University of Southampton

Faculty of Social and Human Sciences

Schools with a Religious Character and Community Cohesion: A Study of Faith Based Approaches to Educational Environments and Aims

By

Barry John Cooper

Thesis submitted for the qualification of Doctor of Philosophy

March 2015

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

<u>ABSRACT</u>

FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

Politics and International Relations

Doctor of Philosophy

Schools with a Religious Character and Community Cohesion: A Study of Faith Based
Approaches to Educational Environments and Aims

By Barry John Cooper

This research explores the effect and contribution of England's schools with a religious character to the 'cohesion agenda'. In so doing, the research contributes to debates which have hitherto been marked by little or no attention to the fact of the differences and distinguishing features of schools which have formal links to religious organizations and which are currently publicly funded. Mainstream educational study and research on the teaching practices and cultures of 'faith-based' approaches to education are also underdeveloped. As part of a growing tradition of scholarly and impartial research on schools which have formal links to religious organisations, this research investigates therefore the 'cohesion agenda', and how that agenda may be potentially served or disserved by faith-based approaches to educational environments and educational aims. From analysis of qualitative and quantitative primary research conducted in three English secondary schools, the research develops two empirically grounded and theoretically informed, conceptually and institutionally important faith-based approaches to education.

 Although the research does not, nor should it be seen to be trying to, provide categorical truths about the wider group of schools with a religious character, the research nonetheless has a wider resonance beyond its particular empirical parameters and is generalizable. Although not generalizable in any statistical sense of being a description of what schools with a religious character are actually doing, the research is generalizable rather as a description of what any school with a religious character could do; and how different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims can potentially serve or disserve cohesion. The research concludes that the accusation that schools with a religious character disserve cohesion is unjustifiable when stated in a general way, and shows how faith-based approaches to education can in fact (potentially) be more functional for cohesion than secular based approaches.

Table of Contents

Academic Thesis: Declaration Of Authorship

I, BARRY JOHN COOPER

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

SCHOOLS WITH A RELIGIOUS CHARACTER AND COMMUNITY COHESION: A STUDY OF FAITH-BASED APPROACHES TO EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS AND AIMS

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;

2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;

3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;

4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;

5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;

6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;

7. Either none of this work has been published before submission, or parts of this work have been published as: [please list references below]:

Signed:

....

Date: ....

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following for their contribution to making this research a reality.

Firstly this research owes a great debt to the three secondary schools which participated in the primary research, and also the Diocesan Directors of Education. Without the help and generosity of time of all those involved, this research would not have been possible.

Secondly, I would also like to thank my supervisor, Gerry Stoker, for his ever reliable encouragement and insightful guidance over the past several years.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for being a welcome, and also often sorely needed distraction from study.

My sincere thanks and appreciation go to all of you.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 An Introduction to the Research

This thesis asks the question, and enters into the debate, what is the contribution of England's schools with a religious character to the 'cohesion agenda'. At the time of writing there is a vociferous public and political debate over the continuation and expansion of schools which have formal links to religious organisations in England's mosaic of school provision. This debate is not new, nor at all likely to be resolved in the foreseeable future. It is a debate which is the source of many column inches, and public and political opining, but also one which generates far more heat than light, being in the main characterised by misinformation and misunderstanding. As part of a growing tradition of scholarly and impartial research on schools which have formal links to religious organisations, this thesis therefore investigates the 'cohesion agenda' and how that agenda maybe potentially served or disserved by different 'faith-based' approaches to educational environments and aims.

This initial introductory chapter proceeds by first using up a few words to clarify terminology, before introducing the reader more fully to schools with a religious character and community cohesion; giving a brief history of the development of both, in order to provide a working understanding of each for this study. In the remainder of this first chapter I will use up a few more words to clarify an assumption which this thesis makes, before finally summarising the value and aims of this research and the forthcoming chapters.

1.2 A Few Words on Terminology

There are various terms which are often applied interchangeably to the various school types which have a religious designation in law, both in the independent and maintained sectors. Arguably, none of these by themselves do justice to the variety of 'educational cultures, principles and practises' of these schools (Grace, 2003). 'Church school' is often used in an historical context and is appropriate when referring to and discussing the history of religious

organisations, particularly Christian organisations, and their contribution to the provision of education in England. The three most ubiquitously used contemporary terms are 'faith schools', 'faith-based schools' and 'schools with a religious character'. The term 'faith school' is relatively new and originates from a 2001 Green Paper, 'Schools - Building on Success' (DfEE, 2001b). The term is reflective of that paper's desire to expand the number of schools run by non-Christian faith groups (Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005). It's the term which is most commonly used by the media and other opinion formers in public debate; it's also often used in policy discourse, and at the time of writing is the term one will find used on www.gov.uk . Somewhat newer still, is the term faith-based school. This term is reflective of a more nuanced debate over the aims and practices of schools with a religious designation and in particular a distinction which is sometimes made between 'religious nurture' and 'religious education'. The Humanist Philosophers group defines a 'faith-based school' as a school which '*intentionally encourages its pupils to have a particular religion and which regards such encouragement as a significant part of its mission*' (2001). A final alternative term, more accurate perhaps (Barker and Anderson, 2005), and less emotive certainly, is 'school with a religious character', as adopted by the Schools Standards and Frameworks Act 1998 and the Religious Character of Schools (designation Procedure) Regulations of the same year.

This research can be located in the rich vein of discourses which attempts to define and categorise schools which have formal links to religious organisations, so the term faith-based school would be appropriate. Nevertheless, though for some the term is unappealingly cumbersome, the term 'school with a religious character' is less emotionally loaded and it is for this reason that the term is in the main embraced here. Additionally, the term has historically only strictly applied to schools in the maintained sector which are designated as such by The Secretary of State for Education. All three schools in which research was conducted are publicly funded, it is also the continuation and expansion of these schools in the maintained sector which the public and political debate invariably focuses upon and which is also the focus of this thesis; though the research findings also have relevance for any school which is 'faith-based' or has formal links to religious organisations. Where the term 'autonomous school with a religious character' is used, this denotes those legal types of schools with a religious character which have autonomy over their admissions procedures and over their curriculum (see 1.3 below for further regarding different legal types of schools).

1.3 An Introduction to Schools with a Religious Character

Historically, church schools, and in particular Church of England schools, have played a significant role in the provision of education in England; '*from the first (in England), education was the creature of religion, the school was an adjunct of the church, and the schoolmaster was an ecclesiastical officer. For close on eleven hundred years, from 598 to 1670, all educational institutions were under exclusively ecclesiastical control*' (Leach, 1911). English education was, as the historian H.C Dent notes, 'born in the church' (1963), and '*for nearly a thousand years the church controlled its destiny*' (Hansen 1965, p.356). In Victorian Britain there was a '*persistent disinclination of the State - in the shape of Parliament or of the government of the day - to take any direct initiative in the extension of public education*' (Judge 2001, p.466). The pervasiveness of Victorian Britain's libertarian prejudice and the 'deep-rooted individualism in the English character' ensured a persistent concern and hesitation over the role to be played by the state and resistance to any encroachment '*on what had been regarded as the ancient preserve of the churches and of private voluntary bodies*' (Hansen 1965, p.356; see also, Curtis and Boultwood, 1966). The prevailing opinion in Britain was that in the interest of liberty it would be wrong to '*place in the hands of the Government, that is of the Ministers of the day, the means of dictating opinions and principles to the people*' (Lord Chancellor, Lord Brougham in his evidence given to the Parliament Committee 1834, Maclure 1965, p.40). This concern was the major stumbling block on the road to a fully comprehensive school system in England and Wales funded by pubic taxation. More importantly, for the present purposes of this research, was the consequent gap which it left. This gap was filled by 'voluntary' schools, the majority of which were owned and administered by religious organisations dedicated to the provision of education for the poor. The Church of England, being the 'established church' of the nation since the 16th century, played a particularly crucial role (for further see from among other Adamson, 2000, Berkeley, 2008; Coulson, 1999; Chadwick 2001; Chitty, 2004; Francis, 1993b; Franklin, 2009; Gates, 2005; Ipgrave and McKenna, 2008; Johnson, 2006; Judge 2001; Skinner, 2002; Smelser, 1991; Ward, 2008).

When in 1870 legislation enabled a national system of state education open to all, many of the voluntary schools had been in existence for almost a century and Anglican and Catholic churches dominated the provision of elementary schooling. Although the realities of an expanding and changing economy had by this time demonstrated that a reliance on the voluntary societies could not meet the absolute needs of a modern state, in a typical act of

British pragmatism parliament avoided confrontation and opted for a quintessentially British compromise. This compromise was a system of dually maintained denominational schools existing alongside non-denominational board schools (now community schools), thus establishing the dually maintained system of educational provision as a principle as well as in reality, and also the partnership between the state and the churches that continues to this day. This historical compromise has not been seriously disturbed ever since. The Education Acts in 1902 and 1944 secured the future of this system as well as establishing a '*ready-made model for the extension of state funding to schools run by or serving other more recently arrived religious communities*' (Skinner 2002, p.179; see also Tomlinson, 2001). The vast majority of contemporary schools with a religious character within the state system are 'maintained schools' (either voluntary controlled or voluntary aided), schools - founded, owned and to some extent run by a voluntary body - a church, a trust or foundation. The number of minority faith schools, of whatever legal type, also remains small. Only a small number of voluntary schools are not faith-based.

