its widespread acceptance, it doesn't always align with actual practices. Financial aid is often used as a tool to control, rather than empower, particularly young churches struggling to achieve financial independence (Duncan, 2007).

Although existing scholarship has extensively examined the challenges of power imbalance, paternalism, and unequal resource distribution in global mission partnerships, less attention has been given to how mutuality is actually developed and practiced within concrete interchurch partnerships. Moreover, much of the discussion on mission partnership has been shaped by North–South mission relations, while relatively limited attention has been given to emerging South–South partnerships among churches in Asia. Consequently, there is a need for empirical studies that examine how churches move from traditional sender–receiver relationships toward more reciprocal, participatory, and relational forms of mission partnership. This study

addresses this gap by examining the development of mutuality in the partnership between Gereja Isa Almasih (GIA) and the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK).

In this study, mutuality refers to a reciprocal and participatory relationship in which mission partners recognize one another as equal participants in God's mission, share responsibility and resources according to their respective gifts and contexts, and engage in mutual learning and decision-making. Mutuality therefore does not require identical contributions, but emphasizes reciprocity, complementarity, shared agency, and respect for local leadership. The GIA–PCK partnership was selected because it is a relevant case for examining the development of mutuality in interchurch mission partnership. It has a long historical trajectory since the late 1980s, allowing analysis of partnership development over time. The relationship also shows a shift from an initially asymmetric sender–receiver model to a more reciprocal form, including GIA later sending ministers to Korea. In addition, as a South–South Asian partnership, it offers a less-studied context compared to North–South mission relations. Finally, it provides rich empirical evidence of mutuality through shared mission, resource exchange, and changing missionary roles.

This study investigates the following research questions: how is mutuality articulated and developed within the mission partnership between the Gereja Isa Almasih and the Presbyterian Church of Korea, and what are the implications of this mutuality for the comprehension of mission partnership in a global context? This research seeks to examine the development of mission collaboration between the two synods and to provide a theological perspective on the notion of mutuality in interchurch mission partnerships. This examination contributes to missiological scholarship by examining mutuality in a South–South partnership between two Asian churches. It demonstrates how mutuality develops from a sender–receiver relationship toward a more reciprocal, participatory, and relational mission partnership. Beyond its contribution to missiological scholarship, the findings offer practical implications for churches seeking to develop more reciprocal, participatory, and sustainable mission partnerships.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case study design to examine the development of mutuality within the mission partnership between GIA and the PCK. The GIA–PCK partnership was treated as a bounded case, with particular attention to its historical development, changing partnership roles, and practices of reciprocal mission participation. A case study design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to examine the partnership within its actual ecclesial and ministry contexts (Yin, 2018).

The empirical data were drawn from documentary sources and field observations. Documentary data consisted primarily of records from GIA General Assemblies, including decisions, reports, and materials concerning mission cooperation with foreign partners. Field observations were informed by the researcher's direct involvement in the institutional context of the partnership. As part of Abdiel Theological Seminary, where PCK missionaries served in theological education, the researcher had direct access to and familiarity with the ministry context of PCK missionaries in Indonesia. In addition, the researcher conducted a field visit to Kimhae, South Korea, to observe the mission activities carried out by GIA ministers among Indonesian migrant workers. Photographic documentation from these contexts was used as supplementary visual evidence to corroborate the observed mission activities and partnership practices. The field observations focused on the practical expression of the partnership, particularly the roles of mission personnel, patterns of collaboration, local leadership, reciprocal participation, and the relationship between the two churches in their respective ministry contexts. The observations were not treated as a separate research approach but as one source of empirical evidence within the case study.

