The Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology:
A New Model of Doctoral Research in the UK

Zoë Bennett
David Lyall

Summary
The essay describes a professional doctorate developed in the UK that seeks to foster interdisciplinary research and learning in practical theology as preparation for chaplaincy.

Introduction

Yesterday, I (ZB) posed for ceremonial photographs with my two most recent doctoral graduates, one of whom had researched schools chaplaincy and the other community chaplaincy. Today I will see a candidate who is the pastor of a Black Pentecostal church, researching how to raise the attainment of Black boys in British schools, tomorrow a woman who is researching the meanings same-sex couples give to their Civil Partnerships at the church where she ministers in London. These richly diverse doctoral research candidates are part of a programme which has been running in the UK since 2006—the Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology. It is currently located in four

_____
Dr. Zoë Bennett is the Director of Postgraduate Studies in Pastoral Theology in the Cambridge Theological Federation and Anglia Ruskin University, East Rd., Cambridge, UK, CB1 1PT (Email: zoe.bennett@anglia.ac.uk).

Dr. David Lyall, before retirement, taught Practical Theology and was Principal of New College at the University of Edinburgh. More recently he has been a Senior Associate of the Cambridge Theological Federation. He is an Honorary President of the British and Irish Association for Practical Theology (Email: lyall3@googlemail.com)..

universities: Anglia Ruskin University through the Cambridge Theological Federation, and the Universities of Birmingham, Chester, and Glasgow. I am the course director of the Anglia Ruskin University programme.

The Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology is mainly a part-time programme. Candidates are embedded in researching their 'professional' context; this may be either paid work or voluntary practice. The degree is conceptualised as moving from *practice to theory to practice* and requires that the thesis should not only make explicit a contribution to knowledge, but also a contribution to the practice context in which the candidate works and the professional development of the candidate themselves. The degree is entirely done by research with no taught elements other than research skills. It is contextual, in that a candidate must research his or her own practice and context. This has immediate appeal not only to practitioners but also to organisations, and has particular attractions in international contexts where capacity building in institutions and communities is of paramount concern.

Our candidates currently comprise Christians, Buddhists, a Muslim, and some who do not have a particular faith stance, although Christians are the majority. 'Participants are not required to have a personal faith-commitment but they should be interested in the role of religion, theology, and ethics in relation to a range of contexts ranging from social policy, management, politics, healthcare, community work, congregational ministry, and institutional chaplaincy.'[1] The emphasis is on critical reflection, and the expectation is that practical theology will be one of the academic disciplines used for that reflection. There are several reasons for the appeal of this programme: the nature of the research required, the significance of the peer cohort in which the candidates work, the supervisory relationship, and the emphasis on self-reflexivity. Furthermore, this final feature, reflexivity, offers an insight into possibilities for practical theology as a discipline beyond the specific context of the programme.[2]

The nature of the research: the programme in context

In recent years, the UK has seen a burgeoning interest in master's degrees in the field of ministry and pastoral/practical theology. While such programmes have provided an intellectual stimulus to participants, there has not been a route by which the best of these graduates could continue their professional development at doctoral level. For such people, the traditional

PhD is limited. These Master of Arts (MA) graduates are often practitioners not seeking academic careers for which the PhD is designed. Moreover, it is rarely possible for practitioners to take years out of a working life to engage in full-time study and further part-time study (more realistically 'spare-time' study) can be a lonely business and has a high drop-out rate.

For some people, the DMin programme, developed mainly in North America, has brought a renewal of their ministry particularly where British academic institutions have developed formal links with American seminaries. But these programmes, too, have their limitations. They are what they purport to be, doctorates in ministry and, therefore, limited in what they can offer to potential candidates wishing to reflect theologically on professional engagement in work situations and communities beyond traditional areas of ministry.

In setting up the Professional Doctorate, it was recognised that the whole degree should be designed at the doctoral level as defined by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), and also that it should be shaped by the needs of part-time candidates, often with major professional commitments. The discipline of practical theology, with its emphasis upon reflective practice, is peculiarly suited to candidates whose motivation for taking the degree is the enhancement of their own practice and professional context.

