

# Redesigning Missiological Education for the Twenty- First Century

---

**International Joint Degrees in Development  
Studies and Missiology Through Institutional  
Partnerships in the Americas**

KEVIN BOOK-SATTERLEE

DOI: 10.7252/Paper. 000039

## **About the Author**

Kevin Book-Satterlee is field dean for William Carey International University and academic coordinator for Avance, a training program of United World Mission in Mexico City.

## Abstract

---

It is time to design twenty-first century models for theological higher education to replace the nineteenth-century models. Missiological education ought to be a forerunner in this era of globalized and internationalized education, and the idea of international joint-degrees in development and missiology is a groundbreaking start for future collaboration. While joint degree programs are not uncommon in higher education, their inclusion in higher theological education is rare. This is especially true regarding joint missiological degrees, and to do so through international partnerships is even more rare. This paper reviews Schreiter's third-wave mission and opportunities for globalizing missiological education through joint degree partnerships to engage the changing context of mission. A key emphasis for missiological joint degrees is a hybridization of cultural contexts for andragogical glocation. I also conduct a content survey of missiological curricular course offerings at the master's level among institutions in the Americas to determine course and curriculum similarities and differences. This content survey provides an initial way to begin to look for joint degrees, and one can draw potential suggestions from the survey for other schools to consider modeling.

As global studies and mission scholars, why is it that we are behind in global academic collaboration? Why are more and more specialize degrees popping up in our schools therefore creating in some cases, unhealthy competition among institutions?<sup>1</sup> Why are we continuing to play an “us and them” game between U.S. institutions and those of our companions throughout the globe? Missionaries and missiologists, by and large, have pushed for global theological education, contextualization, and the study of world Christianity, yet our missiological programs are perhaps the least reflective of shared equity in the missiological education of our world, recruiting foreign nationals to study in U.S. institutions, yet providing little to encourage potential students to study abroad for any significant length of time.

The future of missiological education will be through global collaboration.<sup>2</sup> Tennent (2012) remarks, “We must have greater bi-lateral exchanges based on relationships and shared vision... [the notion that] all ‘real’ education takes place in the West must be replaced by a new era of mutuality and shared vision with seminaries and training institutes around the world.” Creating a solid network or system of international schools would be ideal, but the establishment of joint degrees to formulate and cement an internationalization commitment among institutions is also a way forward. While international joint degree programs are not uncommon in higher education, their inclusion in higher theological education is rare. This is especially true regarding missiological joint degrees. Neo liberal capitalist models are characterized by an increasing global competition, with an ethos that only the fittest survive. Most seminaries, reacting to this, are protectionist and scrambling to keep their institutions in order. This is not only evident in the United States, but similarly present among institutions in Latin American, and elsewhere. For some, a caution to be labeled colonialist adds to the reservation of joining with others, especially cross-global institutions. No institution is now ignorant of the global growth of Christianity. In light of this, Walls (1991) describes the academic state with historical reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> century:

The discovery of America did not mean that people threw their maps away and got new ones; still less did it mean that learned people abandoned ideas about humanity and society that were the product of European ignorance of the world beyond their own. In fact, the new discoveries were intellectually threatening, requiring the abandonment of too many certainties, the acquisition of too many new ideas and skills, the modification of too many maxims,

the sudden irrelevance of too many accepted authorities. It was easier to ignore them and carry on with the old intellectual maps...even while accepting the fact of the discovery and profiting from the economic effects (149).

Perhaps, despite Walls' (1991) call for restructuring mission studies to reflect the growth and input of those from the growing church, "the rule of the palefaces over the academic world [still] is untroubled," (152). The above quote is fitting regarding the state of protectionism and the neoliberal competitive response. Yet, the fittest seem to survive this global competition, not through protectionist isolation and commoditized education, but through networked collaboration.

This paper continues the theme of last year's APM conference, educating for justice, and fits this year's theme by offering frameworks for thinking about global collaboration in missiological education for the globalized world. I propose that global institutions should form missiologically-based joint degrees with an emphasis in international development in response to challenges of globalization and missiological education and as a starting point for long-term, mutual collaboration. To do so, I begin this paper discussing globalization and mission by drawing from Schreiter's (2005, 2012) observations about the "third wave" of globalization and "third wave" mission. I specifically highlight the dynamics of deterritorialization and hybridization and their effects on mission education. Schreiter emphasizes the importance of mission as reconciliation (2005: 86), for which the inclusion of development and justice guided by missiology is crucial. In the second part of this paper I conduct a content survey of missiological curriculum offerings at Latin American and U.S. evangelical seminaries and universities in order to explore opportunities for constructing joint degrees. I further discuss how the collaborative efforts of joint degrees in missiology are important for Schreiter's "third wave" mission and how collaborative degrees have andragogical benefits for the student of mission. I end this paper with concluding thoughts based on my research and the potential to shape such collaborative efforts via joint degree partnership.

## Globalization and Mission

---

There would be no reason to propose new models of missiological education if globalization did not change the context of mission. In this section I will summarize Schreiter's observations of the changing context of mission due to third wave of globalization (2012: Kindle location 901) focusing on deterritorialization and hybridization. In response to this changing context of mission Schreiter coined "third wave mission," (ASM 2014). I will close this section by mentioning Schreiter's fifth task of mission – mission as reconciliation – added to the list of four tasks developed at the 1981 SEDOS conference, and the importance of international development to engage in this task.

Schreiter (2005, 2013) highlights three points about the changing context of mission due to current or third wave of globalization (2005: 76, or 2013: Kindle location 914). This new context of mission stems from the characteristics of modern globalization: the compression of time and space due to technological advances; economic consumption for some and economic exclusion for others due to neo-liberal capitalism, political privatization, and the degrading of civic imaginary in favor of the individualist consumer.

Two significant consequences of globalization for mission are deterritorialization and hybridization. Where once culture was considered static and concrete, the postmodern understanding of culture shows it to be dynamic and ever-changing (Arbuckle 2010:17). This is not lost on Christian mission, yet the complexities of both deterritorialization and hybridization make culture and mission within culture considerably more complicated.

