



Chapter 1

To understand: The purpose of research and of methodology

Christo Lombaard 

Abstract

In the first part of this contribution, the true purpose of research – understanding – is placed in opposition to examples of misplaced expectations of research. In the second part, methodology is considered as the scholarly-controlled manner of attaining deeper understanding. The third part includes the contents of a (translated) debate on the purpose of study.

The purpose of research (Or: *unfinished 'n onklaar'*)

In our intellectual history, the purpose of research in the wake of the Enlightenment of the 1600s (for an overview cf. Moyn & Sartori, 2016), from which scholarship as understood in our time springs, has always been to understand. Often an instrumentalised view of research however dominates in the public mind. Research, in that view, is something one does to obtain a Master's or Doctorate, in order to advance one's career. The social and professional status and the enhanced occupational prospects thus become the purpose of research. In a regrettable trend in academic life, the corporatisation of universities and the accompanying managerialist culture that easily dominate within modern universities (cf. e.g. Poutanen et al., 2020:419–442, Lombaard, 2006:71–84), reflect this instrumentalised view of research too. In such a context, research 'outputs' are counted and the uptake of that research in wider circles is measured (without exception, badly). Based on this, academics are then rewarded or reprimanded (the latter, despite oft-stated intentions to the contrary), thus

draining much of the joy from research. From political circles, in a perplexingly naïve reversal of how the positive effects of education naturally unfold in a society, Doctoral qualifications are at times encouraged for the sake of economic growth – as if increasing the number of *doctorandi* in a society would somehow magically solve problems created in the political economy of a country (cf. e.g. Muller, 2012).

These matters are of course more complex than a mere statement of these trends, as was done here, can give fair justice to; however, simply indicating these superficial views found, in different spheres of our society, on the nature and purpose of research, already serves to make the case strongly enough that research is often instrumentalised. Research is held to have other justifications than its only real purpose. It's only achievable goal, can really ever be to understand. Only by understanding ever more deeply whichever subject matter one studies, does one's research contribute to the wellbeing of humanity (locally and universally).

Irrespective of the field of investigation – Mathematics, History, Language, Chemistry, Law, Music, Theology, Economics, Literature, Medicine, etc. – research is about understanding well what one investigates. Keeping for the moment to the disciplines included in what has traditionally been known as the encyclopaedia of Theology (cf. e.g. Heyns & Jonker, 1977:274–311), and in more current idiom is called the subject areas or specialisations within theology, however:

1. Precisely what understanding is, has not always been clear – hence the essential, intellectually demanding field in theological studies of hermeneutics (cf. for an overview e.g. Thiselton, 1992);
2. How understanding unfolds, historically, has often been viewed quite naively as a linear process – hence the sobering and therefore rewarding field of Philosophy of Science (foundationally, Kuhn, 1962; applied to Theology more generally by Küng, 1994 and by Mouton, van Aarde & Vorster, 1988; applied to Mission Studies more specifically by Bosch, 1992);

3. What such understanding relates to, is framed directly by the implicitly accepted relationship of the (grasping possibilities of the) mind in relation to its surroundings (or ‘reality’, cf. Deist, 1994). This is no simple matter either.

Oversimplified, hence:

- Is understanding constituted by a comprehension of how matters correspond to higher ideals (e.g. God)?
 - (– This is the reflex outside of Modernism); or
- Is understanding constituted by a comprehension of how matters are in reality (e.g. nature)?
 - (– This is the reflex within Modernism); or
- Is understanding constituted by a comprehension of how matters relate to how other matters are understood (e.g. how humans can be understood as texts)?
 - (– This is the reflex within Post-Modernism); or
- Is understanding constituted by a comprehension of how matters correspond to all three of these possibilities – but with all of these evaluated critically?
 - (– This is the currently unfolding reflex, within what is uneasily termed Post-Secularism).