Candidates are required to submit a portfolio: Stage One consisting of three papers and Stage Two of a Research Dissertation. In Anglia Ruskin, this thesis is of 59,000 words, with an additional 7,000 for each of the Stage One papers, making the total number of words for the whole degree comparable to that of the traditional PhD. Paper One requires the candidate to situate the research in its professional context, and to begin an engagement with the relevant literature that enables a critical perspective on that context and on the research question. Key voices in the academic discipline of practical theology relevant to the candidates's context are identified.

Paper Two of Stage One is a 'Publishable Paper' normally submitted towards the end of the second year of the programme. The aim of this paper is to deepen the candidate's conceptual understanding in relation to their research question, and to enable them to grasp what is required to write a paper in which one topic is examined in depth and the findings communicated to a chosen audience. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a capacity for independent, original, and in-depth thinking.

Paper Three of Stage One consists of elements designed to prepare the candidate for the doctoral dissertation required for Stage Two. The first is a

research proposal. This must display a sophisticated understanding of the issues involved, philosophically, theologically, and practically. Appropriate research methodologies are identified together with issues of research design and associated ethical issues. The second element is the keeping of a Research Log and Learning Journal. This is a common practice in professional doctorates and while the journal remains the confidential property of the candidate, its insights can be a 'primary text' as the candidate, as a 'researching professional', engages in the kind of critical reflection required in the thesis.

Stage Two, the research dissertation, normally takes three further years. (The total maximum time of registration is six years). This dissertation must be an original contribution in the field of practical theology, with the fundamental 'research question' generated by the context of the candidate, and explored in depth throughout Stage One. For example, the Chief Executive of YMCA of a city in the North of England investigated the current status of the Christian faith in that organisation (Where is the 'C' in the 'Y'?) through research involving senior people in the organisation. While each candidate's working context and research project are unique to themselves, what has been critically important to this professional doctorate in practical theology has been the collaborative nature of the learning.

The Peer Cohort

> Being part of a cohort has contributed a number of qualities to the doctoral experience for me. On nights when I would happily light a fire and watch a film the thought of colleagues working on their research has motivated me to turn on the computer. The cohort has offered support (listening to my struggles in the balancing of family, work, and study commitments); it has provided encouragement through the shared motivation to relate theory to practice in a way that has academic credibility; it has been challenging ('what do you mean by...?', 'have you read...', 'how are you going to evidence that?') and it has given me a necessary level of competition (if they can finish that paper I'm jolly well going to!). Most importantly, though, being part of a cohort has set the doctoral process in a collaborative environment…Without the cohort I would probably be lighting lots of fires and watching too many films
>
> —Sally Buck, DProf candidate and theological educator

It is built into the expectations of a professional doctorate that there will be a peer cohort group which works together. As we have developed it in the DProf Practical Theology programme in the UK, the peer cohort has

two elements: 1) an annual national Summer School; and, 2) smaller regular workshops (some residential) in each university centre.

The Summer School includes input from an academic or a practitioner who has made a major contribution to practical theology. It has invariably followed the annual conference of the British and Irish Association for Practical Theology (BIAPT). Candidates are encouraged to attend the BIAPT conference, where they are further exposed to contemporary developments in the discipline through networking, lectures, seminars, and work-in-progress sessions (in which some of the more advanced candidates have profitably shared their own developing research).

Single centre meetings can have anything from four to 50 participants. Our group at Anglia Ruskin has stabled out at around 45, although meetings are often half that size as Stage One and Stage Two candidates may meet separately. We aim for a single start point in September so initially there is a year group, but normally this group starts to spread out like long distance runners on a track, as candidates have between three to six years to complete, and work at different paces, so the cohort comprises candidates at different stages of their work. Size matters. The group needs to be big enough to support one another, and not too large to lose the sense of personal interaction and support which Sally identifies. This support, which is fostered by candidates reading papers to one another, and by eating, socialising, and learning together, is vital to peer-critique and doctoral depth of learning.