Kennedy (2010), drawing from Welsch (1999) writes:

...so profound have been the changes brought by cultural flows and scapes that we need to jettison the idea of interculturality and multiculturality since both presume we still live in a world of separate and internally coherent cultural 'islands or spheres'. Instead, there is transculturality characterized by overlapping and interconnecting of

cultures through ‘external networking’...With fragments of every culture implanted everywhere, hybridization also becomes inevitable and commonplace,” (33).

In light of this statement, especially with regard to interculturality, the intercultural studies titles of many of our missiologically-based degrees may need rethinking. Yet, Kennedy’s statement makes the assumption of synthesis in hybridization that overstates the situation, and in so doing makes the global situation less complicated. Networks and overlap are not constructed neatly. In some cases they are planned, but in most cases such overlapping occurs unconsciously, without a driving center. Perhaps one may find familiar cultural anchors or viral narratives creating recognizable hegemony, but hybridization does not negate the art of culture-crossing. The gospel may be transcultural (Moreau: 2012:61) and not territorial, but people are the opposite. People create place and boundaries, even if porous ones. Escobar (2001) writes: “Places concatenate with each other to form regions, which suggests that porosity of boundaries is essential to place, as it is to local constructions and exchange. Locality, in this way becomes marked by the interplay between position, place and region; by the porosity of boundaries; and by the role of the lived body between enculturation and emplacement...,” (144).

While hybridization and deterritorialization do complicate dynamic and consistent cultural change, mission *ad gentes* (Schreiter 2012) or *to the people* still requires the education of ministering to and ultimately *with* the people (Gutzler 2013:Kindle location 1079) who are networked, mobile, yet continue to create pliable boundaries. We may or may not need to change the titles of our degrees, but they must expand the ability to navigate networks, cultural change, and overlapping glocality if we want our students to truly engage in third-wave mission.

Schreiter reemphasizes the tasks of mission developed from the 1981 SEDOS seminar as proclamation, interreligious dialogue, inculturation, and liberation of the poor. In light of neo-liberal globalization, he adds the fifth task of mission as reconciliation (2005:86). He states: “Because so much of the work of mission is done on behalf of the poor people of the world, missionaries who call the world’s attention to what is happening in their locales play a significant role in countering the worst aspects of globalization,” (Schreiter 2005:78). This is echoed in another of his works, where he reimagines mission as “mission *ad vulnera*” or mission to the wounds. He explains (2012) that “[t]his kind of mission would focus itself on locating the breaches and wounds in the contemporary

world...Considering wounds – the wounds of our world and the wounds of Christ...might provide the stimulus to imagination needed to help reshape mission in the twenty-first century,” (Kindle location 996). While mission as reconciliation is not particularly new, the new context of mission advertises the need in the context of global and cultural change.

In order to be effective in third wave mission, missiological education must encompass all five of Schreiter’s noted tasks of mission *with* people. To accomplish this in missiological education I advocate for international residential joint degrees focused on international development and justice with missional principles as a core basis among evangelical schools. I do so in light of Schreiter’s suggestion for the fifth task as reconciliation, combined with liberation of the poor; in light of the changing missional motivation of evangelical seminary students (Slimbach 2010:190); in light of student-driven consumer demands to add new emphases to missiological education; and in light of the consequential opportunities in mission thanks to deterritorialization and hybridization and third wave mission.

## **Missiological Education and International Development as Ministry of Reconciliation**

---

Before moving into my research survey of evangelical missiology programs in the Americas and opportunities to generate missiological joint degrees in international development, it is important to understand how international development fits into missiological education as a response to Schreiter’s fourth and specifically fifth tasks of mission. Development is a broad category with as many variations of definitions as there are definitions.<sup>3</sup> This is both debilitating and freeing when it comes to the ministry of reconciliation that Schreiter mentions. It is debilitating in that there is no set standard and even little agreement on best practices. It is freeing in that it is holistic. *Integral Mission* author Yamamori (2000) proposes that, “Development is a process of qualitative change of life in which a person’s total maturity (social, physical, and spiritual, as well as in understanding) as an individual or as a person-in-community” occurs

(12, translation mine). Bryant Myers's (1999) idea of "transformational development," reflects Yamamori's emphasis. Transformational development seeks "positive change in the whole of human life, materially, socially, and spiritually," (Myers 1999:1). Development in its broadest sense is holistic as well as integrative.

Development as holistic is manifested in many forms, (Hoekbergen 2012:60). Church-life, and theological education as it continues to inform the practice of the church, is essentially a piece of the wide range of missional and transformational development in that it recognizably covers the spiritual dimension mentioned by Myers. But the church need not just occupy itself with spiritual components of people, as transformational development is not so easily partitioned. Yamamori (2000) notes that the holistic local church directs and focuses individuals and communities to obey the commands of Christ to love God and neighbor (13). He also states that the local church helps its leaders and members grow like Jesus (14). These two key functions of the local church – to love God and neighbor – popularly interpreted with greater spiritual emphasis, reinforces the concept of segregating development. Yamamori's third key function of the local church also requires recognizing the overall needs – spiritual, as well as physical and emotional needs – of individuals and the community and respond with wisdom to those needs (14).

As globalization continues to complicate those needs, seminary educators need wisdom and understanding to integrate international development alongside traditional missiological education. While *one* of the principal tasks of mission is proclamation, Schreiter's tasks of poverty alleviation and reconciling the wounds caused by globalization and other factors are also critical.

## **Course Survey for the Basis of Joint Degree Opportunities**

---

Seminaries in the United States are beginning to recognize poverty alleviation and a ministry of reconciliation to globalization's wounds as key aspects to address in degree and course offerings. Most institutions have incorporated these into traditional missiological degree programs or



created new programs such as the Master of Arts of Global Development and Justice at Multnomah University and the Master of Arts of Justice and Mission at Denver Seminary.<sup>4</sup> These degrees are important in addressing the need for and growing interest in Christian international development, especially when incorporated alongside other traditional seminary offerings. For thirty years Eastern University's School of Leadership and Development has offered an MBA in Economic Development with a focus on developing countries. Students may also combine this degree with a Master of Divinity degree at Eastern University's Palmer Theological Seminary.<sup>5</sup> Many other programs have courses in international development as electives or concentrations for their missiological degrees.