Voluntary controlled schools are entirely paid for by public funds and offer limited rights to the founding body which appoints a minority of the Governors. The Local Authority however runs the school, appoints the staff, sets admissions policy and determines the curriculum in accordance with national policy. Head teachers are appointed by the Local Authority from a shortlist supplied by the Governors which may take into account his/her suitability to the school's religious character. Voluntary controlled schools have to provide religious education according to a local authority agreed syllabus, but also must provide denominational education if requested to do so by parents (see also Brown, 2003; Oldfield et al, 2013; Skinner, 2002). Voluntary aided schools on the other hand have all their running costs met by public funds but the governing bodies are responsible for capital costs, although the government assists the governing bodies with grants (originally of up to 50% but Acts in 1959, 1967, 1974 successively increased the proportion, in 2001 the percentage rose to 90), the balance is then met by the governors. In exceptional circumstances the government can pay capital grants of up to 100%, Local Authorities may also help governing bodies with their share of costs. The majority of the Governors are appointed by the founding organisation, which are then the legal employers and appoint the head teacher and staff. Voluntary aided schools with a religious character are also permitted to apply religious criteria in selecting staff and pupils (if oversubscribed, if undersubscribed voluntary aided schools are required by law to admit all pupils), religious education and worship is also determined by the

governors, and are conducted in accordance with the school's trusts deeds (Lankshear. 1996). Voluntary aided schools may also decide whether to teach subjects which are not on the curriculum, such as Personal, Social and Health Education and Citizenship (Oldfield et al, 2013). Religious Education in both voluntary controlled and voluntary aided schools is not subject to Ofsted inspection but is subject to inspection under section 48 of the 2005 Education Act.

Voluntary controlled schools are almost all Anglican (and mostly primary), whereas only one Roman Catholic school did not accept the status of voluntary aided. As of June 2011 there were almost 7,000 maintained faith schools in England in total. Around 68 per cent of which are Church of England schools and 30 per cent are Catholic. Only 61 of the maintained schools with a religious character were not associated with the major Christian denominations. These 61 schools were made up as follows:

- Jewish (42)

- Muslim (12)

- Sikh (3)

- Greek Orthodox (1)

- Hindu (1)

- Quaker (1)

- Seventh Day Adventist (1)

- United Reform Church (1) (source DfE 2011).

The major Christian denominations are made up as follows:

- Christian (138)

- Church of England (4606)

- Roman Catholic (1985)

- Methodist (26)

Since 1944 further educational reforms have seen the introduction of a 'quasi-market'

in school-based education (Le Grand and Bartlett, 1993; Chadwick, 2001; Edwards and Whitty 1997; Tritter and Chadwick, 1998). Since the Education Reform Act 1988, the education policy of successive governments have been committed to '*a more diverse school system*' and greater opportunities for parental choice which are believed to '*deliver better results for our children*' (Hansard, 2002). The policy of increasing the number of schools with a religious character can partly be understood within this wider transforming context, in which educational policy has emphasised diversification, or 'specialisation', in the provision of education and the desirability of a range of external organisations becoming involved in delivering education and managing schools (Clements, 2010; Gamarnikow and Green, 2005; Mirza, 2005; see also DfES 2001a, 2002). Schools with a religious character have become a key part in affirming a more diverse educational provision, orientated towards affirming and meeting the 'different' needs and identities of children; as well as fulfilling the neoliberal ideal of parental choice and improvement through diversity (Ward 2008; Parker-Jenkins et al 2005; Mirza, 2005). Schools with a religious character are often perceived by policy makers as superior to state comprehensive education (Chadwick, 2001), being both successful schools and also models of successful schooling; reflected in terms of their academic achievement and distinct and superior school ethos, which is seen to encourage both moral development as well as academic success (DfES 2001b, see also Brettingham, 2007; Donnelly, 2000; Gamarnikow and Green 2005; McKinney, 2006; Clements, 2010; Ward 2008).

Further categories which offer opportunities for religious organisations and bodies to play a role in state funded education have been established. Firstly Academies, officially classified by the DfES as 'publicly-funded independent schools' (see also Walford, 2008). Management of an academy is entrusted to the governing body and the head teacher; it is also the governing body which is responsible for appointing the majority of the governors, the total number of which is not prescribed. Sponsors have more control over the curriculum and the academy's general running and ethos than under the normal system. Although, like all state-funded schools academies remain bounded by the statutory School Admissions Code (see also Chapter 8), those academies designated as having a religious character may give priority for admission to children on the basis of religious affiliation. A second further category, similar in concept to academies, are 'foundation schools' (also known as trust schools), which are state funded foundation schools supported by a charitable foundation or trust. Foundation Schools were established under the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and

have the same freedoms as voluntary-aided schools. Unlike academies the trust is not obliged, nor even expected, to make any financial contribution to the school (see also The Independent, 2006; DfES, 2005). As of November 2011 there were 218 academies open which have a faith designation. All of these have a Christian character except 7; these 7 were made up as follows:

- Sikh (1)

- Muslim (1)

- Jewish (7)

Since 2010 there has been renewed support for schools with a religious character from the Conservative-Liberal democrat coalition government. David Cameron, who himself sent his daughter to a much sought-after Church of England primary school in west London, has said that he was a '*strong supporter personally and politically*' of schools with a religious character (cited in Paton, 2010). Echoing New Labour, David Cameron has said that '*I think that faith schools are a really important part of our education system and they often have a culture and ethos which helps to drive up standards*' (Ibid.). The coalitions' 'programme for government' stated that they (Conservatives and Liberal Democrats) '*will work with faith groups to enable more faith schools*' (Cabinet Office 2010, p.29). The Conservatives have said that they want to turn most schools in Britain into 'free schools', described by the DfE as 'non-profit making, independent, state-funded schools'; ostensibly Academies, publicly funded schools run by private bodies, including faith groups, independent of local authorities. New Free schools which do not replace a predecessor school, can give priority to pupils who support a particular religious ethos in up to 50% of their intake and have the same freedoms as academies over the curriculum (maintained faith schools which choose to convert to become a free school or academy retain their religious character and their faith-based freedoms); free schools with a religious designation must provide religious education and a daily act of collective worship in accordance with the tenets of their faith. 323 groups applied to open free schools in the first application window, of the 24 Free schools opened in September 2011, 7 have a faith denomination; those 7 were made up as follows:

- Christian (3)

- Jewish (2)

- Hindu (1)

- Sikh (1)

1.4 An Introduction to Community Cohesion

Community cohesion is a concept which was born out of the civil disturbances which erupted in some areas of northern England in mid-2001; and after which, according to Arun Kundnani, '*Britain woke up to the fact that a generation had grown up living 'parallel lives''* (2006; see also Travis, 2002). It was the official reports into the riots led by Ted Cantle, Community Cohesion (Home office 2001), and John Denham, Building Cohesive Communities (Home Office, 2002; see also Ouseley, 2001) which coined the term 'community cohesion', a vocabulary and discourse which was politically identified as the prime component in building an effective response to the violence of that summer; and also defined the Home Office's strategy for order and harmony in areas characterised by multi-ethnic, multi-faith and multicultural communities. Community cohesion became, as Wetherell remarks, '*one of the UK Labour Government's most durable frameworks for thinking through issues of ethnic diversity and conflict*' (2007 p1).

According to Cantle the primary factors in the disturbances were cultural differences and self-segregation which the report captioned as 'parallel lives' that '*do not seem to touch at any point, let alone overlap and promote any meaningful interchanges*' (p.9). The central themes of the Denham report are likewise community cohesion versus segregation and it concludes that '*positive action must be taken to build a shared vision and identity...*' (p.12; see also Bagguley and Hussain, 2003b). Communities were understood by the reports as being united in their ignorance and hostility towards each other; a mutual lack of understanding and tolerance, and ultimately fighting on the streets was understood to have been the culmination of this breakdown in contact between communities (Burnett, 2004). Though it's worthy of mention here that no measures of segregation can in fact be found in the reports, and both The Cantle and Denham reports provide little or no evidence to support the picture they paint (for further commentary and comments of the reports, see from among others Bagguley and Hussain, 2003a, 2003b; McGhee, 2003, 2005a, 2005b, 2008). Both reports nonetheless argued that there was a need to break down cultural and religious barriers and encourage more social mixing and understanding between communities.

As Community Cohesion became a central plank in government policy however, a more vociferous public and political debate over the continuation and expansion of schools with formal links to religious organisations in England's mosaic of school provision arose. The continuation and expansion of maintained schools with a religious character, and religion more widely, have been conspicuous and contentious elements in the development of the cohesion agenda and policy discourse. A religious or religious-cultural dimension was implicated, at least indirectly, in the reports and analysis of the socio-spatial segregation which the Cantle report captioned as 'parallel lives'. Educational institutions, especially schools, were also acknowledged as having an important role to play in promoting cohesion, and since September 2007 (DCSF, 2007b) all state-maintained schools have also been required to promote Community Cohesion. Separate educational arrangements are listed as being particularly problematic for the cohesion agenda (Home Office, 2001 p.9). The demand for separate ethnic and religious schools was implied in the Cantle report as possible contributory factors to the disturbances in the summer of 2001. Nonetheless, although the official reports into the 2001 riots understood a strongly bonded religious or religious-cultural dimension to have militated against intercultural and interreligious engagement and wider community cohesion, the implication of this understanding was also a recognition that whist British society was becoming more secular generally, members of ethnic minority faith communities were not declining but in fact growing; and religious belief for many citizens from ethnic minority communities remained a key organising principle for their lives and identities (Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005).

The 'riots' also occurred within a context of growing concern that increasing social differentiation and fragmentation at the neighbourhood level was undermining social cohesion; together with a revival of interest in, and reinvigoration of, the idea of 'community' as a realm and means of governance and government strategies to address social problems and counter a perceived apparent new crisis of social cohesion and a crumbling of a previous era's social glue (Robinson, 2008; McGhee, 2003; 2005). The new policy discourse of 'community cohesion' owed an ideological influence to the politics of communitarianism (see for instance Atkinson, 1994; Bell, 2005; Etzioni, 1995; Fraser, 1999; Selbourne 1994; for a critique of communitarian ideas, from among others see for example, Leech, 2001; Bauman, 2001, also see Giddens, 2000) which emerged out of the philosophical critique of liberal theory's conception of the relationship between the individual and society, and its devaluation of community (particularly the liberal theory of John Rawls and especially

Rawls' <u>A Theory of Justice</u>, 1972; see for instance MacIntyre, 1981; Sandel, 1982), Walzer, 1983; Taylor, 1985; for Cohesion and Communitarianism see Robinson, 2008). The series of official reports which followed the disorders further mobilised this new politics of community.