Theological and missiological literature was used differently from the empirical sources. Rather than constituting a separate research approach, the literature provided the conceptual framework for interpreting the empirical findings. Relevant scholarship on mission partnership, mutuality, missio Dei, and missional friendship was therefore engaged to interpret patterns identified in the documentary and observational data. The analysis proceeded by first reconstructing the historical development of the GIA–PCK partnership and identifying recurring empirical patterns, including changing sender–receiver roles, local leadership, complementary resource sharing, reciprocal missionary participation, and joint mission activities. These patterns were then interpreted through selected theological and missiological concepts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Historical Development of the GIA–PCK Partnership

The initial contact between the Gereja Isa Almasih (GIA) in Indonesia and the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK) can be traced to a visit by a delegation from Korea to Indonesia in 1988. On January 25, 1988, a group of fifteen representatives from Pusan Presbyterian Church—including pastors, elders, and deacons—arrived in Semarang. This visit was facilitated by Korean missionaries serving as lecturers at Abdiel Theological Seminary, Rev. Suh Sung Min and Rev. Shin Bang Hyon (GIA XIV General Assembly Materials, 1990). This encounter created an important opportunity for mutual introduction and opened pathways for further dialogue and collaboration. The relationship was strengthened through an official visit to Korea by several GIA leaders on September 28, 1989. This visit fostered confidence between the two synod

leaders and led them to establish a commitment for formal cooperation between the two synods. As a result, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed at the 14th GIA General Assembly in 1990, marking the official beginning of a partnership, particularly in missionary service (GIA XIV General Assembly Materials, 1990).

As a follow-up to the MOU, the partnership between the two synods was realized through the sending of PCK missionaries to work within the scope of GIA. Based on the researcher's firsthand observation within Abdiel Theological Seminary, PCK missionaries were involved in theological education and interacted with the seminary community in their ministry. These missionaries contributed to theological education by serving as lecturers at the Abdiel Theological College and in church planting efforts in several areas, including West Kalimantan, Lampung, Sumatra, Bali, and Central Sulawesi. They also supported the advancement of theological education at GIA by providing scholarships to students in need. They occasionally provided assistance for the development of facilities needed by the school. However, they never provided financial assistance for the school's operational needs. Although the PCK missionaries made a great contribution, they were limited in their role in terms of leadership or intervention in administrative matters both within the theological schools and within the church.

Over time, the partnership between GIA and PCK has become more structured and expanded. After two decades of collaboration, GIA and PCK saw the need to conduct an evaluation for the future development of the partnership. This occurred through a mission consultation held on March 14, 2012, in Semarang (GIA XXI General Assembly Materials, 2012). The mission consultation resulted in a renewed Memorandum of Understanding in which both synods reaffirmed their commitment to continuing the expanded partnership. Several key elements of that partnership are reflected in the updated agreement. First, both churches committed to continuous information exchange in order to strengthen mutual understanding and prayerful support. This exchange was carried out at multiple levels, including synod, presbytery, and local congregations, thereby fostering a multi-layered relational network.

The second element of the new agreement concerns human resource exchanges. This includes sending theologians, theology students, and young people from both churches to participate in various joint activities. The third element is to hold regular consultations at least once every five years, both in Korea and Indonesia. These consultations aim to strengthen the existing partnership, deepen theological reflection on the collaborative relationship, and evaluate various mission projects that have been implemented. And the fourth element of the renewed cooperation is the commitment of both churches to support each other in various joint mission activities. This support includes cooperation in the exchange of ministers and the implementation of joint mission projects. The renewed Memorandum of Understanding has not only remained conceptual but has been implemented in

practice in the partnership between the two synods. This implementation is evident in the development of cooperation that is expanded to the local church level. Local churches from both synods are actively building direct relationships through various joint programs, such as collaborative mission projects, short-term mission trip and youth ministry exchange.

On March 14, 2017, the leaders of the GIA and PCK met again in Seoul, South Korea, to sign a renewed partnership agreement between the two synods. This meeting marked a significant milestone in strengthening the direction of missionary cooperation between the two churches (GIA XXIII General Assembly Materials, 2022). The meeting resulted in concrete progress in mission cooperation, namely an agreement to collaborate on services for Indonesian migrant workers in Korea, particularly in Kimhae City, an area with a large concentration of Indonesian migrant workers. As a manifestation of this agreement, GIA established a service organization called Mitra Tumbuh Bersama (MTB) Mission Society. This mission organization serves to prepare the deployment of service personnel to serve Indonesian migrant workers in Korea (GIA XXIII General Assembly Materials, 2022). Field observations conducted during the researcher's visit to Kimhae, South Korea, provided direct contextual information concerning the ministry of GIA minister among Indonesian migrant workers. Photographic documentation from the field visit was used as supplementary visual evidence of the ministry context.