Added degrees and courses in international development may move towards an unhelpful partitioning of missiological tasks set out by Schreiter. Seminaries in Latin America are also influenced by poverty alleviation and international development. These categories are often described as *mission integral* (Bullón 2013:234). Alcántara Mejía (2001) echoes Myers's perception of the term "transformational" from a context of *misión integral*. He writes, "transformation' has synthesized for me what the Good News of the cross does in the person, and by him or her, in society and its structures," (88). Here development and mission are more intricately entwined and reflect an integration of Schreiter's five tasks of mission.

To understand points of collaboration based on the strengths of degree programs in the U.S. and Latin America, I conducted a content survey to look for possible joint degree collaborations. I do not offer any specific prototype that can be implemented as "already packaged." Partnerships do not work that way (Spencer-Oatey 2012). Instead, I offer recommendations based on the surveyed content to demonstrate possible collaboration. For this research I have conducted a content survey of degree and course offerings in order to explore the possibilities and opportunities for partnership through a joint missiological degree in international development. I will explain the parameters of my content survey, summarize the data, and outline three possible joint degree collaborations based on the data.

## Parameters and Data Observation

There are many seminaries and mission training programs scattered throughout the globe which are too numerous to survey with too many variables to produce helpful data for this paper. I have therefore set my parameters to survey master's level missiology and international development degrees at evangelical institutions (seminaries or universities) in the United States and Latin America. My choice for incorporating institutions from the United States is most relevant for this conference, since many participants in the Association of Professors of Mission are representatives of one or more of these institutions. My choice to include Latin America builds from my other curricular surveys among Latin American evangelical theological education including course offerings, descriptions, and course syllabi.<sup>6</sup>

In a technologized world people turn to the internet for quick, cursory information. I begin choosing my data-set in the same way that a person might begin to investigate their potential degree, via searches on the Internet to look for possible programs in Latin America and the United States.<sup>7</sup> To narrow the search initially, I omitted any programs which were not tied to an expressly academic institution. Even with this initial filter my survey resulted in hundreds of potential degrees from both regions.

One observable difference between many Latin American institutions and those from the United States was the academic entry level for missiological education. Latin American students tend to enter their missiological education at a certificate or associate's level, completing their missiological degree as a second degree, and have been involved in formal ministry or mission prior to entering. By contrast, U.S. students tend to enter their missiological education at the master's level, with varying levels of prior formal ministerial and mission experience. Since joint degrees work best administratively when coursework is conducted at the same academic level and the typical entry point for U.S. students of missiology is at the master's level, I narrowed my survey parameters to postgraduate certificates and master's degrees.

The number of master's degrees in missiology or intercultural studies in the U.S. is numerous, so I limited my list of U.S. institutions to those with international development or justice degrees in order to find manageable possibilities of partnering in the area of international development. This resulted in eight master's programs in development or justice among six institutions. Some other international development programs were contained within the business and management departments of their institutions, which, for the purposes of missiological collaboration I removed from the final list. I also did a second search for Latin American evangelical schools for post-graduate work with a similar focus in international development.<sup>8</sup> This resulted in including two more programs, and the final list includes ten Latin American missiology and development post-graduate programs among nine schools (Appendix A). Neither of the lists are likely to be exhaustive, however they provide a good example of the kind of content that students in both regions will find in an internet search.

Because I conducted a content survey rather than completing a full content analysis I did not investigate the constantly changing syllabi of each course within the programs. In order to keep language consistency for Latin American institutions I chose only institutions offering degrees in Spanish. This removed global mission giant Brazil (Center for the Study of Global Christianity 2013: 76), as well as French or English-dominant countries. It also eliminated programs designed to be completed in indigenous languages. Each of these omitted options would warrant similar surveys to gain a more complete picture of degree and course offerings in Latin America. Despite language similarity, I also did not look into North American Spanish-based missiological education, although this too would produce interesting findings. Future surveys might also include content of non-academic programs, as well as a survey of comparative content for technical, undergraduate, and doctoral degrees.

## **Survey Observations**

Generally, I found that justice and development master's programs in the U.S. are few and relatively new. Their recent addition to seminaries reflect the growing interest in global development issues and justice from the church, and especially younger students termed "New Evangelicals" (Slimbach 2010:193). Each of these programs contain some classical

seminary courses to provide adequate biblical, theological, historical, and missiological foundation, yet firmly address development studies. With the exception of one program, at least one-third of each degree required development and justice courses. Among these programs, most have a generalist curriculum, however some have specific foci, such as Fuller Seminary's children-at-risk or Eastern University's urban studies with community development.<sup>9</sup> U.S. institutions tend to offer more electives and provide greater student flexibility in their degree programming.

Despite decades of influence from the *Fraternidad Teológica Latinoamericana* and *misión integral* among evangelical circles and seminaries throughout Latin America (Bullón 2013), there are still few courses or missiological emphases geared directly towards development studies. *Seminario Teológico de Puerto Rico* (STDPR) incorporated development courses for one-eighth of its program. *Seminario Sudamericano's* (SEMISUD) children-at-risk program does not dedicate much of its curriculum to the development category described above, only one course, however seventy percent of its courses fall into counseling and social work. Interestingly, this program at SEMISUD included no courses in theological, biblical, or missiological formation. I kept it in the list because the degree was offered directly in a seminary, as opposed to the development programs offered from business and management schools. Apart from the programs at STDPR and SEMISUD, no other surveyed program in Latin America listed coursework in development. Instead, program emphases varied between ministerial leadership or missiology categories. That said, a number of programs required at least one course of *misión integral*. Further analysis of each course syllabi will help to determine the influence of development as *misión integral* within each course.

When analyzing both data sets, a significant content complication can arise in the discrepancy with regard to number of hours, credits, units, classes, etc. (Michael and Balraj 2003:138) required by each institution surveyed. This diversity in degree lengths will make collaboration difficult, but not impossible. As long as the core concerns for each partner are met, the remainder of classes, while important, can be negotiated to some extent. Stand-alone creations, however, especially those borrowing from, but not as an extension of, existing programs may help in this process as degree lengths will be consistent with already existing degrees at both (all) institutions. Despite the requirement variations in institutions, a key similarity for constructing joint degrees is that most programs in both Latin America and the United States require some sort of practicum and

cross-cultural experience. This suggests that there is a common value placed on experiential learning, an important component to the andragogical formation of students.