The policy discourse of community cohesion '*bought into*' the concerns of the urban theorists and the discourses of community as an explicit solution to them (Robinson 2008, p.14); together with the concomitant political implication that there may therefore be a need to identify and cultivate valued forms of community and communal attachments in the hope of producing consequences that are desirable for all and which counter the new 'crisis' in social cohesion. Communities were understood to potentially be a cultural sphere where the individualism and subsequent fragmentation of the social, fostered by the invisible hand of unregulated free-market capitalism, could be re-educated and re-socialised to recognise a responsibility to a broader moral and social obligation. Here communities are distinguished by '*shared moral values which are seen as a means of restoring social cohesion*' (Johnson, 1999, p 92). Faith-based organisations and faith-based community activity, being community oriented by nature and demonstrably among the more resilient of community-based organisations, unsurprisingly were perceived by the New Labour government as repositories of social goods (Dinham, 2008). The riots therefore added impetus to political will for engagement with faith communities. In the official reports into the disturbances, the potential of faith communities and particularly faith leaders to foster greater community cohesion is clear (see for instance Ritchie 2001, p.51; see also Community Cohesion Panel, 2004; CIC, 2007; CLG, 2007; Furbey, 2008; Finneron et al. 2001; LGA 2002a, 2002b; Home Office, 2004; Smith, 2001).

The policy of increasing the number of schools with a religious character can also be further partly understood therefore within a wider commitment to 'community life', which governments see being played out in schools with a religious character, based on assumptions made from communitarian theory (Parker-Jenkins, 2005; Annette, 2005). Schools with a religious character are perceived to develop cohesion therefore, based on their values consensus and ethos which can support a more moral education which could remediate the effects of the education market, as well as support higher academic achievement. The work of Etzioni can also help facilitate a deeper understanding, in particular of New Labour's education policies and policies for faith communities in the context of the cohesion agenda. According to Etzioni social change and the fragmentation of the family meant that the

necessary functions which traditionally had been located there, for instance the transmission from one generation to the next of core values such as 'hard work pays' and 'treat others as you would have them treat you', must now be taken on by the wider community and by schools in particular (1995; see also Dinham, 2008). Policy-makers' perceptions of schools with a religious character can therefore also be characterized as perceiving them to be institutional forms functional for community values such of duty and responsibility, and fostering citizens who appreciate the value of education.

1.5 The Importance of this Study

At the time of writing schools with a religious character in England continue to find themselves in a generally privileged as well as unique position, within a wider, generally sympathetic policy context. Nonetheless, publicly funded schools with a religious character have never been entirely controversy free (see for example, Hirst 1972, 1981; British Humanist Association, 1967; The Socialist Education Association, 1981, 1986; for discussion of these see Francis, 2003; Francis and Lankshear, 2001; Swan, 1985; see also ACUPA, 1985; Mirza, 2005), and they remain one of the most debated questions today at the interface of religion and education in England (Cush, 2005). The contemporary amount of articulate scrutiny and consideration which schools which are formally linked to religious organisations receive though is in marked contrast to the amount of attention which they were receiving some twenty years ago. The reason for this has much to do with the much changed context in which these schools continue to exist, which has sharpened concerns and intensified debate over whether these schools do (or even can) promote community cohesion.

The wider context has been much changed by complex and generally interacting causes, not least by the policy of the main political parties of increasingly inviting faith groups to run schools with fewer statutory controls (see above). More than this, twenty years ago, in an increasingly secularised society, many had assumed that such schools would eventually fade away or at least remain a relatively inconspicuous element within England's mosaic of school provision (Lawton and Cairns 2005, p.242). Part of the reason why this did not prove to be the case has been the increased religious diversity of the UK since the Second World War. Successive waves of immigration have raised the UK's ethnic minority population to over 10% at the time of the 2011 national census. For many of these more newly-arrived communities their faith was an important part of their lives and their ethnic and

cultural identity, and they have pressed for recognition of their religious identity at a time when Church attendance in the UK was in long-term decline (Billings, 2009; Graeme Smith, 2008; see also Blair, 2002; DfEE, 2001b; Parker-Jenkin et al, 2005; Ward, 2008).

Establishing schools has been a way for some of these more recently arrived faith groups to preserve their identity (Merry, 2007), and though emerging initially mostly in the independent sector (Walford, 2001), government education policy supporting schools with a religious character for these more recently arrived religious minority communities has reenergised older debates and dialogue about the purposes of education and educational experience, and in particular the place of faith in these purposes (McGettrick, 2005; see also Burn et al, 2001; Charlotte Simpson, 2012). This renewed life to an old issue has also seen the rise of an evangelical type of atheism which often demonises religion as the cause of many of the world's worst evils (Grey, 2008a). From the journalists Polly Toynbee, Matthew Parris, and also the late Christopher Hitchens, to the biologist and writer Richard Dawkins, and from the philosopher Michel Onfray to the authors Phillips Pullman and Martin Amis, many contemporary prominent journalists, writers, philosophers and scientists write and speak against religion more openly and more loudly than twenty years ago, and often express a view that religion is a bad thing and has no future; or at least has no future in the West (Grey 2008a, 2008b). Rather than assisting religion's withdrawal to the margins of society however, for some the rise of this 'fundamentalist' form of secularism is indicative of a wider retreat of secularisation instead (Ibid. see also Berger, 2005; Norris and Inglehart, 2004). Often the 'new atheists' help only to amplify religion's prominence in the public sphere and inspire counter responses from believers, see for instance The Dawkins Delusion by Alister McGrath (2007).

The debate over public funding for schools with a religious character, and the role of religion in education more widely, has also intensified for more devastating and catastrophic reasons. The community cohesion agenda and policy discourse developed in a context which was punctuated by terrorist attacks in New York and Washington in 2001, and in London in 2005, which were carried out in the name of a religiously-inspired ideology. Most of the individuals involved in the London attacks were born and/or brought up in Britain, 'home grown' terrorists claiming to act in the name of Islam, leading many to conclude that something had failed; that the bombers were a consequence of '*a misguided and catastrophic pursuit of multiculturalism*' (Pfaff, 2005; see also Liddle, 2006; Phillips, 2005a). In the community of West Yorkshire, home to three of the Muslim fundamentalists involved in the

London Bombings of July 7 2005, local schools often have high concentrations of either Muslim children or white children and '*second and third generation Muslims can reach university age without integrating into the wider British society in any meaningful way*' (Sajid 2005). All four of the bombers in fact attended community schools but given the high degree of separation between communities in West Yorkshire the London Bombings have generated further concerns about segregation, and the reported 'parallel lives' between different ethnic and faith groups; and generated great suspicion (and prejudice) upon the contribution (or lack of it) of faith-based schools, especially Muslim schools, to cohesion.

These cataclysmic examples of the negative use to which religion can be put to has increased concerns more widely about the negative impact of religion and the growth of religious fundamentalism, and of Islam in particular; giving an added urgency to the government's search for policies to promote cohesion and significance to the importance of the 'common school' (Billings, 2009; Pring, 2005). Currently, the fundamental acceptability of schools with a religious character, and the place of faith in education more widely, are rarely out of the headlines, arousing strong and often sharp views from both opponents and supporters. A recent example occurred between March and July in 2014, after Birmingham Council revealed that it was investigating a number of schools in the city after receiving an anonymous letter which referred to 'operation Trojan horse'; an alleged plot by conservative Muslim groups to install governors at schools. Four separate inquiries were subsequently launched into the allegations, including a Department of Education probe which found evidence of an agenda to introduce 'an intolerant and aggressive Islamist ethos' into some of Birmingham's schools. Media coverage of the saga was extensive and criticism was directed at England's mosaic of school provision. The Guardians Catherine Bennett acerbically concluded that in the present system, had the schools instead successfully applied to the secretary of state for their schools to have a faith designation in law, the schools could have advertised their Islamist ethos on '*a designated faith school's perspective.... and got on with doing God's will*' with the states blessing (2014).

The case of the 'Trojan horse' incident shows how an atmosphere of moral panic can sometimes seem to surround the continuation and expansion of schools with a religious character, particularly those which prioritise admissions on the basis of parents' religious affiliation, and of those especially the ones which have formal links to minority faith organisations. The expansion of a more diverse and multi-faith dually maintained system remains a highly significant and controversial legacy of the New Labour Government's

education policy (Walford, 2008; Cush, 2003; see also Halstead, 2001). The debate about the wisdom of providing support for these schools, as Parker-Jenkins et al, is one that '*cuts across political arrangements, with racism in general – and Islamophobia in particular…*'(2005, p.4). Much of the contemporary opposition focuses upon these schools' contribution or lack of contribution to cohesion, generally related to fears around the schools using their autonomy to nurture faith and a faith identity, the beliefs and values which are part of that identity, and the wider consequences of this for cohesion. It's worth just noting here too that many of these issues that arise in the English context are also found in other contexts too (see for instance McKinney, 2008 [Scotland]; Underkuffler, 2001 [USA]; Engebretson, 2008 [Australia]).

The welcoming and expansion of schools with a religious character continues to ignite considerable public and political debate, and raise sharp questions about the proper role for religious groups in providing education in the state sector, and the role of religion in education more widely (Berkeley, 2008). This debate however, generally pays little or no attention to the fact of the differences and distinguishing features of the schools which have formal links to religious organizations and which are currently publicly funded. The fundamental research question remains, what contribution to cohesion can faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims make, particularly those that include faith-based admissions criteria. Greater scrutiny needs to be applied to the charges which are levelled against autonomous schools with a religious character, and more thoughtful study given to the responses available to their supporters regarding their suitability to fostering cohesion. Mainstream educational study and research on the teaching practices and cultures of school with a religious character and their wider consequences for cohesion remains underdeveloped however (Grace 2003). As Gerald Grace comments, '*thoughtful debate about faith schooling must recognise that faith schools constitute a great variety of educational cultures, principles and practises*' (2003, cited in Gardner and Cairns 2005, p.224). The 2001 White Paper, Schools Achieving Success for instance, was notable for not just its support for an expansion of 'faith schools' and its welcoming of 'independent faith schools' into the maintained sector; but also for paying little or no attention to the variety of educational cultures and practices of schools which comprised schools with a religious character (DfES, 2001a; see also Gardner and Cairns, 2005). From whatever position it is viewed, the relationship between faith and the purposes of education and educational experience poses a key challenge for our times and makes clear the need for opportunities to give the schools

themselves a voice to discuss this (Barker and Anderson, 2005).

