How to Work with Normativity in the Religious Education Faculty/Program?

Prof. dr. A. (Jos) de Kock

Jos de Kock is Professor of Practical Theology at and Rector of the Evangelical Theological Faculty, Leuven, Belgium (www.etf.edu)

Abstract
Working with normative considerations is an important part of empirical research on religious education and the formation of practical theologians in general and religious educators in RE faculties/programs in particular. How does a sufficient reflection on normativity look like in teaching religious educators? From a practical theological perspective, partly based on the theoretical frameworks of De Kock & Norheim (2018) and De Kock, Sonnenberg and Renkema (2018) directions for working with normativity in RE faculties/programs is provided and discussed on. These directions are based on taking empirical observations in RE practices (including the daily lifes of students) as a starting point for organizing pedagogical and theological reflection on the level of four layers of normativity: (1) discourse in religious practice, (2) professional theory of practice, (3) academic theory of practice, and (4) the metatheoretical foundation of observations of and research in practices.

1. Introduction

Working with normative considerations is an important part of empirical research on religious education and the formation of practical theologians in general and religious educators in RE faculties/programs in particular. How does a sufficient reflection on normativity look like in teaching religious educators? In this paper, from a practical theological perspective, partly based on the theoretical frameworks of De Kock & Norheim (2018) and De Kock, Sonnenberg and Renkema (2018) directions for working with normativity in RE faculties/programs are provided and discussed on.

These directions are based on a practical theological perspective in which (a) the empirical reality of the here and now is taken as a main source for developing theological reflection, (b) a threefold set of empirical hermeneutical skills is applied (observation as reception, listening as reception, and learning language), and (c) a thorough reflection on four layers of normativity in studying religious practices is advocated: (1) discourse in religious practice, (2) professional theory of practice, (3) academic theory of practice, and (4) the metatheoretical foundation of observations of and research in practices.

These directions have been elaborated in more detail earlier this year in an inaugural address at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven (Belgium), in which I presented the directions for sufficient reflection on normativity taking *learning in encounter* as a guiding principle for practices of religious education and (practical) theology at Religious Education faculties/programs. Therefore, I start this paper in section 2 with a discussion of how the concept of learning in encounter can be understood. Next, in section 3 the particular practical theological perspective in the paper's argument is explained focusing on the empirical as a source for theological reflection. In the short fourth section I present the threefold set of empirical hermeneutical skills which are fundamental for religious educators in RE faculties/programs, where in section 5 the four layers of normativity are discussed. Section 6 concludes with a discussion of directions for working with normativity in RE faculties/programs.

2. On learning in encounter

In the article "What about Learning in Practical Theological Studies: Towards more Conceptual Clarity", I give an overview of descriptions and interpretations of what can be understood as "learning" in relation to faith and religion, together with an overview of normative and pragmatic approaches to the concept and practice of learning.[1] In the article, I argue that in both religious practices and academic research, the way learning is conceived and searched for is partly based in interpretational and normative frameworks that meet particular conditions in a particular context and time. In this paper, I propose to choose a concept of learning that starts from the observation that learning is relational; i.e., an intersubjective activity that can be understood technically and pedagogically as a social process,[2] and theologically understood as a phenomenon situated in the encounter with God and each other.[3] Partly following the research outcomes of the PhD projects

---

[1] A. De Kock, "What about *Learning* in Practical Theological Studies. Towards more Conceptual Clarity," *SAGE Open* (2015), DOI: 10.1177/2158244015592682.

[2] Ibid., 6.

[3] Ibid., 7.

of former colleagues Ronelle Sonnenberg[4] and Harmen van Wijnen[5] in particular among youth I would say that learning in encounter has both an interpersonal and dialogical aspect, and a participating and acting aspect.

During a paper presentation I held at the annual meeting of the Religious Education Association in 2017, I elaborated somewhat on the concept of learning in encounter.[6] I stated that developing oneself as an individual cannot be done without others. In other words: Without others, you cannot become yourself and be yourself. Who you are as an individual depends on others with whom you are in a relationship. It is difficult to speak about yourself without speaking about others. However, in how upbringing is written and spoken about nowadays, we commonly observe "the individual without the others": "To grow up means to discover who you are as a unique human being"; "In the end, education's aim is the child being able to be authentic." The implicit message of these kinds of comments is that the child should not be brought up to be dependent on others or even be influenced by others. Frequently, this slips into high rates of individualism, pressure to achieve, and consequently, "stressful" educational ideals.