Figure 1: GIA Minister, PCK Deacon and Indonesian Migrants in a Meeting



The deployment of GIA ministers to Korea demonstrates a significant development in the partnership between GIA and PCK. While initially the GIA-PCK partnership was limited to a relationship between a receiving church and a sending church, this phase has seen a new, mutually beneficial relationship emerge. GIA now also serves as a sending church. This demonstrates that the relationship between the two synods is shifting toward a more complementary form of cooperation.

From Sender–Receiver to Reciprocal Partnership

Mutuality in the GIA–PCK partnership developed progressively. Initially, PCK functioned primarily as the sending church by providing missionaries and other forms of support, while GIA provided the local institutional and ministry context. Although this arrangement contributed to theological education and church planting,

the roles of the two churches were not yet fully reciprocal. Such a pattern reflects a broader history of mission partnerships in which distinctions between sending and receiving churches could create unequal relationships and dependency (Dean, 2013; Lederleitner, 2010).

After 2012, the partnership expanded through information and human-resource exchange, regular consultations, prayer support, and joint mission initiatives. A significant transformation occurred when GIA began sending ministers to Korea to serve Indonesian migrant workers. GIA therefore moved from being primarily a recipient of missionary resources to becoming an active contributor to mission beyond its own national context. This development demonstrates that mutuality does not require identical resources or institutional roles. Rather, it emerges when each partner's resources, experience, and contextual capacities are recognized as complementary. This understanding is consistent with Bosch's argument that true mutuality does not require partners to exchange identical "commodities," but to share on the basis of their diverse strengths (Bosch, 1978). PCK contributed contextual support in Korea, while GIA contributed ministry personnel and knowledge of the Indonesian migrant context.

Mutuality was expressed through four interconnected practices: respect for local leadership, complementary resource sharing, reciprocal mission participation, and sustained relational engagement. These dimensions correspond with broader discussions of mutuality that emphasize reciprocity, shared participation, contextual sensitivity, and the recognition that all partners both give and receive (Dean, 2013; Lederleitner, 2010). Thus, the GIA–PCK partnership illustrates how a relationship initially marked by sender–receiver roles can develop toward shared responsibility and complementary participation in God's mission.

Comparison with Other Mission Partnership Patterns

The development of the GIA–PCK partnership can be situated in relation to broader patterns of mission partnership discussed in missiological literature. Traditional sender–receiver arrangements distinguish between churches that provide missionary resources and churches that receive them. Such arrangements have historically contributed to mission but may also generate dependency and unequal relationships when differences in resources become associated with decision-making power (Dean, 2013; Lederleitner, 2010).

Van Engen's discussion of present-day mission partnerships is particularly useful for positioning the GIA–PCK trajectory. Contemporary partnerships increasingly include forms in which a formerly receiving church becomes a mission sender and participates in ministry with another receiving church or mission agency (Van Engen, 2019). The GIA–PCK case reflects this broader development. Its initial arrangement was characterized by PCK's role as sender and GIA's role as receiver, but the relationship subsequently developed through reciprocal exchange and GIA's

participation as a sending church. The significance of the GIA–PCK case therefore lies not simply in its being a partnership between two Asian churches, but in the transformation of roles within the partnership. Its development reflects a broader shift in mission partnership from fixed sender–receiver arrangements toward relationships characterized by mutual participation, reciprocal exchange, and complementary contributions (Bosch, 1978; Engen, 2001; Nasimiyu-Wasike, 2001; Van Engen, 2019). The GIA–PCK case provides an empirical example of this transformation, as GIA moved from primarily receiving missionary personnel to also participating as a sending church. This development illustrates the possibility of mutuality as a dynamic process in which partners learn to contribute and receive according to their respective gifts, contexts, and capacities.