This matrix just outlined implies a complexity of referentialities involved when one tries *to understand*. The relationship between the mind and the subject matter one studies (cf. most recently Chomsky & Moro, 2022), is never simple. Perhaps unsurprisingly, therefore, the delicacy of this link has been paraphrased within humanity across millennia. Ecclesiastes 12:12 is often referred to in this regard, also tongue-in-cheek at academic public events, as an ancient instance of an educational warning, which — it is worth noting (and this is seldom indicated at such public events) — on its part quotes a by then already well-known wisdom adage.

Ecclesiastes 12:12 reads (here translated strongly literally; cf. however Shields, 2000:123–127):

עֲשׂוֹת סְפָרִים הַרְבֵּה אֵין קֵץ

To make many writings, no end.

Practical Theology and Mission Studies

(On which follows an uncomfortably cynical remark:

וְלִמְדוּ הַרְבֵּה יָגֵעַת בְּשָׂר׃

And study much tires flesh.)

This complexity of referentialities in trying to understand can be illustrated by the process of watching a baby growing into a child, or by a person coming to a better sense of nature or of faith. We, for instance, often find it humorous when a five-year-old misapplies the thus far learnt logic of language (e.g. when the superlative ‘pitch black’ is extended to indicate other extremes, such as ‘pitch heavy’ or ‘pitch tasty’). We may all well recall the moment of confused surprise when realising in science class at school that a 1 kg-ball and a 10 kg-ball that are in all other respects identical, when dropped from the same height at the same time, against our expectations, reach the ground at the same instant. As a third example: Christianity repeatedly runs into the cultural barrier that this faith is especially meant for good people, whereas the opposite is centrally valid for Christianity: even someone who may be regarded as the worst possible person, can find forgiveness in God. In these examples, as in many aspects of scholarly understanding, a too naïve initial theory of how things work has to be adapted. A shift in comprehension is required to reach a more valid approximation of the actual state of affairs; that is: to understand better.

With all three examples, however, each of us can indicate that the complexities extend much further than was just stated above, hence requiring multiple further shifts in comprehension. Nothing is easily understood, *finish 'n' klaar*. Always, we continue to grow in our grasp; that is: to understand better.

This is true of all research. Final answers may well elude us, but better ones present themselves. More importantly, with good research (though somewhat counterintuitively for less experienced researchers), better ways of asking questions are found.

Chapter 1

Certainly, every research project cannot go into all of these aspects numbered A to C above. Most research undertakings have a very specific focus, and that is positive: the smaller the focal point of investigation is, the greater the depth of insight that can be attained, and hence the more valuable the contribution is that one can make. That is precisely the value of specialisation, in which university research ought to excel. (The distinction between primary research, applied research and transdisciplinary research does not diminish the unparalleled gain of specialisation.) However, all research is embedded in this broader framework (i.e. in numbers A to C above); inescapably so. Even when not explicitly acknowledging as much in one's academic writing, we should still always be aware that these are the flags under which our writings inevitably sail.

There is, for this and other reasons, a long tradition of writing on research topics under the rubric of the unity of all knowledge (cf. Cat, 2017). Already in the name *university* it is implied that 'the universe' – the total body of matters – is available to be studied (cf. Rossouw, 1993). Nothing is forbidden us to which to apply our minds, in seeking to understand — which principle resonates with intellectual as much as with theological validity. This does not imply that different matters are studied in the same way, in what would then amount to philosophical and methodological imperialism. For instance, as an extreme example: the superb ethereal quality of silence in a musical piece cannot be understood according to the same precepts as can the quality of road tarring (cf. respectively Harris, 2005:521–558 and Blades, Kearney & Nelson, 2018). 'Lysenkoism' was, during a phase of the then Soviet Union, an example of ideologically enforced methodological unity which, predictably, first suppressed and oppressed, then failed as an approach to scholarship, and is now part of academic laughing stock (cf. e.g. Gordin, 2022). Rather, the opposite is valid: the multitude of approaches, methods and models, in their diversity and even in their opposition, themselves already indicate the remarkable miscellany of what we find before us to study.