In response, various pedagogues, teachers, and politicians are pleading for a more relational approach to the individual and, as a consequence, a more relational approach to education, whether in schools or in the home. The most important prerequisite for such an approach is education that gives space, also in a literal sense, to share life with others; to provide opportunities to the child to let others' lives be part of the child's life. To let others' lives be part of your own life is not a passive thing, but something active: it demands a conscious choice. Through these encounters, the child becomes more human and the other becomes more human.

One might say that a great number of expectations from the environment, pressure to achieve, and the complicatedness of finding out who you are in a liquid world, and even a liquid church,[7] lead young people to a stressful (religious) identity development process accompanied by feelings of tiredness and forlornness as main stress responses.[8] In struggling with this, children and youth can be helped by educators who say: "wait a minute, let's take time to be attentive to each other and oneself"; these are the educators (whether as parents, as teachers in school, or as youth workers in the church) who stimulate learning in encounter as a key part of formation in general and religious formation in particular. In the words of Castelli, such an approach asks for a pedagogy of faith dialogue.[9] Besides taking time, faith dialogue as a pedagogy of religious

---

[4] P.M. Sonnenberg, and M. Barnard, "Educating Adolescents through Christian Youth Worship. Reclaiming Space for Learning in Liturgical Context," *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (2012), Art. #1111, 8 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v68i2.1111.; P.M. Sonnenberg, M. Nel, A. De Kock, and M. Barnard, "Being Together in Youth Worship: An Empirical Study in Protestant Dutch Contexts," *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (2015), art. #2832, 10 pages, DOI: 10.4102/hts.v71i2.2832.

[5] H. Van Wijnen, "Faith in Small Groups of Adolescents. Being Together as a Basic Given" (PhD Thesis, Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, 2016).

[6] A. De Kock, "Raising a Child is Madness: Learning in Encounter and Foundations of Education," *Paper presented at the 2017 REA Annual Meeting, St Louis (MO), Nov 3-5.*

[7] P. Ward, *Liquid Church* (Peabody (MA): Hendrickson, 2002).

[8] Compare C. Klaassen, *Socialisatie en moraal. Onderwijs en waarden in een laat-moderne tijd* (Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant, 1996); A. Verbrugge, *Tijd van onbehagen. Filosofische essays over een cultuur op drift* (Amsterdam: SUN, 2004); A. De Kock, "Religieuze identiteitsontwikkeling en -vorming van christenjongeren in een moderne context. Master thesis Godgeleerdheid, Universiteit Utrecht" (PhD Thesis, Universiteit Utrecht, 2008).

[9] M. Castelli, "Faith Dialogue as a Pedagogy for a Post Secular Religious Education," *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 33, no. 2 (2012): 207–216.

education entails "seriousness, humility, hesitation, articulation and imagination."[10] Castelli suggests that "[a]n encounter through dialogue will entail change if only a growth in an understanding of the other. Self and the other may not be seeking assimilation or domination, but neither are they totally detached or unchanged by the encounter."[11] A growth in the understanding of the other is in itself a win, but at the same time, understanding the other is part of a reciprocal process in which there is also a growth in understanding yourself. In this way, learning in encounter can be a basic and promising approach to learning for religious educators in both schools and faith communities.

Learning in encounter as a promising approach is echoed in (academic) discourses on religious education in different ways. With regard to formation at school, in one of his blog posts, my colleague and Flemish religious educator Bert Roebben recently stated: "One learns to get engaged in the "together" of society (socialization) by learning experiences in the living presence of others. To become a person (subjectification) requests time – collision and affirmation, feedback and appreciation"[12] Learning in encounter in schools, including in religious education in schools, is thus needed for becoming a successful participant in society. However, this necessity is not limited to schools. Religious education in faith communities is, in the words of Thomas H. Groome, a 'pressing social issue,'[13] and in line with that statement, faith communities should stimulate respectful encounters for their (young) participants. Groom states: "[T]he first responsibility of religious educators is to inform and form people in their own particular tradition, giving them a sense of belonging to a spiritual home. We must ground them in the particular, however, in a way that diligently discourages sectarianism and bitterness toward 'others'. Let us enable people, instead, to embrace the universality of God's love for all humankind and to respect and appreciate all life-giving religious traditions."[14]