Feedback repeatedly confirms Sally's assertion that relating theory to practice is at the intellectual heart of this research degree. The cohort sustains this: 'Being in the group confirms the value of theoretical work; [it is] an anchor point in the sea of experience' (P, a parish priest). Interestingly this *intellectual* impact of collaborative learning is frequently emphasised: 'The ability to share knowledge and the realities of learning in a secure and supportive environment such as my cohort provides, has had a positive intellectual impact' (Tessa, a Racial Justice Co-ordinator). This collaborative reflexivity has not only been central to candidate progress, but has enabled leaders in the programme to catch a new vision of something at the heart of the discipline of practical theology.

Equally important is the encouragement of the cohort group, which brings motivation and confidence, two factors which go a long way to explaining the excellent retention and completion rates. 'It makes a huge difference to be part of a learning community' (Anne). Or as another candi-

date and minster, Richard, put it: 'I found two candidates who like me had moved ministry posts. Their wisdom born of experience was most helpful when I was going through it…'

There are three key ingredients to the cohort workshops: 1) candidates sharing their work together through presentations to one another; 2) learning both to give and to receive critical feedback; and, 3) to respond to peer review are vital academic skills and part of training to be a researcher. Thus good practice as researchers is shared and reflectively discussed.

Sessions are designed to develop understanding of what it means to do research in practical theology. These may be generic research skill oriented, such as a presentation on doing case studies or developing the 'architecture' of the thesis;[3] or they may relate to the conceptuality and practice of practical theology in particular, such as 'using the Bible in practical theology,' or 'ethics in practical theological research.'

Outside speakers who can share examples of successful performance as theological researching professionals—ranging from a documentary filmmaker to a Jesuit priest working with migrants, from an art critic to a business professional; and, of course, former successful candidates.

The heart and genius of the cohort programme at all stages is collaborative learning. It is a community of practice.[4] 'I enjoy the fact that research subjects are so very diverse as the group seems to take on its own identity as a "community of enquiry"[5] in which mutual support is offered and received. Collaborative working is not only good educational practice; it also reflects what we believe to be an essential feature of practical-theological method itself. As one candidate, Susy (looking into how Catholic social teaching is best embedded in a faith-based agency) writes: 'My own research methodology, Theological Action Research, places great emphasis on conversation and it would be strange if this epistemology was not reflected in the DProf process.'

Supervision: Academic and Pastoral?

For the past 40 years, I (DL) have been involved in 'supervision' and as time has passed I have become increasingly aware that I have been using the word supervision to describe what are, theoretically at least, two different processes. One of these processes refers to the pastoral supervision of candidates on placement and people in ministry; the other refers to academic supervision of dissertations and theses at master's and doctoral level. This

came into sharp focus, in my previous appointment, when I supervised the master's dissertation of an ordinand, soon to become a full-time, Presbyterian minister. The candidate's father was a parish minister who became stressed around the time of Session meetings. For his dissertation, the ordinand decided to explore this phenomenon by interviewing several other ministers. He found that 'ecclesiogenic distress' was not uncommon! It was clear that his thesis was not simply of academic interest. He realised that this could be his lot in a couple of years. What became clear was that academic supervision could not take place apart from allowing this candidate to reflect upon the personal implications of his dissertation.

In the professional doctorate, the research conducted by candidates is not something detached from their lives, but is always a topic in which they have a huge professional and personal investment. The supervision of such candidates must take this into account so that the academic and professional/personal issues are 'neither separated nor confused.' Most of the previous experience of those who supervise for the professional doctorate has been either in relation to the traditional PhD, or in relation to supervision of reflective practice at a lower academic level than doctoral research. These supervisors did not initially have experience of supervising for a professional doctorate with its model of research which runs 'practice—theory—practice.' Through staff development and much collaborative learning we have developed a robust model of appropriate research supervision.