Therein lies another pleasing irony of specialisation: the deeper one specialises on an ever more finely focused area of study, the greater the realisation that great depths, and more, lie under the surface of every aspect of our lifeworld. Research specialisation thus contributes to our encounter with life in two ways: as we explore deeply one small facet of our existence, we cannot help realising (in tandem and instinctively) that such richness characterises every matter around us. Research thus counteracts superficiality. At once, research energises us in greater pursuit of the knowledge we seek *and* it elicits humility, as we realise that however great our contribution may be, its relative modesty within all that exists is even more overwhelming.

Such modesty in research is a virtue which serves as a practical corollary to the complexities of what it means to understand. It is therefore well worth our while, as humans and as researchers, to guard against some of the vagaries of our times that would be forced onto research.

‘Aha!’ or ‘Huh?’: The purpose of methodology

If the purpose of research is to understand, then the purpose of methodology is to understand well. By this is meant, that 1) how one approaches one’s subject matter; 2) how one analyses one’s subject matter; and 3) how one then draws conclusions on what has been studied, must be sound. In other words: 1) identifying the most suitable ‘tools’ with which to analyse what one intends to study; 2) how one then uses those tools; and 3) the conclusions one then draws, should all be appropriately related to the study, and should, moreover, be applied in logical coherence with one another.

As a banal example (and following the same numbering here as in the paragraph above): if you want to eat soup, 1) it is better to choose a spoon than a fork or a straw; 2) once the right approach or tool has been chosen, then use it well: do not put the handle of the spoon into the soup, but the spherical part (its ‘bowl’), and do not just dip this bowl of the spoon into the soup, but use the spoon’s bowl to scoop up some soup;

and 3) after enjoying some soup, do not conclude that spoons are bad for eating *boerewors* – as obvious as the latter may seem – since that is not what was indeed investigated, which means such a conclusion would be non-appropriate. On the latter, it remains surprising how inexperienced researchers at times like to defer to ‘applause clause’ generalities in research conclusions, with variations of ‘Jesus is the answer’, ‘*ubuntu* is the answer’ or ‘holism is the answer’, and similar broad explanations, presented as a catch-all conclusion on the problem under investigation.

The same three-fold integrity (numbers 1 to 3 above) holds for whichever methods one uses in Practical Theology.

These methods include, broadly:

- **Exegetical methodologies**, which are employed if one wants to draw on Bible texts in research writing. However, contrary to the expectations of especially younger researchers, drawing on the Bible is by no means a *sine qua non* requirement for research in Theology (except, naturally, in the Bible sciences).
- **Theological methods**, which are strongly interpretatively oriented, usually in the opening and closing sections of theological research writings that primarily employ other methods. Such methods of theological interpretation are strongly to be encouraged to qualify one’s research as indeed theological. However, such theologising can regrettably rely, though well-intentioned, on naïve appropriations of important aspects of Christian theology, such as, frequently, the *imago Dei* concept (cf. Lombaard, 2022:1–15).
- **Statistical methods**, which are employed if one wants to present numerical or mathematical interpretations of the subject matter under investigation – with the cautioning comments on both the previously listed methods above, that also apply here. Statistical processing of data is certainly not a *sine qua non* for research in Practical Theology, and is alas too easily poorly done. These highly technical research practises cannot be lightly mastered.