This exact metaphor of an embrace is also used by Miroslav Volf, but in relation to embracing others: "the most basic thought that it seeks to express is important: *the will to give ourselves to others and "welcome" them, to readjust our identities to make space for them, is prior to any judgment about others, except that of identifying them in their humanity.* The *will to embrace* precedes any 'truth' about others and any construction of their 'justice'. This will is absolutely indiscriminate and strictly immutable; it transcends the moral mapping of the social world into 'good' and 'evil'."[15] My Czech colleague Frantisek Stech recently linked Volf's theology of an embrace with the 'youth theology' Bert Roebben portrays in his reflections on religious education and youth ministry: "Youth theology is a form of living theology in the presence of the (young) other; it is doing theology with open arms ready to embrace our fellow human beings, the realities of this world, as well as God who is the (Triune) One searching for

---

[10] Ibid., 213.

[11] Ibid., 210.

[12] English translation from a passage in B. Roebben, "*Menswording als vorming. Pleidooi voor meer eenvoud op school,*" Blog May 9, 2019: https://bertroebben.blogspot.com/2019/05/menswording-als-vorming-pleidooi-voor.html?fbclid=IwAR16AErrA3xwQk4pkhw8CEVEgcuq7DS9cSLXMxoTZxtAhro7m0RXYZdIYOE

[13] T. H. Groome, *Will There Be Faith? A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples* (New York: HarperOne, 2011), 11.

[14] Ibid.

[15] M. Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville (TN): Abingdon Press, 1996), 29.

each of us with open arms."[16] This is how learning in encounter can be related to faith formation among young people.

These different voices illustrate how the concept of learning in encounter is present in current debates on religious formation. These and other voices need further reflection by professionals in schools and faith communities, and also by (practical) theologians and religious educators involved in research and teaching on practices of religious education. We can detect at least four key issues for further reflection in terms of both theological and pedagogical consequences of an approach of learning in encounter: goals, identity, authority, and safety.[17] When it comes to the issue of goals, a main question for religious educators is: is there any important goal involved in encountering the other which steers the educational learning process or the process of bringing up the child? If so, what is that goal?

With regard to the issue of identity, a second main question for reflection is: from what conception of identity do religious educators arrange the educational context? Different views of identity can be at work in practices of religious education and youth ministry that can be both pedagogically and theologically loaded.[18] Who is the child, from a theological and/or pedagogical perspective, and what does that mean for why and how they are learning in encounter?

Next, an important field of reflection on theological and pedagogical consequences of learning in encounter is the issue of authority. What or who is authoritative when it comes to decisions in life: voices 'from outside,' like structures given in society or the local community, or voices coming 'from within,' from the heart, so to say? An encounter with someone who is different might challenge authority structures that the child is used to. The conscious choice to share life with the other who is different is a conscious choice to open up the realm of possibilities, by way of authority located in the other, to critique one's own voice and views, to correct one's own opinions, and to develop one's own identity further.

A fourth key issue for further reflection is that of safety. Learning in encounter with the other is not without risk. A child might lose the sense of self through contact with others; in the relationship between the educator and the child, there is also a risk of children losing themselves through becoming totally focused on meeting the expectations of educators in all kinds of ways. Learning in encounter thus asks for a safe atmosphere in which the child's integrity is safeguarded and where the child is not forced to lose that sense of self. Education directed toward the encounter with the other who is different should reflect on the issue of integrity: how do we safeguard it; where do we define limits (if at all / if needed) in challenging children to "lose" parts of themselves?

These four key issues are in a way reflecting core questions to be embraced in a sufficient reflection of religious educators on normativity. I will elaborate on that in sections 5 and 6.

3. A Practical Theological Perspective: the Empirical as a Source for Theological Reflection

Now we first turn to what it means to take a practical theological perspective in a sufficient reflection on normativity in Religious Educations faculties/programs.