Sometimes it is possible/desirable to allocate two supervisors to a candidate. Joint supervision has many advantages when it goes well and can be disastrous when it does not! Joint supervision can provide a wider experience for the candidate and can enhance the educational process when the supervisors respect and trust one another enough to disagree openly, enabling the candidate to form a personal opinion as part of a living academic discussion. Furthermore it enables those who have more experience in professional doctorate supervision to train new supervisors 'on the job.' Finally, it allows the possibility of a researching professional to join the team alongside a supervisor who is an academic post-holder.

While competent academic supervision is fundamental, academic supervisors need to be aware of the personal and professional context of the candidate's research. Sometimes a sensitivity to, and acknowledgement of, this context is sufficient. Occasionally, however, there are perceived to be advantages in helping candidates work through such issues outside the academic supervision. For example, one Anglican priest was exploring the role

of self-supporting ministers within the Church of England. Since her experience as a self-supporting minister had not always been positive, she explored some of her personal experiences in that role with a pastoral supervisor who was not involved in her academic supervision.

The pastor who is researching how to raise the attainment of Black boys in British schools has had a chequered experience himself of growing up as a Black boy in a British school. Since his personal experience is a major source of data for his thesis, it was considered that he also might benefit from exploring his own experience beyond the boundaries of his academic supervision. He writes in his Research Log/Learning Journal (quoted with his permission):

> Through my pastoral supervision, I realised that I had been sharing aspects of my education experience that I had not shared in the past. I knew the value of being able to talk through both personal and professional issues in a supportive relationship with someone ready to listen…What I needed was the type of support that would enable me to unravel what was happening to me personally, professionally, and academically from a theological standpoint, in the light of my studies.

> I could not therefore think of a practitioner who was better placed than a pastoral supervisor to provide the support I needed. I was grateful in this regard that my supervisor, a practical theologian, was able to offer me the time and personal space to explore and reflect upon my experiences. This personal support I saw as a third space that was missing in my academic and professional inquiry…It allowed me to step back and begin to process complex issues that had arisen in these environments.

This experience of a 'third space' was critical for this candidate in enabling him to engage in the reflexivity which is central to the professional doctorate.

Reflexivity

A crucial lesson which the process of delivering the professional doctorate has taught us is the centrality of a radical reflexivity to the work of practical theology. The absolute insistence that a professional doctorate thesis must originate with a question from the candidate's own practice, must research that practice, and must make a contribution not only to knowledge but also to contextual and personal practice[6] has been instrumental in pushing us to a deeper understanding of the role of reflexivity in practical theology as a discipline. This is about the pedagogy of practical theology, about examining self as part of the 'pastoral reflective cycle.'[7] But it is about more than that. Reflexivity is a means of understanding; it yields cognitive disclosure.

Furthermore, reflexivity is a way of finding a critical space in which, while not pretending to relinquish subjectivity, we may nevertheless gain some distance in which to see more than one viewpoint and also to see how the effects of our subjectivity colour the object in view. This process of critical subjectivity is at the heart of the epistemology of practical theology.[8]

We use the term 'reflexive' to mean specifically looking thoughtfully at one's own self—at what I am like, or at how I see what is outside of myself, or at how I affect it, or how my seeing of it affects how I present it. Reflexivity in research is increasingly valued across a wide range of disciplines and the related dynamic of the insider/outsider is a crucial consideration for professional doctorate candidates. This liminal position is wonderfully captured by Orsi in his image of the insider/outsider anthropologist 'not going behind the curtain like Toto in Oz to uncloak the imposter' but rather being like 'a child glancing over his folded hands at his mother at prayer beside him.'[9]

Two examples indicate the significance of reflexivity in our work, illustrating respectively the cognitive disclosure yielded by reflexivity, and the way in which it opens up a critical space. C, a candidate researching gay and lesbian experience, found that interrogation of her own feelings as a lesbian woman in respect to speaking and silence in the church yielded not only affective understanding, but a clue to conceptualising the link between submissive silence and terror of destroying one's own contextual house of being. H, exploring the role of values in the founding of a free school, a process in which she herself was deeply involved, found that reflexivity enabled her to gain a range of perspectives which had some critical distance, but which were given depth and richness by her role as an insider. It is necessary to *see* oneself and also to *be* oneself in reflexive research.