- **Interview methodologies**, though important and popular, and though they render valuable insights not obtainable in other ways, should also – like the Bible and statistics – not be regarded as the be-all and end-all of research in Practical Theology. Both the social-scientific research interview techniques and the processing of the resulting transcripts are exacting skills, which can easily be applied in a sub-standard manner (with theologians that have the additional danger of unreflectingly confusing the purposes and techniques of the pastoral discussion with those of the research interview).
- **Socio-theoretical methodologies**, which draw on strongly developed theoretical analyses of society or aspects thereof in academic fields such as Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Education, Communication Studies, Political Studies and Psychology. The difficulty here is to master well the concepts, histories and nuances of these (at times rapidly developing) academic fields and their methods, and at the same time remain theologians, maintaining both these research orientations in mutual and critical interaction.
- With **surveys and questionnaires**, the art of the concise yet valid research question, whether such questions are circulated or administered in person and whether they are intended to garner anywhere on the continuum of a Yes/No response to deeply revealing disclosures, are scientific skills which are, equally, not easy to attain.
- **Philosophical-conceptual studies** are conducted by drawing on an already attained depth of knowledge in a particular scholarly field. The ideas, models and theories available on the subject matter are identified, characterised and critiqued, to arrive at a more thoroughgoing intellectual engagement with the subject matter.
- A **survey of literature** is one of the aspects without which research cannot be undertaken at all. The assertion found in surprisingly many postgraduate students' early versions of their research proposals, that 'nothing has yet been written on this topic', is always mistaken. What that

Chapter 1

assertion in reality means, is: 'I have not yet read widely enough'. As Connell (2019:19) states on this matter:

The process [of constructing new knowledge] starts, ironically, by looking at old knowledge. PhD students are usually told to write a 'literature review' at the start of their thesis, where they summarize earlier research. Many wonder why. It may seem a pointless ritual; in fact it is vital. What research does is transform an existing state of knowledge into a new state. The more deeply the existing knowledge is understood, the better.

Differently put, the long, drawn-out activity that research students are at times most loath to spend their valuable time on – to read, read, read – because they want to get to the 'real' research is, in reality, the most important pursuit that makes research possible. "If it does not take cognisance of the newest publications, trends, insights and debates, nor make a new contribution, it is per definition not research, but simply writing" (cf. Legodi, 2021).

The above paragraphs constitute an attempt at giving a different kind of overview than the usual distinctions that are drawn on research. These usual distinctions include those between empirical and interpretative research, inductive and deductive approaches, quantitative and qualitative analyses, experimental and non-experimental research designs, mixed methods or grounded theory approaches to conducting research (cf. e.g. Sheppard, 2020; Laher, Fynn & Kramer, 2019; Somekh & Lewin, 2005). These usual distinctions are by no means unimportant and are discussed in all standard works on research; they are therefore not restated here. Nor is what was related above exhaustive. The above understanding does however give a different, broad indication of some research methods that may be employed within Practical Theology.

A range of publications are available on each of the above approaches and distinctions, which must certainly be consulted to understand well what it is that we as researchers do. Such in-depth methodological preparatory work must be

done for the very sake of research: understanding better what we explore. The alternative – what may be called ‘deep-end in, sink-or-swim research’ or ‘quick-and-dirty research’, or, drawing on American expressions, ‘gung-ho research’ and perhaps ‘gonzo research’ – cannot render reliable results. Such implied haphazardness does not constitute research, nor good writing; such approaches render only words on paper, woefully, and not scholarship. The result on the part of informed readers will then not be ‘Aha!’, but ‘Huh?’.

Fruitful approaches should be an acquired and treasured part of the frame of reference of researchers, to come to an understanding of their subject matter to such a degree that their work meets the traditional criteria of *validity* and *reliability*. These are the two basic yardsticks which determine whether research has managed to help us to understand well; that is, soundly, reasonably and defensibly.

Differently formulated:

- Does the research study what it set out to understand better (validity)?;
- Does it do so in a way that, if others repeat the study along the same methodological lines, essentially the same conclusions would be reached (reliability)?

If research writing does not comply with these two standards, it is indeed writing, but it is not research: it does then not lead to understanding the subject matter better. That would be contrary to the nature and purpose of research.

A debate, to illustrate the above

In March 2023 a letter in the *Kerkbode* church newspaper asked a brief question on the purpose of post-graduate theological studies; specifically on research undertaken by serving church ministers. What follows is a translation of the response (Lombaard 2023) to that reader’s letter; this response also quotes the substance of the initial reader’s letter to the *Kerkbode*, to the extent that it is not necessary to repeat that initial letter here.