Although, as McLaughlin advises us, it is '*rash . . . to condone or condemn certain kinds of separate school solely on grounds of philosophical principle*' 1992, p. 115), empirical investigation into the contemporary teaching practices and educational culture of schools with a religious character, and importantly their impact upon pupils, remains weak, still eleven years after Gerald Grace first commented as such (2003). The lack of empirical research and nuanced understandings about the 'great variety of educational cultures, principles and practises' of schools with a religious character means that this thesis is both important and timely. Support for the continuation of these schools also currently continues from both of the main political parties, this despite a recent survey by Opinium which showed that a majority of taxpayers believe that schools with a religious character, which are allowed to give priority to applications from pupils of their faith, and to teach only about the religious tradition of the school, should not be funded by the state or should be abolished (cited in Helm and Townsend, 2014). This continued support also confirms the policy relevance of this research, in particular following events in Birmingham and the call from the current shadow education secretary, Tristram Hunt, for cross party talks about faith, multiculturalism and state education (ibid.). Though political parties and politicians may continue to talk about the desirability of continuing these schools, the policy, and more importantly the schools themselves, will suffer if further considerate thought isn't given to the variety of faith-based approaches to educational aims and environments (Gardner and Cairns 2005).

1.6 The Aim of the Research

As intimated above, the aim of this thesis is a more thoughtful and thought-provoking debate about faith-based approaches to education, and how these may serve or disserve cohesion. Faith-based approaches to education and their outcomes are bound to wider normative debates around cohesion and the proper role for religious groups in providing education. The fundamental research question is what contribution to cohesion faith-based approaches to education can in fact make. Although I believe that further valuable conceptual, sociological and philosophical work and progress needs to be made in order to define and categorise such faith-based approaches, without engaging in the difficult task of empirically investigating these schools, no philosophical argument alone can determine whether they serve or disserve cohesion. The thesis therefore also makes a modest entry into the field to investigate the

educational environments and aims of schools with a religious character so as to develop empirically grounded, and theoretically informed, conceptually and institutionally important faith-based approaches to education. The aim of this research is therefore to make an important and timely contribution to a more nuanced understanding of the distinctive nature and mission of different schools with a religious character and their wider potential significance for cohesion, and bring greater clarity and revision to existing generalisations.

1.7 An Assumption of this study

The study assumes that publicly funded schools which have formal links to religious organisations are going to remain a feature of the educational landscape for the foreseeable future. In 1944, when the Minister of Education and Archbishop of Canterbury were negotiating the future of 'church schools' and the British school system, the Churches were unable by themselves to maintain their voluntary schools but the state was also unable to buy up their schools and was reluctant to annex them (Francis 2003, p.126). Seventy-years later, this study assumes that this situation has not been seriously disturbed. The contribution to the total educational provision made by schools with formal links to religious organisations remains considerable, the land and the buildings of these schools are also owned by the sponsoring religious organisations. Though the religious organisations cannot afford by themselves to maintain their schools, nor can the state afford to buy the land and the buildings, and currently there exists no political will to annex them. Given the historical basis of the development of universal school education in the UK, the clear popular support for many of these schools amongst parents, and also how the experience of Alan Johnson shows how difficult even adjustments to admissions policies are to impose (see Chapter 2, p.33), this study assumes that for now and for the foreseeable future the provision of public education in England will include schools with a religious character.

1.8 A brief Overview of the Thesis

The thesis can be seen as being in essentially three distinct parts, though the three different parts are not formally marked as such hereafter. The first section is introductory and comprises this and chapters 2, 3 and 4. Chapters 2 and 3 look in greater depth at the sociological underpinnings of the cohesion agenda, and which also influence the different

kinds of claims involved in accusations that the educational environments and aims of schools with a religious character are antithetical to cohesion. Chapter 4 discusses and outlines the research design and practice. Part 2 comprises Chapters 5, 6 and 7, and is at once both empirical and also broadly philosophical and sociological, drawing upon the empirical research conducted in the three schools to present an analysis of the schools and their educational environments and aims. The chapters outline two faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims, the 'religious passing approach' and 'the religious engaging approach', which are relevant to the research questions and which have clear policy relevance. These chapters discuss in detail the ways in which these faith-based approaches to education maybe (potentially) advantageous (or disadvantageous) for cohesion. Part 3 is conclusory and comprises Chapter 8 which provides a final summary of the research. The research concludes that the accusation that schools with a religious character disserve cohesion is unjustifiable when stated in a general way.

Chapter 2

Schools with a Religious Character and Cohesion: The Problematization of 'Restricted Non-common Educational Environments'

2.1 Introduction

The causal story of the official reports commissioned to examine issues arising from the riots in 2001 was the problematization of the social, and in particular ethical and religious, bases to community. The focus of community cohesion is therefore inevitably directed towards forms of association - reorienting and transforming undesirable negative associational manifestations (withdrawals into restrictive and isolated intra-community forms of behavior) into positive and desirable ones (inter-community forms of behavior which generate inter-community understanding and toleration). It is here where the concepts of contact theory, social capital and also social identity theory play important roles and are concepts which are heavily drawn upon to refer to the perceived apparent new crisis in cohesion and its remedy. They're also the concepts which most frequently inform the criticisms and assumptions of critics, be they analysts, observers, intellectuals or opinion-formers, of schools with a religious character. These will be the themes of this chapter.

According to the final report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC, 2007) and the Local Government Association's Guidance on Community Cohesion (LGA, 2002a) a cohesive community is one where '*there are strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods*' (CIC 2007 P42, LGA 2002 p6). These statements acknowledge the importance of schools and the education system to cohesion. Schools are recognized as common and crucial points of contact and therefore important vehicles in fostering cohesion. Schools provide both an institutionalised arena of diversity along ethnic, religious and socio-economic lines, and a degree of uniformity through the national curriculum (Flint, 2007). However, these can also be two distinctive features of autonomous schools with a religious

character, their degree of autonomy over admissions procedures and governance (and also staffing), and also their degree of autonomy over the curriculum. The problematization of schools with a religious character is firstly therefore, the problematization of 'restricted non-common educational environments', and secondly the problematization of 'distinctive non-common educational aims'. Halstead and McLaughlin define 'non-common educational environments' as follows;

> *'Faith schools involve restrictive non-common educational environments because the very nature of the school involves the separation of a group of children and young people for schooling from the rest of society… The educational environment of a faith school is restricted and non-common in that it is precisely intended for a particular group within society and not for a society as a whole…'* (Halstead and McLaughlin 2005, p.63)

In having faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria which prioritise children from families of the faith of the school's sponsor, concerns are raised therefore that this will be antithetical to 'improving the value of everyday interactions between people from different backgrounds'. Related concerns are also raised that autonomous schools with a religious character will use their autonomy to 'cream skim' more 'desirable' pupils, that faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria will, either directly or indirectly, have the effect of favouring the privileged and deepen socio-economic divisions in society.

This chapter further explores 'Community Cohesion' and conceptualizes the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' in the context of cohesion; as read from the conceptual underpinnings and sociological assumptions of the Cohesion agenda and the broader normative debate around schools with a religious character. The sections which follow unpack and provide a conceptual framework for understanding and situating the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' within. In order to structure further discussion in this area and subsequent chapters, this chapter firstly establishes a greater working understanding of social capital and (direct) contact. What emerges from this is a cohesion agenda, the end ambition of which is a cohesive society lubricated by large amounts of intergroup contact and bridge-building capital, Robert Putnam's 'sociological wd-40' (see also 2.2 below). The problematization of 'restricted educational environments' is then conceptualised to demonstrate that for many, the realisation of this ambition is significantly, if not wholly, disserved by an education policy which includes support for such environments

as part of its commitment to raising standards, academic attainment and the principles of competition, choice and diversity. Finally, this chapter provides a brief review of existing empirical evidence of the faith-based oversubscriptions admission criteria of autonomous schools with a religious character, and the separation of children along religious, ethnic and also socio-economic lines.

2.2 Community Cohesion and Social Capital

From within the theoretical toolkit of the social sciences, community cohesion makes significant use of 'social capital' and also 'contact theory' (as a mechanism for promoting social capital). Social Capital is the conceptualization of, short hand/useful metaphor for, and broad generalization about, the benefits which accrue from associational activity. The theory of social capital at its core is a simple although also an important proposition; just as people are enriched by their physical capital and economic capital so too are they by their social capital, their interpersonal relations; *'people connect through a series of networks and they tend to share common values with other members of these networks; to the extent that these networks constitute a resource, they can be seen as forming a kind of capital'* (Field 2003, p.1). This is an idea which has been understood since at least Lyda Judson Hanifan's discussion of rural school community centres in 1916, which Robert Putnam credits as the first recorded instance of the use of the term 'social capital' (Hanifan, 1916; Putnam, 2000). The more recent work of Bourdieu (1983), Coleman (1988), Putnam (1993) and Fukuyama (1999) have been the most influential in social capital's rediscovery and entry into the contemporary popular sociological lexicon, and also its progression into '*something of a cure-all for the maladies affecting society at home and abroad*' (Portes 1998 p2).