Reflexivity, or looking at oneself, is not only a complex task, but one which is open to critique. The problems are illuminated by two contrasting images.[10] The first is Caravaggio's painting of Narcissus,: the luminous boy looking with yearning at the reflection which only just comes into focus—the danger of what he is doing and the compelling delight of it. Such 'narcissism' has its dangers, not least the difficulties of seeing that which is ugly, inconsistent, inadequate, or painful to know. The self we see is never exactly the self we are. It requires a certain distance to overcome the fuzziness, though the boy tries to get a clearer picture simply by coming ever nearer. Narcissus is poised on the brink of falling into the water, becoming one with his own reflection, fatally losing forever any critical space between himself

and what he sees. So the first danger is of so much closeness that we fail to see ourselves with critical distance.

The second danger is that we tell too simple a story—as if there is merely a single reflection and no complexity about ourselves in relation to our context. Anish Kapoor's Cloud Gate (also known as "The Bean") in Chicago is a huge public sculpture with a highly reflective surface of seamless stainless steel plates, curved and shaped like a 'bean.' It reflects and distorts—in changing patterns dependent on where you are standing—the Chicago skyline, the masses of people around it, and the individual viewer, who is likely to be taking a photograph of themselves taking a photograph of themselves reflected in the 'Bean.' It is an image of the complexity and the multi-faceted, potentially distorted, iterative, and changing nature of reflexivity. In seeking to reflect on ourselves and our context, and on how these affect how we see that to which we attend in practical theological research, these two images may serve as exploratory devices to think through the nature of the task and its complexity.[11]

<div align="center">

Reflections

</div>

The Priority of Human Relationships

All three issues which we have identified as foundational to the programme speak of the priority of human relationships and of collaboration: the relationship of candidate and supervisor; the peer relationship between the candidates; and, the relationship of the candidate to him or herself. Furthermore there is the relationship of the different centres and among the supervisors nationally, in the Summer School and in staff development—as one person put it, 'we are friends.' Finally, action research, which is the methodology used by many of the candidates, is itself collaborative.[12]

These relationships build confidence and enable critical self-reflectiveness. They are a kind of midwifery, in which knowledge is given birth. Linda Robinson, a professional doctorate candidate from Chester, writes of her 'experience of supervision as a meeting of minds and hearts where the reality has had a quality greater than the sum of [competencies] in what is proving an embodiment of Buber's concept of an 'I and Thou' relationship.'[13] Human relationships are a locus of revelation, places of theological disclosure, where fundamental issues of value, of truth and of what it is to be human are critically examined: 'In practical theology, we study the field of lived religion in a hermeneutical mode, that is, attending to the most fundamen-

tal processes of interpreting life through endless conversations in which we construct meaning.'[14]

A Philosophy of Pedagogy

It took three years of inter-university thinking and planning to give birth to the professional doctorate programme.[15] We were encouraged to present our proposals not only with attention to detailed mechanics of delivery, but also with a robust defence of our 'philosophy of pedagogy' which was driving the practical arrangements we wished to make. This 'philosophy of pedagogy' is experiential, enquiry-based, value-oriented, and human-relationship centred. It is not a 'banking' model of education, but person-centred, experience- and context-determined, and process-driven. The aim is to bring out the full potential of candidates and to enable their work to be transformative of their context.