The purpose of including the material from that debate here, is that it relates well to at least some of the public misconceptions around research and it also illustrates how the purpose of post-graduate studies or research may be explained in a church-related forum. The name of the original letter writer is here replaced by 'Reader', in order not to treat the letter writer unfairly. Moreover, both the response and the quote from an earlier publication (Lombaard, 2010) included in the response, are here translated from the original Afrikaans versions.

Faith grounds research

In a recent *Kerkbode* Letters-from-Readers column, with the letter titled 'Pastors! Why so many degrees behind your names?', Mr Reader asks the question, crucially and succinctly:

'Why is every second church minister a doctor? Is it for status, a better salary or what? Why waste so much time on further reference work, research, etc., to obtain a doctorate?

Does a pastor have time for such things? Some even have two doctorates! No wonder the gospel doesn't get enough attention! Why don't these doctors like to undertake home visits?'

Perhaps Mr Reader intended his letter to be analysed in depth, or perhaps it was just a quick thought. Be that as it may, he articulates a sentiment that is aired every now and then, about which I had wanted for some time to write something for the *Kerkbode*. I therefore take the opportunity now to do so, with thanks to Mr Reader for raising this matter again as a topic of public discussion.

Mr Reader firstly asks, why study further? Let us start there.

The longest enduring institution in our world is the church – it has been in existence for, by now, a good two millennia. The second longest enduring institution in the world, which has been around for roughly a millennium, is the university. The university, it should be noted, originated

Practical Theology and Mission Studies

directly from the church, with the aim of serving church and society. Therefore, pitting church and academia against one another ('wasting so much time for further reference work, research') does not work well: faith and reflection / research cannot, in principle, exist without one another. The one animates the other. Hence the similarly almost millennium-old wisdom of Anselm (which he in a way took over from Augustine, another six centuries or so earlier), *fides quaerens intellectum*: faith seeking understanding. Stated differently: 'I believe, Lord; help me understand'. This is what study is all about. This link, that faith inspires reason and that reason is at the service of faith and humanity, also has deep biblical grounds: that we love God fully with heart, soul and mind (the opening verses of Deuteronomy 6 and the closing verses of Matthew 22, among other Bible texts).

On the surface it may perhaps sound saintly, in a way, to ask: But why study more? However, a non-reasoning faith is neither biblical nor Christian – *in principle*; that is to say, on very basic faith grounds already.

The *practical demands* of pastors serving God, church and humanity also require that church ministers take seriously their vocation to study as, also, service with the mind. The Bible as Word of God was given to the Christian church in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. These are, 100% practically speaking, the languages of revelation. Such is Scripture. Would we now rather, practically speaking, want to keep the Bible at a distance by not taking these languages seriously?

Here and there in the world, there are some believers who advocate a Christian life without the Scriptures. For the vast majority of us, however, we simply cannot do without this Basic Source. The Reformed / Calvinist understanding of faith is the Christian tradition that places this aspect most centrally. That is why, for instance, the Afrikaans churches have always taken the basic languages of the Bible very seriously as an integral part of ministerial training. Therein lies, apart from the religious realism that the

Chapter 1

Bible speaks to us from those ancient languages, also plain human integrity, the value of which we must thoroughly appreciate. Which is: Would we take seriously someone who talks about Shakespeare's plays but cannot read English? Would we listen to someone who talks about a local poet but who cannot understand the language in which the poet wrote? We will probably laugh them out of the lecture hall. Should we then expect any less with the Bible?

(Try asking this type of question to a rabbi about Hebrew or to an imam about Arabic, and you will immediately see the surprise: But how could it *not* be?)