---

[16] F. Stech, "Emerging youth theology and the theology of embrace," *Unpublished paper* (2019), https://www.academia.edu/39581926/Emerging_Youth_Theology_and_the_Theology_of_Embrace.

[17] De Kock, "Raising a Child is Madness."

[18] Ibid. In the paper three conceptions of identity are discussed: an intra- , inter- , and suprapersonal conception.

The study object of practical theology is religious praxis,[19] and its strategic goal is the description, interpretation, and ultimately, the enhancement of religious praxis.[20] Taking on a practical theological perspective in the study of (theological) phenomena is then, more precisely, taking the empirical reality of the here and now as a main source for developing theological reflection.[21] For the academic study of youth ministry, for example, my Norwegian colleague Norheim and I recently discussed how studying the empirical can be the starting point to "gain insight into both the descriptions and interpretations of religious self-understandings or faith constructs of young people and to be able to build theology and design practices in which these insights are taken seriously."[22] After taking it as a main source for theological reflection, an important task for the scholar taking on a practical theological perspective is to then search for interactions between the empirical data and the theological and nontheological interpretative and normative frameworks.[23]

By presenting the practical theological perspective in this way, we see reflected in it the four tasks of a practical theologian as identified by Osmer (2008): (a) the descriptive–empirical task, (b) the interpretive task, (c) the normative task, and (d) the pragmatic task.[24] What I learned from conducting a large variety of practical theological research together with colleagues and students over the past ten years is that two particular concerns related to tasks (a) and (c) ask for greater than average levels of attention. The first concern is what skills and attitude are needed for an adequate description of religious praxis as an empirical phenomenon. The second concern is how to adequately incorporate a (theological) reflection on normativity that is at work at different levels in an empirical research project on religious practices.

What I propose here as what constitutes a practical theological perspective is particularly addressing these two concerns. To adopt a practical theological perspective in the academic reflection on religious praxis means that the practical theologian (a) takes the empirical reality of the here and now as a main source for developing theological reflection, (b) applies a threefold set of empirical hermeneutical skills in the empirical investigation of religious praxis, and (c) thoroughly reflects on four layers of normativity in empirical research on religious praxis.

Taking the empirical reality of the here and now as a main source for developing theological reflection is based on the assumption, or the theological belief, that God reveals himself in Scripture, tradition, reason, and also in human experience.[25] In my view, considering Scripture as the most important source of God's revelation, a practical theologian, at the same time, gives particular weight to current-day experiences as a 'source of justification' in the theological reflection on religious phenomena.[26] A practical theological perspective asks for the researcher to encounter the empirical, which results in learning theologically. The encounter with

---

[19] R. R. Ganzevoort and J. Roeland, "Lived Religion: The Praxis of Practical Theology," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 18, no. 1 (2014): 91–101.

[20] H. G. Heimbrock, "Practical Theology as Empirical Theology," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 14, no. 2 (2011): 153–170.

[21] A. De Kock and B. E. H. Norheim, "Youth Ministry Research and the Empirical," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 22, no. 1 (2018): 69–83.

[22] Ibid., 71.

[23] De Kock and Norheim, "Youth Ministry Research and the Empirical." Pagina?

[24] R. R. Osmer, *Practical Theology. An Introduction* (Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans, 2008). Pag?

[25] See De Kock and Norheim, "Youth Ministry Research and the Empirical," 80.

[26] See R.R. Osmer, "Practical Theology: A Current International Perspective," *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 67, no. 2 (2011), #Art. 1058, 7 pages. http://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v67i2.1058.

the empirical can take different forms, varying from a somewhat distanced encounter as an observer of religious practices to an engaged encounter where the researcher is part of and a participant in the religious practice under study.