Although there are differences in the different conceptions of social capital and focus of the work of Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam, they are all generally agreed upon the traditionally recognised elements; '*all the definitions identify social capital in terms of networks that facilitate trust, social cohesion, and co-operation, and that it is something to which all communities should aspire*' (Hepworth and Stitt 2007, p.896). The decline of social capital thesis as conceptualized by Robert Putnam, especially in his <u>Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community</u> (2000), is a theme the influence of which can be tacitly felt throughout the discourse of the official reports into the riots in 2001 and the community cohesion policy agenda. That more Americans were bowling alone rather than in

organized community groups and bowling leagues was for Putnam both a cause and a symptom of Americans civic disengagement and growing distrust in their government over the last 30 years (other political scientists have criticized Putnam however, see for example, Edwards et al. 2001; Portes, 1998). The resonating force of Putnam's 'lonely bowler', as an analogy for declining social capital and the serious collapse of community and fragmentation of society, has subsequently continued to endure and influence contemporary policy debates.

For Putnam, although social capital varies across a number of different dimensions, the most important distinction is between networks within groups and networks between groups, which Putnam identifies as 'bonding' and 'bridging' social capital respectively. Bonding social capital is an insular social solidarity and belonging between people who are similar in some important way and who share strong mutual commitments, such as within religious communities. So Putnam's own bonding social capital would consist, so he tells us, of his '*ties to other white, male, elderly professors*' (2007 p143). Putnam dubs bonding social capital as '*sociological superglue*' that binds similar people together (2000, p23). Social capital is not an unambiguously positive concept however, as bonding capital can reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups, and may also, as a consequence of causing strong in-group loyalty, create out-group antagonism (see also Portes and Landolt, 1996). Bridging social capital conversely is connections with people who you otherwise experience in some degree as 'different' from yourself; these may be ties to people of a different generation, different race or a different faith to oneself. Whereas bonding social capital is 'sociological superglue', bridge building capital provides 'sociological WD-40', by increasing relationships that link people to new networks and resources (Putnam 2000, p.23). Bridging social capital can increase outgroup trust and generate and maintain inter-community networks and mutual understanding, as well as foster broader identities and toleration (others make further distinctions, see for example, Woolcock, 2001; Gilchrist, 2004). The 'parallel lives' captioned in the Cantle report is itself a statement influenced by Putnam's social capital theory and amounts to what could be described as '*as a fully-fledged Putmanesque problematization of excessive bonding social capital in a context of insufficient bridging social capital*' (McGhee 2003 p385; see also Levitas, 1998, for the influence of Putnam on New Labour).

Both bonding and bridging social capital can bestow benefits upon its members, and Putnam does not conceive the relationship between the two as being zero-sum (2000; 2007). Bonding social capital can potentially be a prelude to bridging social capital rather than

preclude it; it may be the basis from which people can begin the more difficult project of 'building bridges' to people who they experience as 'different' in some significant way. It is bridging social capital nonetheless which is, according to Putnam et al, '*the kind of social capital that is most essential for healthy public life in an increasingly diverse society*' (2003 p3). This means that what Granovetter (1973) had termed 'weak ties', that is, those less frequent interactions and less dense networks between people who have little in common with each other, are actually extraordinarily important to community cohesion. '*Systems*', as Taylor comments, '*with low levels of connectivity and high homogeneity… become stagnant, because they are unable to adapt*' (2000, p.1032); likewise communities which have high levels of bonding social capital but do not bridge. Bridging social capital is also however much harder to develop than bonding capital according to Putnam, since '*social capital is often most easily created in opposition to something or someone else*' (Putnam 2000, p 361). Importantly for 'Community Cohesion' it is only bridging social capital that is about people from different groups getting on and which is key to measuring cohesion (CIC 2007, p.111). Too much bonding and not enough bridging, that is, too much 'interaction' within communities and not between communities, was understood to be a key cause of England's violent summer of 2001 and the fragmentation of society into 'atomistic' divisions.

2.3 Community Cohesion and Contact

In a cohesive community it is direct intergroup contact which performs the transformative role of turning undesirable inward-looking bonding social capital, into desirable outward-looking bridge-building social capital. Contact between people of different ethnic, racial and religious backgrounds is understood to undermine out-group antagonisms and mistrust, and in its place foster greater out-group empathy, trust and solidarity (LGA, 2002: 6). The idea that systematic contact between conflicting groups may reduce intergroup tensions and mistrust, and lead to more positive intergroup relations, was first theorized by the social psychologists Robin M. Williams JR. (1947, 1964) and Gordon Allport (1954); and has received much attention since its first formulation, becoming '*one of the most long-lived and successful ideas in the history of social psychology*' (Brown 2010, p244). In its simplest form the 'Contact Hypothesis' maintains that intergroup prejudice or bias can be reduced through contact between the antagonistic groups; so the basic idea is that more contact between individuals who belong to antagonistic social groups will undermine the negative stereotypes they may have of each other, reduce their mutual antipathies and improve inter-group

relations (Forbes, 2004). Allport was careful to define prejudice however, and restricted the term to those cases in which intergroup hostility is not caused by actual cultural differences or competition between groups as '*these conflicts are not in themselves instances of prejudice*' (p.88). Prejudice is instead a thinking error, the attribution of unpleasant characteristics to a group which have no basis in reality (Forbes 1997, Bramel 2004).

In contrast to contact theory, 'conflict theory' and 'threat theory' suggest that where the opportunity for contact is not taken up or where contact is not meaningful, the more a greater diversity of peoples are brought into physical proximity with each other, the greater peoples predilection for the familiar and mistrust of the other as a response to the perceived competition (see for example, Blumer 1958; LeVine and Campbell, 1972; Taylor 1998; Bobo, 1999). The community cohesion policy agenda's own emphasis on separation and lack of contact as the root cause of the disturbances, and the promotion of greater cross cultural contact between different communities as the remedy, nonetheless appeals much more to Allport's more optimistic statement on intergroup contact. It has always been understood however, that not just any contact will improve relations among people and the groups to which they belong (see also Amir, 1998; Cook, 1978; Eller and Abrams, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998, 2009). Allport admonished that '*it has sometimes been held that merely by assembling people without regard for race, colour, religion or national origin, we can thereby destroy stereotypes and develop friendly attitudes. The case is not so simple*' (Allport 1954, p. 261). Prejudice, Allport tells us, unless deeply rooted in the character of the individual, may however '*be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals*' (1954, p.267). The effect of this may also be further enhanced when there is no competition between the groups who are interdependent upon each other to achieve this common goal, and if the contact situation is supported by an authority which both groups acknowledge (ibid.).

The reduction of intergroup anxiety in particular is also understood to be a key process underlying the success of intergroup contact and reduction of prejudice; by reducing hesitancy to initiate cross-group contact for fear of being rejected by the interaction partner or that the interaction partner will behave in an offensive manner (Stephan and Stephan, 1985; Plant and Devine, 2003; see also Turner, Hewstone, and Voci, 2007). Mere 'co-presence' of two or more groups may not therefore be a sufficient condition for overcoming ethnic, racial and class divisions, and may in fact instead provide a fertile ground for outgroup prejudice (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; Amin, 2002; Atkinson, 2006; Hewstone et al, 2007). Not all

contact experiences, particularly casual acquaintance, therefore are positive, and may increase conflict as well as reduce it (see for example, Plant, 2004; Plant & Devine, 2003); the basic issue is the nature of the contact, whether contact situations lead to trust or distrust (Pettigrew, 1971, p. 275). The report of the CIC captioned this theme of 'optimal conditions' in the term 'meaningful contact' which is described as being conversations which '*go beyond surface friendliness; in which people exchange personal information or talk about each other's differences and identities; people share a common goal or share an interest; and they are sustained long-term*' (2007, p112).

Intergroup contact is also one of the pathways identified by Vogt through which education can promote 'tolerance', and therefore by extension cohesion (1997; Vogt also identifies three other pathways, which are moral instruction, personality development and cognitive development). Being 'tolerant' is understood to be important in societies marked by cultural and religious diversity, as Walzer explains, '*toleration makes difference possible; difference makes toleration necessary*' (1997, xii). Tolerance has a vast literature dedicated to the complexity of its definition and meanings however (see for instance, Galeotti, 2002, cited in Zembylas, 2011; Gutmann, 1994; Marcuse, 1965; Mendus, 1989; Parekh, 1996; Rawls, 1993; Tonder, 2013; Vogt, 1997; Walzer, 1997; Williams and Waldron, 2008; cited in Zembylas, 2011). At its most basic and uncontroversial, to be tolerant is to be a person who has an authentic personal motivational background and values basis to accept, or simply put up with, things which one does not approve of or dislikes. This is consistent with the more 'passive' and limiting definition of tolerance as 'non-interference' or 'non-practise' in the tradition of John Locke. A passive non-interference in the lives of others may entail respecting a person's right to be different, but may not necessarily entail any respect or value attached to that difference per se (see also Balint, 2010). Tolerance however can be extended to a more active and energetic ethical underpinning of openness to, and embracement and appreciation of, the fact and validity of society's differing ethnicities, cultural beliefs, sexual orientations, genders, and religions; and therefore more in the tradition of John Stuart Mill (see for instance, Mendus, 1989, for a discussion of John Locke's Letter of Toleration and John Stuart Mill's On Liberty; see also Marcusean, 1965).

The impact of diversity at a micro level of analysis is understood to likely be quite different from the impact of diversity at the neighbourhood, city or national level (Janmaat, 2010). Ash Amin for instance has argued that the contact spaces of housing estates and urban public spaces are perhaps incapable of inculcating interethnic understandings '*because they*

are not structured as spaces of interdependence and habitual engagement' (2002, p.969). Attention may therefore be better focused on more 'ideal sites' for the daily negotiation of ethnic difference. These are where 'prosaic negotiations', the 'micro-politics of everyday social contact and encounter', are compulsory. These sites are what Amin terms 'micro-publics', and one example of which is schools (ibid.). Schools, as institutionalised diverse 'micro-publics', can potentially play an important role therefore as arenas extending opportunities for young people to meet others whom they experience in some important way as being different from themselves, and would not perhaps otherwise meet through their own friends and family. The 'restricted educational environments' of autonomous schools with a religious character are implicated in disserving these opportunities however.