With 66 books in our Bible, would someone want to suggest, 'Oh, let's study only a portion of our canon; let's get by with just a little bit of Bible'? This would be a position fully devoid of integrity. That is why pastors' training requires years of study of the Old and New Testaments; with the Bible languages. Rather than 'No wonder the gospel doesn't get enough attention!', precisely the opposite is true: the gospel gets the greater part of the attention. The Bible and faith require study which, moreover, cannot be otherwise: it must continue throughout life. Unless someone would want to suggest that spiritual growth on the part of pastors is unnecessary...?

Now that we may have reached a solid understanding of the Bible, should we rather know nothing about how the church had developed over 2 000 years; until here, today with us? (– Church History / Historical Theology.) Should we leave 20 centuries of the central faith formulations of the church unstudied? (– Dogmatology / Systematic Theology.) Would we ignore the active calling of the church and believers throughout the ages, throughout the world? (– Mission Science / Missiology.) Should we simply leave unconsidered the formal organisation of congregations? (– Church Polity.) Or acting justly? (– Christian Ethics.) Or living along with other religions? (– Science of Religion.) Would we rather try to do the work of the church in an uninformed manner? (– Preaching, Diaconate, Youth

Practical Theology and Mission Studies

Work, Congregational Development, Catechesis and more...) What part of this 'core encyclopaedia' of Theology does not require deep, long-term intellectual engagement to serve God, church and society responsibly (rather than in a knee-jerk manner)? Which of these subject areas should we rather neglect or abandon? Would someone make a suggestion to guide us down that path...?

Then ministers still have to deal with the people whom they serve in valid ways, in order to be relevant: their worlds of thought (Philosophy), their inner worlds (Psychology) and their worlds of living together (Sociology, Politics, Ethics, Economics). The alternative is a ministry that passes by people. Would anyone favour such an irrelevant type of gospel ministry, which ignores the lifeworld of people? (Trying to conduct ministerial training separately from the institution of the university, for which voices are raised every now and then, will therefore inevitably damage the church's vocation profoundly. In all directions.)

Theological training should rather put humanity-and-world into dialogue with faith-and-church in valid ways; doing so, for the sake of its vocation, on the basis of the best available international insights. That is why pastors' training, in addition to studying local languages and in addition to the foundational Bible languages, must also often rely directly on other scientific languages of our time. Also never forget the multilingual world in which we live daily.

Hence, traditionally, that the call to theological training at times includes study up to at least Master's degree level. By then, pastors often already know where their God-given academic talents lie, with the obvious next step, Doctoral study. Would one deny church ministers their calling also to make that advanced contribution in the service of God and neighbour? – Which would be: 'You now have the ability to render this intellectual service of love, so that church and humanity can be better, and you have the academic

Chapter 1

preparation for this; but no, you should rather not... Because specialist contributions within kingdom work are suspect.'

Worldwide, one finds within churches here and there people with what may be termed, an anti-intellectual inclination. The orientation of such an approach is always as if faith-without-reflection would somehow be better than faith-with-reflection. However, this is a false piety: it does not serve the gospel; on the contrary, it obstructs the gospel. As I put it once before (Lombaard, 2010):

If the same argument is applied to any other specialist area, its frightening nature becomes straightaway apparent – for example: 'I am no trained surgeon; I am just an ordinary person like you, who is moreover concerned about your health; so let me operate on you'; or: 'I am no trained engineer; I am just an ordinary person like you, who is moreover concerned about our transport system; so let me build the bridge over the main road.' Why is the absurdity of this type of power argument tolerated, even appreciated, when it comes to faith? Valid as it is that the faith of ordinary people is often of admirable depth, when that is however elevated as a claim to power, such religious hubris portrays precisely the opposite.

Lastly: Mr Reader asks, why then further study by pastors, 'for status, a better salary or what?'. Of course, he senses it correctly, that there are always secondary and even more matters that go along with specialist study. As there are related matters that go along with almost everything that we usually do. (I go to buy a loaf of bread, but I also run into a friend. Or I go on holiday to the coast, but I also take along a few books for my old neighbour.) However, the additional matters do not detract from the main matter. The main activity still remains, when it comes to specialist theological studies: *fides quaerens intellectum* – faith seeking understanding.