4. Threefold set of empirical hermeneutical skills

In encountering the empirical, the practical theologian uses a threefold set of empirical hermeneutical skills: observing as reception, listening as reception, and learning language.[27] This set of skills has been suggested for doing empirical youth ministry research in particular, but I see no reason not to widen the scope to practical theological research in general. The skill of observation as reception means that the practical theologian is fundamentally involved in observing people's faith practices, continuously balancing an apophatic mode (being silent and hesitant being unable to describe the One beyond sensation) and cataphatic mode (trying to describe traces of God and God's attributes). The second skill of listening as reception means that the practical theologian is fundamentally involved in the skill of listening to people's voices, balancing an apophatic and cataphatic mode, "which makes listening not mere registration of words and expressions but a hermeneutical struggle in itself."[28] Both observation and listening are done in a mode of reception, which means a mode of 'being with the other' and 'being with the faith practice,' thus being open to what comes to the researcher and being attentive to what comes from within the researcher oneself. When it comes to the third skill of learning language, De Kock and Norheim explain: "The youth ministry scholar and practitioner is continuously learning language with which revelations of God and experiences of faith can be described and theologically reflected on, in a way which is appropriate for the flesh and blood experiences of young people."[29] In terms of the broader scope of the practical theological perspective I propose here, learning language is the challenge to communicate what can be learned theologically from the encounter with the empirical in a way that is simultaneously appropriate for the practice under study and constructive for theological reflection in a broader academic discourse.

5. Four Layers of Normativity

In encountering the empirical, the practical theologian should also reflect on four layers of normativity in empirical research on religious praxis. The distinctions between and descriptions of these four layers of normativity come from the work my colleagues Sonnenberg and Renkema and I recently published with regard to the question of how one could adequately reflect on normativity in youth ministry and religious education research.[30] This question was raised because we found out that in research reports, it was not uncommon for practical theologians to fail to explicitly reflect on how normativity is existent in practices under study, or how normativity has been impacting or directing (in both wanted and possibly unwanted ways) the design, execution, and reporting of the empirical study undertaken. Following De Kock, Sonnenberg, and Renkema (2018), I distinguish between four layers of normativity: (1) the layer

---

[27] De Kock and Norheim, "Youth Ministry Research and the Empirical."

[28] Ibid., 81.

[29] Ibid.

[30] A. De Kock, R. Sonnenberg, and E. Renkema, "Normativity in Empirical Youth Ministry Research," *Journal of Youth and Theology* 17, no. 2 (2018): 81–103.

of discourse in religious practice; (2) the layer of professional theory of practice; (3) the layer of academic theory of practice; and (4) the layer of the metatheoretical foundation of the research project.

(1) The layer of discourse in religious practice is about verbal, non-verbal, and text-based discourses that become visible in practices. "These discourses reflect standards and convictions in the tradition of the practice, as well as the current standards and convictions of actors (including the researcher) in the practice."[31] (2) The layer of professional theory of practice is about "standards and convictions situated in operant theories of practice or, in other words, theories of practice at work. This layer has particularly to do with normativity as observed in theories construed on the basis of or directing performances in these religious practices."[32] (3) The layer of academic theory of practice is about "normativity situated in academic theories of practice that can be found in handbooks, academic journal articles, scientific theories, and so on."[33] (4) The layer of the metatheoretical foundation of the research project has to do with "how the researcher, the research group, or the research community considers the particular empirical research study in terms of how the empirical, the theoretical concepts, and the personal convictions and experiences of the researcher are related to one another."[34]

Trying to bring this practical theological perspective back to the core, I would say that a practical theologian continuously says to oneself: "Wait a minute: set aside the quick-fix analysis, be open and receptive in encountering the other and the otherness, to what you see and hear."

6. Directions for Working with Normativity in RE Faculties/Programs

One of the important consequences of what has been sketched above for RE faculties/programs is that students are to be stimulated to constantly engage (positive) critically with RE approaches taught in the handbooks they might use. The approaches in these handbooks contain lots of wisdom, and we can definitely use them to be educated as religious educator. At the same time, students (and their teachers!) should be asked for critically exposing normativities in these approaches and bringing them into critical dialogue with what can be experienced in encounters with faith practices and theological practices in the here and now.

Furthermore, methodologically, this means that for students, the principal of learning in encounter should be translated into qualitative research designs using good interviewing techniques and ethnographical methods through which data are gathered by observing carefully and listening attentively, and subsequently analyzed in such a way that sufficient language is found to communicate about the results of the research. This resembles the approach of a hermeneutic-phenomenological methodology for theology that Horner recently proposed in the International Journal of Practical Theology.[35] This hermeneutic-phenomenological methodology encourages practical theologians to refrain "from making judgements in advance about the kinds of phenomena it is possible to encounter."[36] It asks the practical theologian to open oneself to "what gives itself and use phenomenological, hermeneutical, and possibly, also, theological tools

---

[31] Ibid., 86.