2.4 Community Cohesion and 'Restricted Educational Environments'

The 'restricted educational environments' of autonomous schools with a religious character were implicated in the Cantle report's picture of a residual breakdown of social networks between diverse communities. The key issue for the Cantle report was that segregation in schools significantly adds to the separation of faith and ethnic communities. Religious schools specifically are implied in the Cantle report as possible contributory factors to the disturbances in the summer of 2001; '*we are concerned that some existing faith schools appear to be operating discriminatory policies where religious affiliations protect cultural and ethnic divisions'* (Home Office 2001, p.33). The Cantle report admonished that a significant problem to cohesion was posed by existing and future 'mono-cultural schools', and the development of more faith based schools may, in some cases, lead to an increase in these schools (Home Office 2001, p.33). The report recognised a potential contradiction drawn attention to by Kearns and Forrest (2000; see also, Forrest and Kearns, 2001), that social cohesion at the neighbourhood level is not unambiguously a good thing; '*a city of neighbourhoods with a high degree of social cohesion could be a city with a high level of conflict within and between neighbourhoods'* (2000, p.1013). Too strong a sense of community may in fact be divisive; '*the strengthening of social ties within groups can also be a divisive process, in that strong community bonds may be formed around perceived differences to, and the consequent exclusion of, others'* (Hepworth and Stitt 2007, p.906; see also Gilchrist 2009, p.18). There is potentially therefore an underside or 'dark side' to 'strong communities' and 'strong community-based organisations'; privileging unity over difference can potentially be a powerful principle and expression of suppression and exclusion (Furbey

and Macey, 2005; Young, 1990). Within some communities there may be a close but also closed social cohesion with a concomitant defensiveness and hostility towards the outside world. Some communities may only display therefore 'particularised trust' and not 'generalised trust' or 'moralistic trust'; particularized trusters are fearful of strangers (Uslaner, 1997; 2000). Therefore, whilst we may wish local neighbourhoods to be socially cohesive they must also have good social links with other neighbourhoods and their residents in order to foster community cohesion as opposed to parallel social or micro cohesions, lest they express the 'downside' of community.

A significant component in the development of community cohesion discourse has therefore pertained specifically to the issue of school segregation and the 'mono-cultural' environments of schools. Whilst however, still not arguing either for or against public funds for schools with a religious character, the Cantle report recommended that schools with a religious character should open up 25% of their places to students of another faith to the schools foundational faith or none (Home Office 2001, pp.34-35). In 2006, then Secretary of State, Alan Johnson, issued a press release in October 2006 announcing that the government was proposing to add an amendment to the Education and Inspections Bill in line with the Cantle reports recommendation. The Amendment would have enabled councils to ensure that up to 25% of places in schools with a religious character were open to families of a different faith or none where there is local demand (DfES, 2006). The amendment garnered the support of both Anglican and Muslim communities and schools. Vigorous opposition from the Roman Catholic Church and the Board of Deputies of British Jews however persuaded the House of Lords to throw out the proposal. The government, in what was described by Lord Baker as '*the fastest U-turn in British political history*', subsequently dropped its plans to amend the Bill after just nine days (BBC News, 2006).

At the core of the above lies a tension between education policies which seek to promote cohesion through respect for difference on the one hand and those which aim to forge cohesion through uniformity on the other, that is, a diversity of schools or diversity in schools; which is reflective of the wider practical problems associated with attempting to create unity out of diversity (Donnelly and Hughes, 2006; Parekh, 2001). As Parekh explains, '*how is balance to be struck between the need to treat people equally, the need to treat people differently, and the need to maintain shared values and social cohesion* (2001, p.xv)? Deepening concerns that an associated risk of increased choice within the education system could be deepening patterns of religious and ethnic segregation can be a powerful argument

in favour of the contact perspective on multicultural/mixed-faith education. Choice, importantly, is not an end in itself, and can only be justified if it can be shown that such choice achieves desirable outcomes. As with many policy options where there are different, equally desirable objectives however, often these are not mutually reinforcing (Billings, 2009); forbidding the establishment of single-faith schools might result in more contact between young people of different faiths, which may also mean a decrease in outgroup prejudice; however, it could also mean undermining young people's fragile sense of self and who may therefore feel less secure in interacting with religious others (Bertram-Troost, 2011; this is a theme further commented upon in the next chapter).

According to Halstead and McLaughlin (2005) the argument that schools with a religious character are 'divisive' can be understood in three different senses. The first two senses are bound to a school's 'restricted educational environments'. Firstly, that schools with a religious character, specifically those that are their own admissions authority, 'categorise' and 'separate' students for schooling from the rest of society; secondly that this separation is consequentially harmful in some further social, cultural, religious or educational way. The second more pejorative sense is often assumed to be an ineluctable outcome of the first. A '*sad, sectarian future*' is a foreseen unavoidable consequence of schools built exclusively '*for Muslims, or for fundamental Christians, or for orthodox Jews*' (McKie, R, 2002). Together, these encapsulate the most serious practical criticism of autonomous schools with a religious character - physical separation; or in the words of social capital, the 'restricted educational environments' of autonomous schools with a religious character may embody strong bonding capital but exhibit very little bridging capital.

2.5 The Problematization of 'Restricted Educational Environments'

An absence or lack of 'bridging' is very much at the heart of the problematization of 'restricted educational environments'. Social capital may not be an 'unmixed blessing'; bonding social capital can exacerbate exclusionary practices particularly when social capital combines with cultural capital to maintain race and ethnic barriers (Portes and Landolt, 1996). A great deal of research and theory in the field of ethnicity and religion points to frequently negative consequences for cohesion when a differentiation by religion is also coupled with a differentiation by colour and ethnicity. In such a context religion can become associated with a fortress or survival mentality, and the potential for intolerance and

intercommunity conflict is understood to be heightened, particularly for communities which are in transition from one society to another such as South Asians in Britain (Farnell et al, 2003; Furbey and Macey, 2005; Neilsen, 1984, cited in Furbey and Macey, 2005; Robinson, 1988; cited in Furbey and Macey, 2005; Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005; Turner 1991, cited in Furbey and Macey 2005). This problematization of 'restricted educational environments' can be seen reflected in a wide range of expressions concerning the divisiveness of schools with a religious character. According to Polly Toynbee schools with a religious character '*foil all attempts at future integration*'; '*religious schools cause apartheid...*' (2001). Similarly, according to the British Humanist Association; '*If children grow up within a circumscribed culture, if their friends and peers are mostly from the same religion and hence also, very likely the same ethnic group, and if they rarely meet or learn to live with others from different backgrounds, this is hardly calculated to promote the acceptance and recognition of diversity*' (2001, p. 35). At the launch of the report into Community Cohesion in Blackburn with Darwen (ICOCO, 2009), Professor Ted Cantle also stated that faith schools with religious admission requirements are '*automatically a source of division*' in the town (BHA, 2009). According to one prominent critic of schools with a religious character, such schools are in fact nothing less than '*lethally divisive*', in view of (his view of) the experience of Northern Ireland (Dawkins, 2001).

Some religious voices have also expressed their concern about schools which prioritise the admission of children from the school's faith tradition. Echoing the sociological assumption of contact theory mentioned above, the problem with such schools, according to Rabbi Doctor Jonathan Romain, is that '*they may be designed to inculcate religious values, but they result in religious ghettos, which can destabilise the social health of the country at large...*' (2005). Only a mixed education, according to Romain, where '*Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim and Sikh children mix freely together, feel at ease with each other, learn about their similarities and respect their differences*' can properly dispel ignorance and fear (ibid.). The 'common school' should therefore '*be the place where people from different backgrounds, cultures and religions learn to live together and not just come to tolerate or respect diversity, but develop through it*' (Pring 2005, p.53). What these concerns amount to could likewise be described as a 'Putnamesque problematization of too much bonding social capital in a context of too little bridging social capital' (McGhee, 2003); that within a 'bonded' context of 'restricted educational environments' children are not brought together to learn with and from each other. This concern can be conceptualised as one which emphasises

that pupils who attend these schools will be too 'mixophobic', as opposed to being 'mixophiliac' (Bauman, 2011). As Zygmunt Bauman admonishes, the more consistently one is mixophobic, that is, '*the longer people spend in the company of others 'like them'*' the more they fail to '*learn or forget the skills needed to live with difference*, *they view the prospect of confronting strangers face-to-face with rising apprehension*' (ibid, p.17).

The threat posed to cohesion by autonomous schools with a religious character therefore, may be understood to be a 'prejudice' or 'intolerance' which is inevitably associated with voluntary separation, a form of prejudice stemming from ignorance of other cultures (Short, 2003, Troyna 1987; Troyna and Carrington 1990; see also Hewer 2001, Judge 2001). An absence of the familiarity which can extend from day to day direct contact between persons of different faiths and the non-faithful can lead '*to ignorance, which can breed suspicion, spiral into fear and deteriorate into prejudice*' (Romain, 2008). Just as intergroup contact situations can reduce prejudice, the absence of such contact is understood by some to conversely deteriorate into prejudice. Sites where children from different faiths and cultural backgrounds are not brought together, to '*practise toleration, mutual respect, and deliberation informed by the principle of reciprocity*' (MacMullen 2007, p.39), are therefore understood to be fertile ground for outgroup prejudice and suspicion of anyone 'different', undermining children's respect for others and the plurality of beliefs and cultures which make up the wider society in which they live. Simply put, '*you can't 'love your neighbour' if you don't 'know your neighbour*' (Chitty 2007, p.229).