Many factors must be considered with regard to possible pairings for institutional collaboration. Based on the content survey I have done, I propose three partnerships for offering residential joint degrees of missiology and international development as examples of immediate potential opportunities. The first collaborative partnership is a SEMISUD-Fuller Seminary partnership around children at risk; the second is a partnership between *Seminario Teológico Centroamericano* (SETECA) and Denver Seminary in urban ministry and justice; and finally a three-way collaboration could include SETECA, Eastern University, and Fuller Seminary in urban mission.

SEMISUD's program with an emphasis in working with children-at-risk emphasizes counseling and social work a great deal with only two courses in development studies. This particular program requires no courses in Bible, theology, or missiology. The missing theological, biblical, and missiological foundation can be buttressed by partnering with Fuller Seminary's Master of Arts of Intercultural Studies with a children-at-risk emphasis.<sup>10</sup> Based on an already existing partnership, courses from SETECA may transfer to either Denver Seminary or Dallas Theological Seminary and vice versa.<sup>11</sup> SETECA and Denver Seminary could build a collaborative joint-degree around urban ministry and justice. And, since the relationship already exists and classes have already gained recognition between the schools, two major hurdles in collaboration have already been met. Not wanting to complicate matters by increasing too many collaborative options for SETECA, the Guatemalan school could, by course-load, collaborate in an urban mission joint degree with both Fuller Seminary and/or Eastern University. A three-institution collaboration could be tricky administratively, but it could also provide a rich model for deeper collaboration. The difference in proposals with SETECA form around one specific concept "justice" which Denver Seminary already has as a degree where Fuller and Eastern seminaries do not have a specific focus on "justice" as a degree *per se*. In all proposals, I would suggest offering each institution a rotating directorship or leadership (Michael and Balraj 2003:143) so as to not alienate one institution or the other.

These three examples of joint degree possibilities between SEMISUD and Fuller Seminary, SETECA and Denver Seminary, and the three-way collaboration between SETECA, Fuller Seminary, and

Eastern University, are only possibilities. Much would have to be worked out beyond curricular collaboration. Many other partnerships could also be developed given this content survey data. Even cursory surveys can find potential connections to begin to develop joint degrees, thus globalizing missiological education and adding to a collaborative andragogy in the preparation of students of mission to alleviate poverty and be ministers of reconciliation. Similar content surveys within missiology around disciplines other than development would also be valuable for collaboration to meet the changes of the third wave of globalization and prepare for participation in third-wave mission.

## **The Case for Joint Degrees and Andragogical Collaboration in Mission**

---

Schreiter reminds us of our task to work with the poor as ministers of reconciliation. In order to do so God's people must engage in international transformative development. But should seminaries add degrees in development and justice at all? Could not these degrees be found outside of the seminary and in secular institutions? Seminaries certainly do not have a monopoly on training for all the ways Christians engage in the world, so perhaps they should just work to engage Schreiter's first three tasks of mission: proclamation, interreligious dialogue, and inculturation, and leave the final two – liberation of the poor and a ministry of reconciliation – to non-seminary programs. I contend that seminaries must begin to look to all the tasks of mission, not to monopolize, but to be adequately holistic as institutions in the education, training, and mobilization of mission. From this perspective, U.S. institutions may have a great deal to learn from the inclusion of *misión integral* into their programs, just as Latin American schools might look to U.S. schools for specific development courses. This mutual learning is why I have proposed the creation of joint degrees

between the two regions. In this section I will define joint degrees and why I choose such collaboration over other options like dual degrees, as well as highlight the andragogical benefits of residential joint degrees.

## Joint Degrees

Institutional collaboration in the form of joint or dual degrees is the way of the future of higher education. Joint degrees and dual degrees represent similar but different levels of collaboration in education. Obst, Kuder, and Banks (2011) define joint degrees as follows:

International joint degree programs are study programs collaboratively offered by two (or more) higher education institutions located in different countries. They typically feature a jointly developed and integrated curriculum and agreed-on credit recognition. Students typically study at the two (or more) partnering higher education institutions. Upon completion of the study program, students are awarded a single degree certificate issued and signed jointly by all institutions involved in the program (9).<sup>12</sup>

The difference between joint degree and dual/double degrees is subtle, in that with joint degrees, “[u]pon completion of the study program, students receive degree certificates issued *separately* by each of the institutions involved in the program,” (9).

87% of the U.S. institutions surveyed by the Institute of International Education and Freie Universität Berlin in 2009 (Obst and Kuder 2009) plan on developing more relationships to enhance internationalization (32). Globally, dual degrees tend to be more popular among institutions (6) for a number of factors. In comparing the two, dual degrees provide a broader range of flexibility for institutions, not the least of which is greater autonomy and even independence. Distinct programs may share as little as a few elective courses to be able to confer a dual degree, requiring little coordination or interdependence. The onus is on the student and not on the well-working collaboration between institutions or departments.

It is because of the very limited nature of interdependence in dual degrees that I recommend joint degrees instead, pushing for greater collaboration. In contrast to dual degrees, joint degrees require a high level of interdependence and attentiveness of two (or more) partnering authorities (Michael and Balraj 2003: 137). Such interdependence is complicated. The institutions must come together creatively (Spencer-Oatey 2012: 258) in mutually deferential partnership to ensure adequate curriculum development and to be accountable to each other in administration and in the delivery of their respective portions to the curriculum. Most joint degrees are created as stand-alone degrees rather than as add-ons to existing programs in most institutions (Obst, Kuder, and Banks 2011: 12). Because of this, more groundbreaking work is necessary to maintain standardization (20). Complications are exacerbated among differing cultural contexts, and even more so when done in multi-lingual collaborations.

It is precisely this kind of complication that makes such collaboration less attractive, and yet the overall missiological benefits are abundant. The rise in the number of global Christian higher education institutions, including seminaries (Carpenter 2008), and their increased recognition further accentuates the importance of collaboration. This is obvious, but what deterritorialization and hybridization have taught theological and missiological education is that we cannot function as independent islands. It is time that our “glocal” institutions begin to break impervious shells and interdependently influence one another. There has been a historic West-to-the-Rest hegemony, but this is tempered as non-Western institutions have inserted their much-needed voices. Tennent (2012) says, “We are clearly beyond the day when Western scholarship is viewed as the only non-hyphenated theology... We must engage in a new level of partnership which is fully bi-directional.”