[32] Ibid., 87.

[33] Ibid., 88.

[34] Ibid.

[35] R. Horner, "Towards a Hermeneutic-Phenomenological Methodology for Theology," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 22, no. 2 (2018): 153–173.

[36] Ibid., 153.

to uncover its meaning."[37] Horner argues, for example, that "[i]n evaluating what research participants describe of their experience in relation to God, we may well be looking for events, which we can … define as descriptions of *happenings that are of such significance that they radically transform the world of the participant*. Such transformation will not prove the divine origin of events but will enable us to interpret experiences in light of this possibility."[38]

In order to learn this methodological approach in religious education faculties/programs, I found Deborah Court's excellent book *Qualitative Research and Intercultural Understanding – Conducting Qualitative Research in Multicultural Settings* to be extremely helpful.[39] The book is helpful precisely because it positions qualitative research as a personal encounter of the researcher with the other and with otherness: "In qualitative research the researcher is a research participant no less than those whom s/he is studying. Qualitative researchers collect and analyse data through the lens of who they are. Their research journey involves both utilizing and seeing beyond their experiences, knowledge bases and values in order to arrive at understanding of the lives of the research participants."[40] This book can help students to critically engage in the strengths and weaknesses of research designs and instruments used in actual research projects and to critically engage with ideas for research designs and instruments to be developed.[41]

All in all, I plead for an approach in RE faculties/programs that will help students to wait a minute. To wait a minute and give a real encounter with the object of study a chance; reflecting on how to best try to understand what is going on. To wait a minute to weigh alternatives to (RE) theories with which to understand and analyze RE practices and also to design research instruments for studying these practices.

Based on the examples of three outstanding congregational rabbis, through combining their biographical portraits with analyses based on educational scholarship, Sarah Tauber has come up with three crucial roles adult religious educators should hold: being facilitators, being co-learners, and being community builders.[42] Although these three rabbis' learning groups in their synagogues are different from the student community engaged in RE faculties/programs, I find this threefold teacher role inspiring for that particular context too. The threefold role mainly serves what I conceive of as learning in encounter. To be a facilitator as a teacher means, among other things, to be approachable, moderating discussion, guiding text study, and motivated by "a commitment to the dignity of every learner."[43] To be a co-learner requires humility which "helps establish an inclusive and egalitarian learning environment"[44] where teachers and learners are fellow learners engaged in a transformative learning process. To be a community builder means that the learning process generated empowers learners "to contribute to the vitality of their communities"[45] by being directed toward cooperation with others and not primarily their own agency.

---

[37] Ibid., 160.

[38] Ibid., 172.

[39] D. Court, *Qualitative Research and Intercultural Understanding. Conducting Qualitative Research in Multicultural Settings* (Londen: Routledge, 2018).

[40] Ibid., x.

[41] For example, what is proposed with regard to interviewing techniques in practical theology in E.R. Campbell-Reed and C. Scharen, "Ethnography on Holy Ground: How Qualitative Interviewing Is Practical Theological Work," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 17, no. 2 (2013): 232–259.

[42] S. M. Tauber, *Open Minds, Devoted Hearts. Portraits of Adult Religious Educators* (Eugene (OR): Pickwick, 2015).

[43] Ibid., 116.

[44] Ibid., 131.

[45] Ibid., 146.

As facilitators, co-learners, and community builders, teachers in RE faculties/programs can enhance learning in encounter, which is a creative process in research, education, and valorization. Students in these RE faculties/programs should be helped with sufficient reflexivity on normativity on different layers in the engagement with religious praxis. In my view, supporting students in their identity development process is definitely served by a thorough knowledge of and reflection on the four levels of normativity I outlined in this paper. In particular where the Religious Education program is part of a theological faculty, I believe that the theme of normativity should be reflected on with contributions from the full range of biblical, historical, systematic, and practical theology, and religious studies. It is highly important to work on a sufficient understanding of the role of normativity and its different aspects among scholars in the theological faculty. As a consequence, in-depth attention to how normativity is 'at work' in research studies and in the personal thoughts and practices of teachers and students is critical.