A hospitable epistemology

It follows from all that has been said so far that there are certain features of epistemological approach which are embedded within the whole concept of a professional doctorate of this kind. The collaborative and the experiential must be honoured. The epistemology is inevitably perspectival and hermeneutical. Within that overarching framework the programme is, however, hospitable to a wide and rich variety of theologically-determined epistemologies, including the critical realist and the social constructionist. The candidate who is researching the values determining the design and opening of a 'free school' roots her epistemology in the 'living educational theory' of Jack Whitehead and Jean McNiff,[16] an approach in which theory is generated by the collaborative reflection of practitioners She roots this in the concept of 'living theologically' as found in the work of Terry Veling:

> [Veling] recognises that 'living theologically' demands active listening to the voice of the other, stating that if all of our listening merely 'led back to me,'[17] we might as well not be in dialogue at all. The critical factor for Veling is to enter into relationships that understand a voice other than their own, through inclusive conversation.[18]

Another uses a method of Buddhist Inquiry to examine her practices as a Buddhist who is a practitioner psychologist. I quote from her research proposal with permission:

> Buddhist Inquiry will encourage me to be a *vibhajja vada*, one who analyses, the earliest term for dharma practitioners. Sceptical inquiry is the basis of Buddhist practice[19] with all habitual thoughts and assumptions examined as emphasised in *The Kalama Sutta*.[20] This style of questioning is

encouraged within psychology with the use of the question "How do we know what we believe we know?"[21]

A third candidate investigates educational practices within the Salvation Army; her research is framed by an epistemology which presupposes a 'givenness' of theology and interrogates practices to determine what might be more faithful practice, explicitly drawing on Swinton and Mowat's critical realist epistemology:

> Evangelical Christian theology, and therefore Salvationist theology, claims to have its foundation in a shared revelation of God in Christ that is not a construction but reality, even though the description of that reality is an interpretation…We 'know' from our own perspective and that knowledge is always provisional, and open to challenge by other perspectives.[22]

Conclusion

This doctoral programme offers something unique to the community of reflective practice. Research-based from day one, and not a 'taught doctorate,' it is increasingly recognised in the UK as being fully the equivalent of a PhD: 'Recognising that the research focus of the PD (professional doctorate) is a hallmark characteristic that defines the researching professional, it is generally considered inappropriate to use the term 'Taught Doctorate', but rather to refer to the 'Professional Doctorate.'[23] This convention is intended to underline the research-based nature of the award.' Furthermore, Fell and Haines contend, quoting the European University Association: '[Professional doctorates] must meet the same core standards as 'traditional' doctorates in order to ensure the same high level of quality.'[24]

We have identified in this paper three core elements of our person-centered approach to developing researching professionals and enabling them to offer an original contribution to knowledge in practice: the peer cohort; appropriate supervision; and reflexivity. These elements manifest, and indeed further shape, our philosophy of pedagogy. Within this framework a wide range of theological and epistemological approaches find a home. Developing and delivering this doctorate has for us, as for many of our colleagues, been a highlight of our professional careers, stretching us to the full as we engage in the struggle of each new candidate, and opening up fresh vistas of meaning and practice in our discipline of practical theology.

NOTES

1. Cambridge Theological Federation, *Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology*, accessed February 17, 2014, http://www.theofed.cam.ac.uk/professionaldoctorate.html.

2. For further information on this programme and how it developed see Zoë Bennett, The Higher Education Academy: Subject Centre for Philosophical and Religious Studies "Evaluating the Feasibility of a Cross-Institutional Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology: A Report," *Discourse* 6, no. 2 (2007): 55–77, accessed on February 16, 2014, www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/subjects/prs/PrsDiscourse/14.pdf; Zoë Bennett, "Theology and the Researching Professional: The Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology," *Theology* 122, no. 869 (2009): 333–343; Zoë Bennett and Elaine Graham, "The Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology: Developing the Researching Professional in Practical Theology in Higher Education," *Journal of Adult Theological Education* 5, no. 1, (2008): 33–51; Elaine Graham, "The Professional Doctorate in Practical Theology: An Idea whose Time has Come," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 10, no. 2 (2006): 293–311; and on the Professional Doctorate in general see David Scott, Andrew Brown, Ingrid Lunt, and Lucy Thorne, *Professional Doctorates: Integrating Professional and Academic Knowledge* (Maidenhead, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education [SRHE] and Open University Press, 2004); and Tony Fell and Ian Haines, "Introduction," in *Professional Doctorates in the UK 2011*, Tony Fell, Kevin Flint, and Ian Haines, eds. (Lichfield Staffordshire: UK Council for Graduate Education, 2011): 11–19.