The difficulty of interdependence without intentionally difficult arrangements such as joint degrees means that institutions will naturally err in more independent ways, losing the collaborative effort. As Sweeting (2012) has noted, seminary leaders must strive to find ways of connecting educational institutions. He provides a number of suggestions from library sharing, cross faculty exchange, projects, and collaborative research – all good things – but nothing so sticky and binding as considering joint degrees.

Unfortunately, in degree creation, dual degrees are likely to continue to be the more common due to the effort of joint degrees that must occur to make them successful and healthy (Obst, Kuder, and Banks



2011:35). A telling factor of such a trend is that the primary motivation for partnerships seems to stem from international recognition (Obst and Kuder 2009:6; Obst, Kuder, and Banks 2011:27) and institutional financial survival (Rizvi and Lingaard 2010:169). Sadly, there is little mention of the andragogical benefits of internationalization on the part of the institutions. It is the focus on recognition and finances over andragogical benefits that make the independence of dual degrees more attractive than joint degrees.

In the updated survey report from Obst, Kuder, and Banks (2011), student interest, research collaboration, and broadening educational offerings increased the motivation for institutions to collaborate on dual or joint degrees among surveyed institutions. Student interest stems from the desire for broader experiences, pride in multiple institutions, and access to the resources of those institutions (Michael and Balraj, 2003:135). Still, it appears that internationalization of higher education is more of a gimmick for competition in the global knowledge economy (Rizvi and Lingaard:173) rather than a “best practice” of collaboration. Such self-preserving motivation deepens the drive for competition and plays into a survival of the fittest, neo liberal, imaginary. It also fosters an economic attitude that makes it easy to “cut and run” when partnerships get complicated.

Another telling trend that may stunt international collaboration from the United States (despite planned increases of internationalization) is that U.S. students are less likely than their European counterparts to participate in such collaborative programs (Obst and Kuder 2009:5). One possible reason for this is that U.S. institutions and students do not seem to value the study abroad experience as highly as others in the world (27). While U.S. institutions do intend to expand their joint and dual degree programs, more than half of the survey respondents plan to *only* increase dual degree offerings, (Obst, Kuder, and Banks 2011:35). Latin America as a region seems to value internationalization even less (Gacel-Ávila 2011), with little student or faculty interest. As institutions plan for increasing their joint and dual degree offerings, such low interest across the Americas has dramatic impact on the actual establishment of complicated formal joint degree programs in higher education in both regions. Until these degrees are understood beyond their potential for competition, and for true global collaboration, it is likely that such degrees will remain only gimmicks for institutional survival in a neo liberal globalization context.

Yet, seminaries the world over can be prophetic and seek to promote the collaborative benefits of joint degrees. As institutions claiming to engage the world, it is precisely for this reason that mission programs must undertake the task of pursuing joint degrees and prophetically lead the academy in true global collaboration. Many of our missiological students are earnestly hoping to work in cross-cultural contexts, and as such an internationalized education is all the more appropriate for them. However, our programs might reflect this in theory but often do not in practice. This gap between intentions and practice provides a “hidden curriculum” of institutional superiority for U.S. institutions. Joint degrees, however, can move beyond the imperialistic hidden curriculum to advocate for new collaborative models and post-colonial deference in mission.

### **Andragogical Benefits**

Aside from being prophetic, there are practical andragogical benefits to joint degrees. I intentionally choose the word andragogy here rather than pedagogy, because, in many conceptual ways andragogy is the opposite of pedagogy (see Table 1 of Taylor and Kroth 2009:47). They are not dichotomistic, but spectral, as pedagogy is more teacher-oriented by knowledge transmission whereas andragogy is learner-oriented through knowledge facilitation. The distinction between andragogy and pedagogy remains contested (Reichman 2005), but I favor a definition of missiological education that emphasizes facilitating or liberating rather than one that is transmitting or “banking” (Freire 2004) in nature. A key component of andragogy is the student’s self-directed, autonomous, and independent drive for learning (Chan 2010:27), but I would advocate that true andragogy in a globalized world moves beyond the dependence-independence or oppressive-liberating dichotomies towards truly learning *interdependence* and collaboration (Banks 1999: Kindle location 320).

Christian mission has a stained colonial history with regard to dependency (Kollman 2011) as does international development (Gunder Frank 1969/2007; Cardoso 1972/2007). Preferring program design around definitions and paradigms of andragogy rather than pedagogy promotes postures of collaboration and interdependence. If we are educating adult-learners to be reflective around collaboration and interdependence, specifically those who might serve in foreign, multi-, or cross-cultural contexts, we must also allow space for education to truly happen in

contexts other than those directly familiar to the student and under the tutelage of education facilitators immersed in those contexts. Slibach (2010) writes, “Such an imposed distance from normative life...creates a state of liminality, moments out of ordinary time and place, wherein rules about old structures and identities are broken in order to create new ways of looking at reality,” (35).

The benefit to andragogical learning for students stems from a temporal residential cross-cultural exchange between partnering schools. I suggest here mandatory residency requirements in and around each of the partnered institutions, further improving the student’s cross-cultural sensitivities, interdependency, and contextual learning. Zielinski (2007) concludes that “Longer term study abroad may provide the levels of exposure needed to develop higher levels of cross-cultural adaptability, while shorter experiences may not be enough to broaden the horizons of students,” (44). Hoksbergen (2011) states, “When asked what advice development professionals would give young people, an oft-repeated suggestion was, ‘tell them to get as much overseas experience as possible, to go on as many study abroad programs as they can,’” (138). The same can be said by many career missionaries, and such residency requirements add value to the degree program by sheer experience in local realities and increased perceptual acuity (Zielinski 2007:43). Students can complete their practicum requirements in the “foreign” institution while simultaneously taking necessary classes to complete the joint degree from that culture. Andragogically this is of key importance, and I suggest that students complete their practicum during *each* residential location to broaden their andragogical benefit.