Bibliography

Campbell-Reed, E.R., and C. Scharen. "Ethnography on Holy Ground: How Qualitative Interviewing is Practical Theological Work." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 17, no. 2 (2013): 232-59.

Castelli, M. "Faith Dialogue as a Pedagogy for a Post Secular Religious Education." *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 33, no. 2 (2012): 207-16.

Court, D. *Qualitative Research and Intercultural Understanding. Conducting Qualitative Research in Multicultural Settings*. London: Routledge, 2018.

De Kock, A. "Raising a Child is Madness: Learning in Encounter and Foundations of Education." *Paper presented at the 2017 REA Annual Meeting, St Louis (MO), Nov 3-5.*

———. "Religieuze identiteitsontwikkeling en -vorming van christenjongeren in een moderne context. Master thesis Godgeleerdheid, Universiteit Utrecht." Universiteit Utrecht, 2008.

———. "What about *Learning* in Practical Theological Studies. Towards more Conceptual Clarity." SAGE Open (2015), DOI: 10.1177/2158244015592682.

De Kock, A., and B. E. H. Norheim. "Youth Ministry Research and the Empirical." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 22, no. 1 (2018): 69–83.

De Kock, J., R. Sonnenberg, and E. Renkema. "Normativity in Empirical Youth Ministry Research." *Journal of Youth and Theology* 17, no. 2 (2018): 81-103.

Ganzevoort, R. R., and J. Roeland. "Lived Religion: The Praxis of Practical Theology." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 18, no. 1 (2014): 91–101.

Groome, T. H. *Will There Be Faith? A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples*. New York: HarperOne, 2011.

Heimbrock, H. G. "Practical Theology as Empirical Theology." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 14, no. 2 (2011): 153–70.

Horner, R. "Towards a Hermeneutic-Phenomenological Methodology for Theology." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 22, no. 2 (2018): 153–73.

Klaassen, C. Socialisatie en moraal. Onderwijs en waarden in een laat-moderne tijd. Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant, 1996.

Osmer, R.R. *Practical Theology. An Introduction.* Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans, 2008.

Osmer, R.R. "Practical Theology: A Current International Perspective." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 67, no. 2 (2011), #Art. 1058, 7 pages. http://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v67i2.1058.

Roebben, B. "Menswording als vorming. Pleidooi voor meer eenvoud op school." Blog May 9, 2019. Accessed July 6, 2019. https://bertroebben.blogspot.com/2019/05/menswording-als-vorming-pleidooi-voor.html?fbclid=IwAR16AErrA3xwQk4pkhw8CEVEgcuq7DS9cSLXMxoTZxtAhro7m0RXYZdIYOE.

Sonnenberg, P.M., and M. Barnard. "Educating Adolescents Through Christian Youth Worship. Reclaiming Space for Learning in Liturgical Context." *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (2012), Art. #1111, 8 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v68i2.1111.

Sonnenberg, P.M., M. Nel, A. De Kock, and M. Barnard (2015). "Being Together in Youth Worship: An Empirical Study in Protestant Dutch Contexts." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (2012), art. #2832, 10 pages, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i2.2832.

Stech, F. "Emerging youth theology and the theology of embrace." *Unpublished paper (2019)*. Accessed July 6, 2019. https://www.academia.edu/39581926/Emerging_Youth_Theology_and_the_Theology_of_Embrace.

Tauber, S. M. *Open Minds, Devoted Hearts. Portraits of Adult Religious Educators.* Eugene (OR): Pickwick, 2015.

Van Wijnen, H. "Faith in Small Groups of Adolescents. Being Together as a Basic Given." PhD Thesis. Protestantse Theologische Universiteit, 2016.

Verbrugge, A. *Tijd van onbehagen. Filosofische essays over een cultuur op drift.* Amsterdam: SUN, 2004.

Volf, M. *Exclusion and Embrace. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation.* Nashville (TN): Abingdon Press, 1996.

Ward, P. *Liquid Church.* Peabody (MA): Hendrickson, 2002.