2.6 'Restricted Educational Environments', Contact and Division: A Review of the Evidence

The problem with the sociological assumption of contact theory, or at least as it is expressed by Romain above, is that it is unclear that its two fundamental premises can be robustly defended (Short, 2002). These two fundamental premises are central to the problematization of 'restricted educational environments'; firstly that lack of contact leads to ignorance; and secondly, that direct contact, and only direct contact, can dispel this ignorance and make the cultivation of values essential to cohesion easier; values such as mutual tolerance and respect for other peoples beliefs and cultures. Of the first premise, we need only accept that ignorance must be the outcome of an absence of direct contact if we further accept that direct contact is the only means by which one may learn about people who are different from

oneself (ibid.). Children however are not ordinarily cocooned away from outside influences in this way, as Bryant explains, '*in our society, children are aware more than ever of the mores of other faiths and cultures. Through the ubiquitous media they receive views of lifestyles and beliefs outside their own, and isolation by faith or culture is neither possible nor desirable*' (Bryant, 2007, cited in Russell, 2007). Although the potential of education and home arrangements to shield children from exposure to and engagement with diversity should not be underestimated, the basic point is a valid one; direct contact is clearly not the only means through which one may be or seek to be just so exposed and engaging. Allport himself noted that one of the most effective ways of imparting knowledge about people different from oneself is straight academic teaching in school (1954; see also Short, 2002; Ameen and Hassan, 2013; see also Allport and Kramer 1946, cited in Short, 2003; Genesee and Gandara 1999). Making discussion and debate about issues relating to ethnicity, culture and religion part of everyday learning is also something which could, in principle, be undertaken as effectively in a school with a religious character as in a non-denominational one. Allport was also careful to define prejudice (see p.36). Accepting that prejudice is so rooted and therefore not based in reality, there seems to be no intuitive reason for accepting that only direct contact could dispel it.

A further point of issue is that an overemphasis on contact work can also lead to a diminution of multicultural education and curricular work. Research has shown that the school curriculum can have significant potential to alleviate intergroup tensions and prejudice (Gallagher, 2005; Banks, 2005, cited in Donnelly and Hughes 2006; Donnelly, 2004a; 2004b). The school curriculum can be important in increasing the amount of information students have when developing impressions of outgroup members, helping students to make critical judgements and move beyond wrong information and any misconceptions which they may hold and which may, if left intact, leave them judging outgroups solely on the basis of group-based stereotypes; and displaying lower tolerance and respect to these groups (see Peri, 1999; Banks and Banks, 1995; Hogan and Mallot, 2005; also see Allport, 1954; Schweitzer, 2007; Verkuyten et al, 2010). Here perhaps an enlightening and useful distinction can be made between affective and cognitive components of prejudice; the former relates to feelings and emotional responses to a group, for example dislike of an outgroup, whereas the latter reflects perceptions, judgements and stereotypes about a group. Research has shown that direct contact is less effective at reducing cognitive forms of prejudice than affective forms of prejudice (Turner, Crisp and Lambert 2007; see also, Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Wolsko et al,

2003). An intuitive supposition may therefore be that curricular work has the opposite relationship with affective and cognitive components of prejudice to direct contact, though further research and insight is needed to verify this.

Of the second premise, despite the deceptively simple form in which the 'contact hypothesis' is presented, contact theory is not without its critics who would argue that a persistent pattern in research has been partial and ambiguous findings (Vogt, 1997). For one, although the contact hypothesis is implicitly longitudinal, the majority of research has employed a cross-sectional design (see for instance Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000, 2006); these studies are seen therefore as being unable to rule out the possibility of a selection bias, that people with positive attitudes are more likely to seek intergroup contact and prejudiced people are more likely to avoid it (Vogt, 1997; Tausch et al, 2010; for the few exceptions see Binder et al., 2009; cited in Tausch et al, 2010; Eller & Abrams, 2004, cited in Tausch et al, 2010; Van Laar et al., 2005, cited in Tausch et al, 2010). The micro environment of a school would appear to satisfy Allport's optimal conditions since in diverse classes pupils share common experiences, and interaction/'prosaic negotiations' between pupils of different groups are unavoidable on a sustained daily basis (at least in theory), also students are of equal status (at least nominally) (Kokkonen et al, 2008; see also Janmaat, 2010). But even in schools successful contact cannot be guaranteed and research has produced mixed findings.

Research by Irene Bruegel (2006) found evidence for the positive effects of integrated schooling. Focusing on the transition between primary and secondary schools, Bruegel found that friendships at primary schools crossed ethnic and faith divides wherever children had the opportunity to make friends from different backgrounds and that the positive benefits of mixed primary schooling particularly for white children, extended into the early years of secondary school. Bruegel also found some evidence that parents learned to respect people from other backgrounds as a result of their children's experiences in mixed schools (see also Brown et al, 2008; Irwin, 1993, cited in in Gallagher, 2005; McGlynn et al, 2004; Verkuyten, M et al, 2010; see also Frankenberg et al, 2003; Holme et al, 2005, cited in Janmaat, 2010, for a US context). There is also however, a growing body of research which shows that diversity in schools cannot be relied upon per se to consistently result in improved intergroup relations (Troyna and Hatcher, 1992; Gillborn, 1990, cited in Short 2003a). Janmaat, when exploring the relation between ethno-racial diversity and civic attitudes in England, Sweden and Germany found the effects of diversity varied across the three countries (2010). A positive

relationship between classroom diversity and ethnic tolerance was found in Sweden and Germany, but not for white students in England. A negative or non-relationship between diversity and trust was also found across all three countries. Janmaat tentatively concluded that '*irreducible, nationally unique configurations of conditions fundamentally shape the impact of diversity at the school level*' (p.36). This is consistent with further research which similarly emphasises that the success or not of contact is socially and culturally located (for contact in schools see Genesee and Gandara, 1999; Donnelly and Hughes, 2006; for contact more widely see Ray, 1983).

All of this is not to dismiss the claim that direct contact can lead to positive social attitudes and improved intergroup relations, only to underscore that the circumstances have to be right and that in light of the above the right circumstances are difficult to engender even in the micro environment of the school (Vogt, 1997; see also Dixon et al, 2005). Contact for instance in a learning environment which does not support positive intergroup contact could aggravate intergroup tensions rather than alleviate them (Wilson, 1996; see also Troyna and Hatcher, 1992). An important reference point is the murder of a 13-year-old Asian pupil by a white fellow pupil at the multiracial Burnage High school in Manchester in September 1986. Although Burnage School had an anti-racist policy, the inquiry into the murder noted that it had taken place in '*a racist culture and context*' (Macdonald et al. 1989 p45, cited in Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005). Wider social and cultural considerations may also be particularly pertinent in England where there is an emphasis on performance and the more utilitarian and measurable outcomes of education that serve the economy (Hughes, 2002, cited in Donnelly and Hughes, 2006; see also Gallagher, 2005; Johnston, 2001, cited in Gallagher, 2005; Milken and Gallagher, 1998, cited in Gallagher, 2005, for the same themes in a Northern Irish Context). This may be to the detriment of any social cohesion objectives which cannot be measured in any hard or fast way. Moreover, there isn't any consensus on just exactly what the 'right circumstances' consists of (see for instance contributions on this from among others Donnelly and Hughes, 2006, McGlynn et al, 2004, Gurin et al, 2004; Vogt, 1997; see also Yablon, 2011). Equal status for instance, can in practise be a particularly difficult criterion to meet in schools, since ethnic and religious minorities are often in a socio-economic as well as numerically disadvantaged position in comparison to the majority (Vogt, 1997; Plant and Devine, 2003; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006).

A related, perhaps more exploratory point, contrary to the contact hypothesis and the desirability of equal status, is whether there may be an optimum amount of religious

heterogeneity within which meaningful contact across faith boundaries is most likely to occur? More meaningful contact across faith boundaries may in fact occur in a school where there is a greater degree of shared religious belief and where one faith group predominates. Research in America into race relations between black and white students for instance has found that '*racially balanced classrooms provide a sufficient number of black and white students to permit the existence of racially segregated subgroups or cliques*' (Hallinan, 1982, p.70; see also, Longshore, 1982; Schofield, 1993). As already noted, mere co-existence or merely sharing a space with outgroup members is understood to not by itself be sufficient to change attitudes and behaviours in a positive direction towards outgroup members. What matters is whether any 'meaningful' cross-group contact occurs; students' merely brushing past one another in the corridor is not likely to be effective at much of anything (Vogt, 1997).

Although the research on race relations in America is quite dated now, and I am not aware of any similar research on interfaith contact in schools, I would raise the question here whether perhaps in a school where two or three faith groups predominate in near equal numbers, that children (active intervention notwithstanding) might more likely segregate themselves into subgroups within the school. Perhaps a similar dynamic may occur along the lines illustrated by this Christian respondent from a group interview with leaders of a youth project drawn from different faiths conducted by Furbey et al, who commented that at his college '*if you walk into the room you have a corner of Sikhs and a corner of Muslims and if you speak to the Sikhs then you don't speak to the Muslims on that day. You can feel the tension*' (2006, p.31). Similarly, Janmaat, in trying to account for the non-relationship which his research found between diversity and tolerance among white students in England, speculates that inter-ethnic contact may only contribute to improved attitudes in the dominant group up to a certain level of diversity (2010; see also Billings and Holdings, 2008 for similar findings form the Burnley Project). Past a certain amount of diversity dominant groups may for instance feel more intimidated by ethnic minorities and become less tolerant as a result. In other words, there may be a critical tipping point past which conflict theory may apply. That inter-group contact may thrive in conditions of (numerical) inequality would be in complete contrast to the contact hypothesis (ibid.).

As to the physical separation of students along religious lines, there is no national data set available on the composition of maintained schools in England in terms of the faith of the pupils enrolled, nor has any research yet been carried out on the religious composition of schools across England. One study carried out by the London School of Economics and

Political Science examined the religious composition and admissions policies of a sample of secondary schools with a religious character in London. A total of forty-nine schools were included in the sample (thirty-three Roman Catholic, eleven Church of England, three Jewish and two other Christian denominations), each classified by the Department of Education and Skills (DfES) as having a religious character at September 2005. All forty-four Roman Catholic and Church of England Schools had admissions criteria which were related to the religion of applicants. The research found that '*there were differences in the religious composition of schools that were Church of England, Roman Catholic, Jewish and of other Christian denominations*' (Pennell et al 2007, p.3). Church of England schools were found to be religiously more inclusive than Roman Catholic Schools, though the number of non-Catholic children admitted to Roman Catholic schools has increased significantly in recent years (Arthur, 1995, 2005; see also Kennedy, 2009). In Church of England Schools roughly seven out of ten pupils (71.2%) were reported to be Christian, just less than one in ten to be Muslim (8.4%) and a similar figure to be of no faith (no information was available for the remainder). In Roman Catholic schools over nine out of ten pupils (95.9%) were reported to be Christian, only very small percentages were of other religions, the largest being Muslim (1.3%), or no faith (0.7%).