Mutuality within the Framework of Missio Dei

In the framework of the *missio Dei*, all churches participate together in God's mission rather than occupying fixed roles as senders and receivers. As David J. Bosch points out, true mission is not a property or activity of the church, but rather a manifestation of the attributes of the Triune God (Bosch, 1991). In this regard, the church's role in the world is as a participant in God's mission. In line with this understanding, Sebastian Kim emphasizes interdependence as a key characteristic of global Christianity, where churches share resources, learn from one another, and contribute their unique gifts within the body of Christ (Kim, 2014). According to him, this concept is rooted in the biblical depiction of the church as the family of God and the body of Christ, composed of diverse members with diverse gifts. Therefore, churches around the world are called to share resources with one another, whether in the form of ministerial personnel, ministry experience, or financial support.

However, the global partnerships often face challenges related to cultural differences and resource imbalances. Timothy Kiho Park cautions that the monocultural nature of Korean culture can lead some Korean missionaries to unwittingly impose elements of their own culture on the cultural contexts they serve (Park, 2009). Another issue that frequently arises in mission partnerships concerns economic inequality between partners. Mary Lederleitner points out that cross-cultural mission collaboration often faces a dilemma when the majority of financial resources come from wealthier countries. In such situations, concerns arise about a new form of colonialism (known as neocolonialism), where financial aid can create relations of domination even without physical occupation (Lederleitner, 2010). A similar reflection was also expressed by Josef P. Widyatmadja, who assessed that the paternalistic pattern of cooperation between churches from the North and South is not solely caused by one party. According to him, both the donor and recipient churches are part of an unfair global economic and political system (Widyamadja, 2010). Therefore, the challenge for the donor church is how to provide support with sincere

motives without dominating, while the challenge for the recipient church is how to manage this assistance responsibly without falling into dependence.

In the context of interchurch partnerships in Asia, there are both opportunities and challenges. Asian churches generally do not carry the same burden of colonial history as relations between Western churches and churches in the Global South. This opens up opportunities for the formation of new, more equal and mutually beneficial partnership patterns. However, mission theologians also warn that Asian churches need to be careful not to repeat the patterns of domination that have existed in the history of Western missions. Kang-San Tan asserts that if churches do not consciously develop new partnership models, mission efforts risk repeating past mistakes associated with colonialism and imperialism. He also warns that the issue of control and power in missions is not solely a Western problem, as the mission structures that have developed in Asia may also repeat similar patterns (Tan, 2011).

Mission Partnership as Missional Friendship

The findings can be further interpreted through the concept of missional friendship. In this study, missional friendship refers to a relational form of mission partnership in which churches participate together in God's mission as reciprocal partners, recognizing one another's agency, sharing responsibility and resources according to their respective contexts and gifts, and engaging in mutual learning. Unlike a transactional or fixed sender–receiver relationship, missional friendship emphasizes relational trust, reciprocal participation, shared agency, and openness to mutual transformation.

This concept builds upon existing understandings of mission partnership and mutuality rather than replacing them. Mission partnership describes the collaborative relationship between churches, while mutuality emphasizes reciprocity, shared participation, and complementary contribution within that relationship. Missional friendship extends these concepts by emphasizing the relational quality of partnership, in which churches encounter one another not merely as institutional collaborators but as participants and companions in God's mission. This relational understanding resonates with Adiprasetya and Sasongko's Trinitarian theology of friendship, which highlights vulnerability, unpredictability, reimagination, propheticity, and compassion as marks of friendship (Adiprasetya & Sasongko, 2019). Adiprasetya's further engagement with Moltmann's theology of open friendship also emphasizes the openness of friendship to the other and to relationships that transcend fixed boundaries (Adiprasetya, 2021).

The concept of missional friendship in this study is therefore not presented as a theory derived solely from the empirical data, nor as an entirely new theoretical construct. Rather, it represents a theological synthesis used to interpret the empirical development of the GIA–PCK partnership. The empirical findings provide the basis for identifying relational patterns—such as respect for local leadership, reciprocal

participation, complementary resource sharing, mutual learning, and sustained engagement—which are then interpreted through the theological framework of missional friendship.