3. Vernon Trafford and Shosh Leshem, *Stepping Stones to Achieving your Doctorate: By Focusing on the Viva from the Start* (Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2008).

4. Étienne Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity (Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives)* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

5. Elaine Graham, "Is Practical Theology a Form of 'Action Research'?," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 17, no. 1 (2013): 148–178.

6. Anglia Ruskin University, *Research Degree Regulations,* Fourteenth Edition, September 2013, accessed February 16, 2014, http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/academic/public/research_degree_regs.pdf.

7. Jane Leach, "Pastoral Theology as Attention," *Contact: Practical Theology and Pastoral Care* 153 (2007): 19–32 and Stephen Pattison, "Some Straw for the Bricks: a Basic Introduction to Theological Reflection," in *The Blackwell Reader in Pastoral and Practical Theology,* James Woodward, Stephen Pattison, and John Patton, eds. (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 136–144.

8. Zoë Bennett, *Using the Bible in Practical Theology: Historical and Contempoary Perspectives* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2013), Chapter 2.

9. Zoë Bennett, *Your MA in Theology: A Study Skills Handbook* (London: SCM Press, 2014), 92–93.

10. Both images are easily accessible through Google Images.

11. These two paragraphs are taken substantially from Zoë Bennett, *Your MA in Theology,* 59–60.

12. Peter Reason and Hilary Bradbury, *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2008) and Elaine Graham, "Is Practical Theology a Form of 'Action Research'?," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 17, no. 1 (2013): 148–178.

13. Linda Robinson, "Supervision: A Meeting of Minds and Hearts; A Coach and Facilitator of Adult Learning Reflect on the Experience of Engaging in Supervision as a Professional Doctoral Student in Practical Theology," *Work Based Learning e-Journal* 2, no.1 (2011): 213.

14. R. Ruard Ganzevoort, *Forks in the Road when Tracing the Sacred: Practical Theology as Hermeneutics of Lived Religion,* Presidential Address, March 8, 2009 (Chicago: International Academy of Practical Theology, 2009), accessed February 17, 2014, http://www.ia-pt.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/presidentialaddress2009.pdf.

15. Zoë Bennett, "The Higher Education Academy," 55–77.

16. Jack Whitehead and Jean McNiff, *Action Research: Living Theory* (London: Sage, 2006).

17. Terry Veling, *On Earth as It Is in Heaven* (New York: Orbis Books, 2005), 60.

18. From thesis as yet unsubmitted, quoted with permission.

19. Stephen Batchelor, *Buddhism without Beliefs: A Contemporary Guide to Awakening* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1997).

20. Buddhism without Boundaries, *The Kalama Sutta* (AN 3.65), accessed February 18, 2014, http://www.buddhismwithoutboundaries.com/showthread.php?2298-The-Kalama-Sutta-%28AN-3-65%29.

21. Paul Watzlawick, *The Invented Reality: How do we Know what we Believe we Know? (Contributions to Constructivism)* (London: W W Norton & Co., 1984).

22. John Swinton and Harriet Mowat, *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 37; and Karen Shakespeare, *Knowing, Being and Doing: The Spiritual Life Development of Salvation Army Officers*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK, 2011, accessed February 17, 2014, http://anglia-ruskin.openrepository.com/arro/handle/10540/211700.

23. Tony Fell and Ian Haines, "Introduction," in *Professional Doctorates in the UK 2011*, Tony Fell, Kevin Flint, and Ian Haines, eds. (Lichfield Staffordshire: UK Council for Graduate Education, 2011): 15.

24. Ibid., 13; and European University Association, *Doctoral Programmes in Europe: Bologna Follow-up Group Report*, (Brussels, Belgium: European University Association, 2007), accessed February 17, 2014, http://doktorat.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/doktorat/Internationale_Referenzen/BFUG-Report-Doctoral-Programmes.pdf.