Students prepared for collaboration must understand the complexities of place in the deterritorialized, hybridized, and glocal reality because place always influences discourse of movement and change (Escobar 2001:150). To understand the importance of place they must understand the disruption of place through migration, even if for a short period. In this way students come to realize the true influence that place holds in the development of missiological theory and practice. No student can “know” every place, especially places that are constantly in flux. However, through good andragogical practice one may help students to experience and reflect upon how a certain place influences mission and how development provides praxiological tools that can be carried into other “glocal” contexts. Such an opportunity allows students from the U.S. to come under the educative authority of those from other cultural contexts with different forms of thinking. They can be removed, to some extent, from their hegemonic

heritage through learning and collaborating with peers in another culture. For Latin American students, some of the and ragogical benefit is reversed. Rather than comply with a western missiological hegemony, they may take courses from their context and from Latin American scholars, but will also be able to critically incorporate external reflections on their own context when living and taking courses in the U.S. context.

Joint degrees require some level of praxis – action - reflection – and curricular integration. How missional education appropriates the action-reflection cycle and integration of curriculum is of great concern for Banks (1999), who writes:

Our thinking should be embodied, experiential, and contextual, not abstract, objective, and universal. The principle characteristics of such praxis are accountability to minority groups, collaborative reflection, lives-in-relation as an epistemological starting point, cultural diversity, and shared commitment to the work of justice” (Kindle location 320) .

Such action-reflection in multiple “glocal” contexts, under the direction of multiple institutions, will inevitably prepare the student for greater collaboration and interdependence.

## **Concluding Reflections**

---

Admittedly, this paper does not deviate far from the hegemonic principles that I chastised in my introduction. My proposal, considering my audience in the Association of Professors of Mission, inherently assumes initiation from U.S. seminaries. Missiology and development may also be perceived by some as hegemonic terms unhelpfully constructed and partitioned in the academy (Kollman 2011; Bullón 2013: 55). Yet we must begin, and have begun, to take steps towards minimizing U.S.-centric hegemony in mission. As U.S. educators, we come from within a specific system. Our own locale influences the way we pursue mission education. True collaboration is a process, but it takes intentionality to take strides

towards that collaborative process. As mostly representatives from U.S.-based institutions, what we might have to offer are already developed coursework in development studies and global justice. This does not mean that we dominate or monopolize the subject. However, these are resources for the formation of the student to engage in Schreiter's missional tasks of poverty alleviation and reconciliation. Pushing for opportunities in developing joint degree programs based on one-sided perception of value would negate true collaboration. However, it is nonetheless important to promote an assumption of value in these programs to explore collaborative institutional connections which may arise. Such initiation, if done with utter humility and respect for global partners, will produce positive outcomes not perceived at the outset. Such a posture of humility leaves room for collaboration that will truly educate the student in the context of third-wave of globalization, third-wave mission, and the responsibility of mission as reconciliation.

This study's restriction of masters-level degree programs immediately places a recognized U.S.-centric construct in the programs I assess. One might argue that such a restriction promotes a hegemonic imposition in my survey, interpreting education by constructs developed in U.S. education systems. Herein lays an administrative challenge for partnership and one not easily navigated. That seminaries in Latin America are recently adding master's degrees demonstrates their participation in globalization trends in educational systems. Administratively, for U.S. institutions conforming to accreditation, this need to focus on master's programs is difficult to overcome. Nonetheless, Caldwell and Wan (2012) remind us that, "[s]eminaries must especially resist the temptation to do everything in light of accrediting bodies and government regulations. If necessary, [they should] develop a separate Center that is linked to the existing training institution but still has its own relevant...program," (114). Such a discussion of accreditation concerns, however, goes beyond the scope of this paper.

An overall content survey of the Latin American seminaries reveals that mission programs provide the most emphasis in either the proclamation or interreligious dialogue tasks, and veer away from the tasks of poverty alleviation and a ministry of reconciliation. However, as mentioned above, some programs require courses in *misión integral*. Bullón (2013) writes the important, *El pensamiento social protestante y el debate latinoamericano sobre el desarrollo*. In it, he remarks how the Seoul Declaration of 1982 (Seoul Declaration 1982) was influenced by and influenced much of the thinking of early *misión integral* thinkers (Bullón

2013: 236). The declaration states: “Theology will have to give priority to problems related to justice and peace...” (Seoul Declaration 1982: 493). This led *misión integral* proponents to state that theology in Latin America must be based out of praxis, but that “this practice is linked to a primary obedience, a response to a call, that comes from the Word proclaimed to the believer,” (Bullón 2013: 239, translation mine). It is perhaps here that development is best reflected in the Latin American evangelical curriculum and is not so easily divorced from theological reflection. Alcántara Mejía (2001), writes, “A holistic Christian higher education must include a space of reflection on a person’s spiritual being, but it must also be pertinent, relevant, and adequate to the reality that a professional confronts...” (105, translation mine). This is key to the posture of *misión integral* courses in the curriculum. However, do the minimal amount of courses specifically titled to *misión integral* among the Latin American institutions actually help to produce professionals who can “constructively help the development of our peoples and be recognized for doing so?” (Bullón 2001: 197, translation mine). Is there not room for the inclusion of development specific courses alongside *misión integral* courses in our degrees?

Joint degrees in international development and mission are not *the only* answer, but are opportunities to take steps in global collaboration among seminaries to initiate mutual collaboration. Joint degrees bring together multiple locales, multiple places, to influence the education of mission for our students. They provide students a model for a hybridized, deterritorialized, praxiological andragogy that addresses third wave mission.