The GIA–PCK partnership illustrates this relational transformation. PCK missionaries contributed to theological education and church planting without taking over local institutional leadership, allowing GIA to retain responsibility for its own institutions and ministries. Later, GIA participated as a sending church by deploying ministers to serve Indonesian migrant workers in Korea, while PCK provided contextual support. The relationship therefore moved beyond a fixed sender–receiver arrangement toward a more reciprocal form of participation. These developments suggest that missional friendship is expressed not primarily through interpersonal closeness but through the recognition of mutual agency, shared mission, reciprocal contribution, and openness to learning from one another. The contribution of this study lies not in proposing missional friendship as an entirely new concept, but in applying and developing its theological significance within a concrete South–South interchurch mission partnership.

Practical Implications for Other Mission Partnerships

The GIA–PCK partnership experience offers several practical implications for other churches seeking to develop mission partnerships. First, churches should recognize complementary contributions rather than evaluating partnership primarily through financial or material resources. Ministry personnel, contextual knowledge, networks, theological resources, and local leadership can all constitute significant contributions. Second, mission partnerships should establish mechanisms for shared decision-making, regular consultation, and ongoing evaluation. The GIA–PCK experience indicates that mutuality develops through continuing interaction rather than through a partnership agreement alone. Third, churches should avoid permanently assigning the roles of sender and receiver. Where appropriate, partnership arrangements should create opportunities for both churches to participate as agents of mission. The transition of GIA into a sending church demonstrates how reciprocal participation can reshape an existing partnership. Finally, mutuality requires long-term relational investment. Regular communication, cross-cultural learning, joint mission activities, and periodic evaluation can help partnerships develop greater reciprocity and trust. The GIA–PCK case therefore suggests that healthy mission partnerships are strengthened when they are organized around shared responsibility, complementary participation, respect for local agency, and a common commitment to God's mission.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several suggestions for further research emerge from this study and may contribute to the advancement of missiological scholarship, particularly in the area of

interchurch partnership. First, Comparative Study: Research is needed that compares and analyzes the GIA–PCK model with other cases of interchurch partnerships in Asia (e.g., Korea–Myanmar, Japan–Philippines, India–Nepal) to develop a typology of Asian missionary cooperation. Second, Longitudinal Study: By dividing the history of partnerships over 30 years into periods, a developmental stage model can be proposed that traces the qualitative changes in the relationship (e.g., from unilateral support in the early stages to mutual recognition in the middle stages to collaborative agency today). Third, Intersection with Diaspora Missiology: Migrant ministry is a core theme of diaspora missiology proposed by Enoch Wan (Wan, 2011) By positioning the GIA–PCK case within the theoretical framework of diaspora missiology, a more systematic theoretical contribution regarding the correlation between migration and mission is possible.

CONCLUSION

This research examines the development of mutuality within the mission partnership between the Church of Jesus Christ (Gereja Isa Almasih) (GIA) and the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK). The results of this case study study demonstrate that mission cooperation between the two synods has undergone a significant transformation—from a one-way relationship (receiver and sender) to a reciprocal and complementary one. This transformation is evident in several ways, including the recognition of local leadership, the complementary exchange of resources, joint involvement in mission work, and the GIA's increasing role as a sending church, particularly in serving Indonesian migrant workers in Korea.

Theological reflection on this study yields several insights. First, mutuality in mission partnership is grounded in the concept of *missio Dei*, where all churches on earth are called to participate in God's mission, not merely fulfilling their fixed roles as senders and recipients. Second, the emergence of what has been called "missional friendship" indicates a profound shift from a hierarchical structure to a relational, kenotic, and interdependent partnership. This model is rooted in Trinitarian theology, particularly the concept of koinonia as relational participation, and offers a constructive framework for understanding interchurch cooperation. Third, this study demonstrates that mutuality is not a static condition but a dynamic and ever-evolving process. Finally, issues related to resource imbalances and cultural differences remain a concern in cross-cultural partnerships and must be addressed seriously to prevent the recurrence of paternalistic patterns in mission partnerships.

REFERENCES

Adiprasetya, J. (2021). Revisiting Jürgen Moltmann's theology of open friendship. *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, *21*(2), 177–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/1474225X.2021.1942618

Adiprasetya, J., & Sasongko, N. (2019). A Compassionate Space-making: Toward a Trinitarian Theology of Friendship. *The Ecumenical Review*, *71*, 21–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/erev.12416

Alawode, A. O. (2020). Challenges and prospects of partnership among local and foreign christian missionaries in Nigeria. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, *76*(3), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i3.5983

Barnes, J. S. (2010). *Partnership in Christian Mission: A History of the Protestant Missionary Movement*. University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Bosch, D. J. (1978). Towards True Mutuality: Exchanging the Same Commodities or Supplementing Each Others' Needs? *Missiology*, *6*(3), 283–296. https://doi.org/10.1177/009182967800600303

Bosch, D. J. (1991). *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Orbis Books.