In Thy Service.

Bibliography

- Blades, C., Kearney, E., & Nelson, G. 2018. *Asphalt paving principles*. Ithaca, NY: New York LTAP Center.
- Bosch, D.J. 1992. *Transforming mission. Paradigm shifts in theology of mission*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Cat, J. 2017. The unity of science. In E.N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Spring 2022). Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/scientific-unity/>
- Chomsky, N., & Moro, A. 2022. *The secrets of words*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14237.001.0001>
- Connell, R. 2019. *The good university*. London: Zed Books.
- Deist, F. 1994. *Ervaring, rede en metode in skrifuitleg. 'n Wetenskapshistoriese ondersoek na skrifuitleg in die Ned. Geref. Kerk 1840–1990*. Pretoria: RGN.
- Gordin, M.D. 2022. Lysenkoism. *Encyclopedia of the history of science*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.34758/d5bq-k368>
- Harris, E.T. 2005. Silence as sound : Händel's sublime pauses. *The Journal of Musicology*, 22(4), 521–558. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jm.2005.22.4.521>
- Heyns, J.A., & Jonker, W.D. 1977. *Op weg met die Teologie*. Pretoria: N.G. Kerkboekhandel.
- Kuhn, T.S. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Küng, H. 1994. *Christentum: Wese und Geschichte*. München: Piper Verlag.
- Laher, S., Fynn, A., & Kramer, S. (Eds). 2019. *Transforming research methods in the social sciences: Case studies from South Africa*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18772/22019032750>

Chapter 1

- Legodi, N. 2021. *Writing does not equal research*. (An interview with Christo Lombaard.) UNISA, College of Human Sciences. Retrieved from www.unisa.ac.za/sites/corporate/default/Colleges/Human-Sciences/News-&-events/Articles/%27Writing-does-not-equal-research%27
- Lombaard, C. 2006. There is rebellion afoot, and revelry. The nascent reformation of intellectual integrity within South African universities. *Education as Change*, 10(1), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823200609487130>
- Lombaard, C. 2010. *Buchan brou*. Litnet. Retrieved 9 March 2023, from <https://www.litnet.co.za/buchan-brou/>
- Lombaard, C. 2022. ‘Anthropology’ and the ‘Imago Dei’ as (related) problematic concepts when considering technology: suggestions towards greater cross-disciplinary understanding. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 103, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.10349>
- Lombaard, C. 2023. Denkelose geloof is nóg Bybels nóg Christelik. *Kerkbode*, 9 March 2023. Available at <https://kerkbode.christians.co.za/2023/03/09/christo-lombaard-skryf-n-denkelose-geloof-is-nog-bybels-nog-christelik/>
- Mouton, J., Van Aarde, A.G., & Vorster, W. 1988. *Paradigms and progress in theology*. Pretoria: RGN.
- Moyn, S., & Sartori, A. 2016. *Global intellectual history*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Muller, S. 2012. More PhDs are not the answer. *Mail & Guardian*, 20 September 2012. Available at <https://mg.co.za/article/2012-09-20-more-PHds-are-not-the-answer/>
- Poutanen, M., Tomperi, T., Kuuselac, H., Kalevacand, V., & Tervasmäki, T. 2020. From democracy to managerialism: Foundation universities as the embodiment of Finnish university policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, 37(1), 419–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2020.1846080>

Practical Theology and Mission Studies

- Rossouw, H.W. 1993. *Universiteit, wetenskap en kultuur*. Kaapstad: Tafelberg.
- Sheppard, V. 2020. *Research methods for the social sciences: An introduction*. Victoria, B.C.: Pressbooks.
- Shields, M.A. 2000. Re-examining the warning of Eccl. XII 12. *Vetus Testamentum*, 50(1), 123–127. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853300506152>
- Somekh, B., & Lewin, C. 2005. *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Thiselton, A. 1992. *New horizons in hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.