We have the technology and both the virtual and physical infrastructure, yet our programs do not sufficiently enable multi-contextual missional arenas and learning environments. We are content to either train future missionaries, sending them out as representative alumni of our institution; or perhaps, with online education, we allow missionaries to remain in their ministry contexts but drive a thoroughly U.S.-centric education, thus tempting students to not interact with missiology student peers that are studying at seminaries physically located in the context in which our distance-learning students are working. Timothy Tennent (2012) concludes his opening address to the Lausanne Convention of the 2012 consultation of global theological education by stating, “As theological educators we stand at the vanguard of a whole new day in helping to form, shape, and direct the future of the theological education of the church. To do so we must become more globally astute, more culturally savvy, more theologically nuanced, and more missionally driven.” I would also argue

here that we must become more educationally creative. Joint degrees are administratively complicated, but Caldwell and Wan (2012), emphasize that: "...institutions – whether majority world or North American – must resist the urge to conform uncritically to nineteenth-century faculty, courses, and curricula, as well as to standards that are simply not appropriate for twenty-first century...ministry" (114). Seminaries should not be content with mission education models of the nineteenth-century that are not adequate or applicable in light of the changing context of mission brought on by third-wave globalization. Joint degrees, when lifted from the shackles of protectionist ideals provide new models of collaboration for the twenty-first century. Our institutions are at stake, but more so than that, at stake is the pursuit of excellence in third wave mission as a response to third wave globalization.

## Notes

---

1. There is something to be said for competition improving quality of education from both institutional output and student input, however, the rapidly growing number of nuanced degrees in a short period of time provides more options without time-tested and evaluated programs. This especially seems to be the case in the number of online and hybrid lower-credit master's degrees that appear to be truncated generalist degrees compared to their more lengthy counterparts. There is, however, some creation of nuanced degrees with targeted specialization whose curriculum is unique in the Christian higher education field.
2. I contend here that such collaboration will also breed an appropriate competition for quality academics benefiting students and institutions.
3. It is beyond the scope of this paper to review how the field of development studies has changed in recent decades or to review the variation which continues to exist in development studies programs in the U.S., the UK, or in Latin America. As a general rule, however, it is helpful to describe development studies as a field which primarily draws on the social sciences. Economics (and especially Agricultural Economics), Sociology, and (increasingly) Anthropology are some of the fields which influence all sectors of development studies.
4. For more information about Multnomah University's program see <http://www.multnomah.edu/programs/graduate/ma-in-global-development-and-justice/>. For more information about Denver Seminary's program see <http://www.denverseminary.edu/academics/master-of-arts/justice-mission/>. Accessed on 13 September, 2014.
5. Eastern University began offering an MA in International Development as well beginning in 2006. For more information on Eastern University's program, see - <http://www.eastern.edu/3/>



academics/programs/school-leadership-and-development/ma-international-development-global-or-urban. Accessed on 13 September, 2014.

6. Content surveys can be conducted in this manner similarly for other geographic regions, for denominational institutions, different degree types, etc.
7. Key words include: “misiología,” “seminario,” “universidad cristiana,” “estudios interculturales,” “Americatina” “missiology,” “seminary,” “Christian university,” and “intercultural studies.”
8. For these searches, I combined the following search terms: “desarrollo internacional,” “maestría,” “seminario,” “desarrollo comunitario,” for the Latin American programs, and “international development,” “seminary,” “master’s degree,” and “community development” for the U.S. programs.
9. Eastern University has multiple programs in its School of Leadership and Development. Some of these focus on the United States’ urban context while others focus on developing countries.
10. SEMISUD already has a working relationship with Lee University. See [http://www.semisud.edu.ec/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=67&Itemid=90](http://www.semisud.edu.ec/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=67&Itemid=90) (accessed 1 June,, 2014). Adding Fuller Seminary as another institution may complicate matters. Such collaboration between SEMISUD and Lee University should be applauded. However, there is not a specific intention for a joint degree between SEMISUD and Lee, which therefore loses much of the and ragogical benefits discussed previously. In fact, upon first look, SEMISUD’s collaboration with Lee appears to create a dependency on Lee’s accreditation. The arrangement between SEMISUD and Lee need not negate a relationship between SEMISUD and Fuller regarding a missiological joint master’s degree with an emphasis on working with children-at-risk, but in this specific case, careful diligence must be done so as to truly collaborate rather than compete – especially in the case for Lee and Fuller – and mutually benefit all institutions.

11. For more information about Denver Seminary's programs in this regard see <http://www.denverseminary.edu/about/who-we-are/missional-commitments/> Accessed on 1 June 2014).
12. Michael and Balraj (2013) make an important distinction about collaborative degrees. They write, "While all joint degrees are collaborative in nature, not all collaborative degrees are joint degrees," (133). For instance a university-business partnership may be collaborative, but only one institution can confer the degree.

## Appendix A: List of U.S. and Latin American Institutions

---

### Latin American Institutions

Institution Name	Postgraduate Degrees in Research
SEMISUD	Maestría en Desarrollo Integral y Niños en Riesgo
Seminario Teológico de Puerto Rico (STDPR)	Maestría en Estudios Profesionales en Ministerios Cristianos con concentración en Misiones
Universidad Evangélica de las Américas (UNELA)	Maestría con Ciencias de la Religión con mención en Misiología
Programas de Maestría en Estudios Teológicos Accesibles (ProMETA)	Certificado en Misionología
Centro Evangélico de Misiología Andino-Amazónica (CEMAA)	Maestría en Misiología
Facultad Teológica Latinoamericana (FATELA)	Maestría en Misiones Transculturales Maestría en Teología Práctica con énfasis en Estudios Pastorales
FIET Instituto Teológico	Especialización en Teología y Misión
Recursos Estratégicos Globales (REG) <sup>1</sup>	Maestría de Misionología
Seminario Teológico Centroamericano (SETECA)	Maestría en Ministerio con Énfasis en Misión Urbana

### United States Institutions

Institution Name	Postgraduate Degrees in Research
Fuller Seminary	Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural Studies with an emphasis in Urban and International Development Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural Studies with an emphasis in Children at Risk
Multnomah University	Master of Arts in Global Development and Justice
Denver Seminary	Master of Arts in Justice and Mission
Carson-Newman College	Master of Arts in Applied Social Justice
Eastern University	Master of Arts or Master of Divinity in International Development Master of Arts in Urban Studies with a concentration in Community Development
Northern Seminary	Master of Arts or Master of Divinity in Christian Ministry with an emphasis on Christian Community Development

1. REG curriculum is housed in *Seminario Biblico de Puebla* – Mexico, *Seminario Teológico de la Iglesia de Dios* – Paraguay, *Seminario Bautista* – Cuba, *Instituto Biblico Ibero Americano* – Chile, and *Programa de Entrenamiento Biocupacional y Ministerial* – Argentina.