Bush, L., & Lutz, L. (1990). *Partnering in Ministry: The Direction of World Evangelism*. InterVarsity Press.

Cueva, S. (2007). Partnership. In J. Corrie, J. F. Martinez, & S. Chan (Eds.), *Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations* (pp. 273–273). Intervarsity Press.

Dean, M. W. (2013). Mutuality and Missions: The Western Christian in Global Ministry. *Missiology*, *41*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091829613489493

Duncan, G. A. (2007). The growth of partnership in mission in global mission history during the twentieth century. *HTS*, *63*(3), 2007.

Engen, C. Van. (2001). Toward a Theology of Mission Partnerships. *Missiology*, *29*(1), 11–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/009182960102900102

Kim, S. (2014). Inter-Asia Mission and Global Missionary Movements from Asia. In Felix Wilfred (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christianity in Asia*. Oxford University Press.

Lederleitner, M. (2010). Is it possible to adhere to Western ethical and cultural standards regarding financial accountability without fostering neo-colonialism in this next era of global mission partnerships? Thoughts and reflections for broader dialogue. In D. Balia & K. Kim (Eds.), *Edinburgh 2010: Witnessing to Christ Today*. Regnum Books.

Little, C. R. (2012). Breaking Bad Missiological Habits. In M. Barnett (Ed.), *Discovering the Mission of God* (pp. 487–487). IVP Academic.

McAteer, M. (2013). Partnership in Mission: An Analysis of Hindrances and Practical Suggestions for Implementation. *International Journal of Pentecostal Missiology*, *1*. https://www.evangel.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/McAteer_PARTNERSHIP_IN_MISSION_39-54.pdf

Nasimiyu-Wasike, A. (2001). Is Mutuality Possible? An African Response. *Missiology*, *29*(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/009182960102900103

Newbigin, L. (1989). *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. Eerdmans.

Odesola, A. O., & Audi, M. (2019). PARTNERSHIP IN MISSIONS AS A TOOL FOR WORLD EVANGELIZATION VO L. 1 1 • N O. 1 FA LL 2 0 1 9. *GREAT COMISSION RESEARCH JOURNAL*. https://www.gordonconwell.edu/ockenga/research/documents/Christianityinits-

Park, T. K. (2009). Missionary Movement of the Korean Church. *Asian Mission History Forum, Semarang 2009*.

Tan, K.-S. (2011). Who is in the Driver's Seat? A Critique of Mission Partnership Models between Western Missions and East Asian Mission Movements. In K.-S. Tan, J. Ingleby, & S. Cozens (Eds.), *Understanding Asian Mission Movements* (pp. 51–52). Wide Margin.

Tankler, Ü. (2022). The Theology of Partnership in Mission. *European Journal of Theology*, *31*(1), 73–91. https://doi.org/10.5117/EJt2022.1.005.tANK

Van Engen, C. (2019). Mission Partnerships Today. *Acta Theologica*, *Supp*(28), 53–71. https://doi.org/10.18820/23099089/actat.Sup28.4

van Engen, C. (2019). Present-day mission partnerships. *Acta Theologica*, *2019*, 69–69. https://doi.org/10.18820/23099089/actat.Sup28.4

Wan, E. (2011). *Diaspora Missiology: Theory, Methodology and Practice.* . Institute of Diaspora Studies.

Widyamadja, Y. (2010). *Yesus dan Wong Cilik: Praksis Diakonia Transformatif dan Teologi Rakyat di Indonesia*. BPK Gunung Mulia.

Wright, C. J. H. (2006). *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. IVP Academic.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Documentary Sources

GIA XIV General Assembly Materials, 1990

GIA XXI General Assembly Materials, 2012

GIA XXIII General Assembly Materials, 2022