## Works Cited

---

- American Society of Missiology  
 2014 "Call for papers," 2014 Meeting of American Society of Missiology.
- Alcántara Mejía, J. R.  
 2001. "Sean transformados mediante la renovación de su mente': El reto cristiano en la encrucijada de la educación cristiana superior en Latinoamérica." *Presencia cristiana en el mundo académico*. S. Rooy (Ed.). Buenos Aires: Ediciones Kairos.
- Arbuckle, G. A.  
 2010. *Culture, inculturation, and theologians: A postmodern critique*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Banks, R.  
 1999 *Reinvisioning theological education: Exploring a missional alternative to current models*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bullón, H. F.  
 2001 "El docente cristiano y las ciencias económicas y sociales en el proceso de la transformación latinoamericano." *Presencia cristiana en el mundo académico*. S. Rooy (Ed.). Buenos Aires: Ediciones Kairos.
- Bullón, H. F.  
 2013 *El pensamiento social protestante y el debate latinoamericano sobre el desarrollo*. Grand Rapids, MI: Libros Desafío.
- Cadwell, L. W. & Wan, E.  
 2012 "Riots in the city: Replacing nineteenth-century urban training models with relevant "urbanized" training models for the twenty-first century." In *Reaching the city: Reflections on urban mission for the twenty-first century*. G. Fujino, T. R. Sisk, & T. C. Casiño (Eds.). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Cardoso, F. H.

1972/2007 “Dependency and development in Latin America.”  
In *The globalization and development reader: Perspectives on development and global change*. J. Timmons & A. B. Hite (Eds.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Carpenter, J.

2008 “Christian higher education as a worldwide movement.”  
*Journal of Latin American Theology*, 3 (1): 71-98.

Center for the Study of Global Christianity

2013 *Christianity in its global context, 1970–2020: Society, religion, and mission*. Retrieved from <http://www.gordonconwell.com/netcommunity/CSGCResources/ChristianityinitsGlobalContext.pdf>.

Chan, S.

2010 “Applications of andragogy in multi-disciplined teaching and learning.” *Journal of Adult Education*, 39 (2): 25-35.

Escobar, A.

2001 Culture sits in places: Reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography*, 20: 139-174.

Freire, P.

2004 *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, 30th Anniversary Edition, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Gacel-Ávila, J.

2011 “Comprehensive internationalization in Latin America.”  
*Trends and insights for international education leaders*.  
[http://www.nafsa.org/\\_/File/\\_/ti\\_latam\\_america.pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/ti_latam_america.pdf).  
Accessed on 7 October 2014.

Gunder Frank, A.

1969/2007 “The development of underdevelopment.” In *The globalization and development reader: Perspectives on development and global change*. J. Timmons & A. B. Hite (Eds.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Gutzler, A.  
2013 "Response to Robert Schreiter." In *The gift of mission yesterday, today, tomorrow* (Kindle edition). J. H. Kroeger (Ed.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Hoksbergen, R.  
2012 *Serving God globally: Finding your place in international development*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Kennedy, P.  
2010 *Local lives and global transformations: Towards world society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kollman, P.  
2011 "At the origins of mission and missiology: A study in the dynamics of religious language." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 79 (2): 425-458.
- Michael, S. O. & Balraj, L.  
2003 "Higher education institutional collaborations: An analysis of models of joint degree programs." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25 (2): 131-145.
- Moreau, A. S.  
2012 *Contextualization in world missions: Mapping and assessing evangelical models*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Myers, B. L.  
1999 *Walking with the poor: Principles and practices of transformational development*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Obst, D. & Kuder, M.  
2009 "Joint and double degree programs in the transatlantic context: A survey report." <http://www.iie.org/en/research-and-publications/publications-and-reports/iie-bookstore/joint-degree-survey-report-2009>. Accessed on 6 October 2014.

Obst, D., Kuder, M. & Banks, C.

2011 "Joint and double degree programs in the global context: Report on an international survey." <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/Joint-Degree-Survey-Report-2011>. Accessed on 6 October 2014. Reichman, J.

2008 "Andragogy." In *The Routledge International Encyclopedia of Education*. New York: Routledge, pages 23-24.

Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B.

2010 *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.

Slimbach, R.

2010 "Learning from the slums. Transformations at the edge of the world." In *Forming global Christians through the study abroad experience*. R. J. Morgan & C. Thoms Smedley (Eds.). Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press.

Seoul Declaration

1982 The Seoul Declaration: Toward an evangelical theology for the third world. *Missiology*, 10, 490-494.

Schreiter, R. J.

2005 The changed context of mission forty years after the council. *Verbum SVD*, 46 (1): 75-88.

Schreiter, R. J.

2013 "The future of missions *ad gentes* in a global context." *The gift of mission yesterday, today, tomorrow* (Kindle edition). J. H. Kroeger (Ed.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Spencer-Oatey, H.

2012 "Maximizing the benefits of international education collaborations: Managing interaction processes." *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17 (3): 244-261.



- Sweeting, D.  
2012 "The changing role of American seminaries in global theological education." Lausanne Consultation on Global Theological Education 2012, Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, (Boston, MA). <http://www.lausanne.org/en/multimedia/videos/theological-education-videos.html>. Accessed June 2014.
- Taylor, B. & Kroth, M.  
2009 "A single conversation with a wise man is better than ten years of study: A model for testing methodologies for pedagogy or andragogy." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9 (2): 42-56.
- Tennent, T.  
2012 "Theological education in the context of world Christianity." Lausanne Consultation on Global Theological Education 2012, Gordon Conwell Seminary, (Boston, MA). <http://www.lausanne.org/en/multimedia/videos/theological-education-videos.html>. Accessed June 2014.
- Walls, A.  
1991 "Structural problems in mission studies." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 15 (4): 146-155.
- Yamamori, T.  
2000 "Introduction." *El proyecto de Dios y las necesidades humanas*. C. R. Padilla & T. Yamamori (Eds.). Buenos Aires: Ediciones Kairos.
- Zielinski, B. A. Z.  
2007 Study abroad length of program influence on cross-cultural adaptability. (Masters Thesis). <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-04302007-105204/>. Accessed 6 October 2014.