Pennell et al's study is comparable to Grace's survey of 30 London Catholic schools which found that 27 schools had over 60% of pupils from Catholic families and eight schools had 100% of pupils from Catholic families (Grace, 2002, p.195). Of the twenty schools in Liverpool included in Grace's study only three had Catholic school populations below 90% (p.116) and of the six schools in Birmingham, two schools had Catholic school populations below 40% and four had populations over 90% (p.117). Similarly, Allen and West, from an analysis of the first wave of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Young People in England (LSYPE) survey (which, beginning in 2004, is currently charting the progress of a cohort of around 15,000 young people across 658 secondary schools into their 20s), found that two-thirds of children in the Roman Catholic schools included in the sample came from families with a Catholic parent, one-fifth had an Anglican parent, with the remaining being of another or no religion. Similarly, around two thirds of children in Church of England schools had a parent whose stated religion is Church of England.

Further research has been conducted into the degree of separation of children by ethnicity. Research conducted in London has found that pupils from all South Asian minority groups are under-represented in voluntary aided schools in contrast to pupils from Black

African and Caribbean ethnic groups which are over-represented relative to all other groups (West and Hind, 2007; Allen and West, 2009). Geography is likely to be at least one of several explanatory factors for these differences. For historical reasons religious schools are often situated in more deprived areas of England, the internal mission of Catholic schooling in England, for instance, was primarily to the industrial working class in the country's major conurbations, for example, in London (Grace 2002). This over-representation in London means that Catholic schools absorb a disproportionate number of black African and Caribbean children. In England there is also a strong affiliation between religion and ethnicity. Black students are more likely to be Christian than are students of Pakistani or Bangladeshi origin, who are more likely to be Muslim (West & Hind 2007). The majority of voluntary aided schools are also Roman Catholic and selection by religiosity in this case might be expected to over represent pupils from Black African and Caribbean ethnic groups.

Data from Ofsted also shows that Roman Catholic Schools in fact typically have a greater ethnic mix than local authority schools; '*the proportion of ethnic minority pupils in RC schools is slightly above the national figure, at 18.2% compared to 16.7% (2005 figures)*' (CES, 2006, p8). This underscores how focusing upon just one dimension of diversity, such as a school's religious diversity, will not capture the full picture of bridging social capital in a school. This was a point which was made in a speech entitled 'After 7/7; Sleep Walking to Segregation' given to the Manchester Council for Community Relations in 2005. Trevor Phillips, then chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, commented that '*a healthy mix might be a school with a proportion of ethnic minority pupils somewhere between 5% and 40% - where these children neither predominate, nor are they isolated. Among state schools, about a quarter (25.6%) fall into this group. But amongst Catholic schools, a third (32.5%) would fit this description. So the passion being spent on arguments about whether we need more or fewer faith schools is, in my view, misspent*'.

Nonetheless, concerns are often still pressed that an associated risk of increased choice within the education system could be deepening patterns of ethnic segregation, often mirroring concerns in the United States around Charter Schools and the potential to '*provide a public school option for white flight without the drawbacks of residential mobility*' (Renzulli and Evans 2005, p.413). In 2006 a book published by the Young Foundation warned that Roman Catholic schools in Tower Hamlets and the mechanisms of parental choice had fueled segregation between the white and Bangladeshi communities. The research found that some white parents in East London were interpreting the academic success of

Bangladeshi children as not simply being down to the industry of these children but also being the result of '*the solicitude of school staff, to the disadvantage of white children*' (Dench et la 2006 p143). For parents who were ambitious for their children, these feelings and the mechanism of parental choice had prompted 'white flight' and a polarization in the ethnic composition of schools, with very few schools having a balance between ethnic groups which reflected the local population. School procedures, the book claimed, had helped enable Roman Catholic Schools to become 'white citadels'; '*their Governors are allowed to determine their selection system and they can select according to a child's religion. Since Bangladeshis are Muslims, the consequence is that few of them get into Catholic Schools*' (ibid p.145-6).

Thus far, research into the separation of children along socio-economic lines paints an incomplete and inconclusive picture, though is suggestive of some degree of socio-economic sorting in schools which act as their own admission authorities when measuring the number of children known to be eligible for free school meals (the accuracy of using free school meal status as a proxy for the socio-economic status of children is questioned by some however, see for instance Hobbs and Vignoles, 2007). This phenomenon of 'cream skimming' of more 'desirable' pupils, is bound to concerns that where admissions prioritise children from families of the schools' religious tradition, a requirement for prospective pupils to demonstrate their commitment to a faith will have the effect of favouring the privileged and deepen socio-economic divisions in society. Intimately bound to this are concerns how faith-based oversubscriptions admissions criteria can encourage dishonesty among more socio-economically advantaged parents about their religious beliefs in order to gain place/s for their children (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005; Donovan, 2007). Accepting well-established links between academic achievement and socio-economic background, it is not surprising that evidence suggesting alleged biases in the admissions policies of autonomous schools with a religious character cause such concern (see for example, Allen, 2007; Burgess et al, 2004; Coldron et al, 2008; Curtis, P., 2008, 2009a, 2009b; Glennerster, 1991; Gorard et al, 2003; Pennell et al, 2006; Shepherd and Rogers, 2012; Tough and Brooks, 2007; West and Pennell, 2003). This to some extent again mirrors debates in the Unites States around Charter Schools, where there have been similar concerns about potentially 'cream skimming' admissions criteria (see for example Bulkley & Fisler, 2003).

It remains unclear whether this small degree of socio-economic filtering is due solely to religious-based admissions criteria, rather the evidence thus far points to a degree of

advantaged intakes at oversubscribed autonomous schools with a religious character being caused by complex and multiple causal factors; there is also a great deal of variation within the group of schools with a religious character (Allen and West, 2013; Oldfield et al, 2013). A diversity of school choice may in fact be ineluctably associated with some degree of inequity (Walford, 1995, cited in Oldfield et al, 2013). Where there is freedom of choice parents from more privileged backgrounds may go to extraordinary lengths to secure what they consider to be the best education for their children; and will also likely have more resources at their disposal to do so. If schools with a religious character are perceived to be high performing, then they will likely do all that they can to get their children accepted by such schools, including, but not limited to, attaching themselves expediently to the church and being 'flexible' with the truth about their religious beliefs (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005; Dench et al, 2006; also see Keast, 2005).

The above discussion underscores that there remains a poverty of research into the complex causal relationships between choices made by parents, a schools admissions criterion and the offers it makes. Research into school admissions and composition is limited however as there is no national monitoring of school composition (in terms of religion, poverty and prior attainment), nor is there school level information about applications to schools and offers received by parents and their characteristics. No conclusive link therefore can be established between admissions criteria, and practices and school composition (Allen and West, 2013; see also West et al, 2003). We cannot know for instance, to what extent the differences seen in terms of school ethnic composition are a result of South Asian families choosing not to apply for a place at these schools as they do not wish their child to attend them, or do not believe they would be successful; or whether South Asian families are applying but are being excluded by the school's oversubscribed admissions criteria.

2.7 Conclusions

This chapter has further elaborated and expounded upon the conceptual moorings of 'Community Cohesion'. It has elucidated those conceptual supporting frameworks of Community Cohesion which, as outlined, are most frequently marshalled by critics to problematize the 'restricted educational environments' of autonomous schools with a religious character. What has emerged is a cohesion agenda which aspires to a cohesive society lubricated by large amounts of Putmanesque bridge-building capital (McGhee, 2003).

'Meaningful contact' is the conduit through which negative associational manifestations (bonding) will pass through and be transformed into positive and desirable ones (bridging). Echoing the discourse of the official reports into the riots in 2001 and the community cohesion policy agenda, the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' amounts to a concern of excessive bonding social capital in a context of insufficient bridging social capital' (McGhee, 2003), that within this bonded context children are not brought together to learn with and from each other, and therefore not prepared or experienced to take their place in a pluralistic society.

Existing research and evidence into autonomous schools with a religious character and the division of children along religious, ethnic and socio-economic lines is inconclusive and incomplete however. The research indicates some division along religious lines and a degree thereby proxy of separation along ethnic lines, where pupils from all South Asian minority groups are under-represented in voluntary aided schools, and pupils from Black African and Caribbean ethnic groups are over-represented relative to all other groups. Similarly, evidence points to some degree of socio-economic sorting in schools when measuring the number of children known to be eligible for free school meals. No conclusive links however can be established between admissions criteria, and practices and school composition. Moreover, I have given reasons above for questioning that the separation of children along religious and ethnic lines, to whatever degree, is necessarily harmful; and also that bringing children together along these lines is necessarily desirable.

Unsurprisingly the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' is challenged by members of the founders of schools with a religious character and members of faith communities. The problematization of 'restricted educational environments' need not necessarily be a concern over any distinct religious or cultural practice, or the educational aims of the schools themselves. What really matters from the point of view of divisiveness, according to the Bishop of Oxford, '*is not whether a school is secular, Christian, Muslim or Jewish, but how what is taught is taught*' (cited in Harries, 2001, p.6). In an effective school, according to the schools guidance document on the duty to promote cohesion, '*opportunities for discussing issues of identity and diversity will be integrated across the whole curriculum*' (DCSF 2007b, p.8). This however brings us to further round of objections bound to autonomous schools with a religious character, which can be captured as the problematization of 'distinctive non-common educational aims'; and which is discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Schools with a Religious Character and Cohesion: The Problematization of 'Distinctive non-common Educational Aims'

3.1 Introduction

This chapter continues to elaborate upon the problematization of autonomous schools with a religious character within the broader normative debate around their contribution (or lack of it) to cohesion. Intimately bound to the problematization of 'restricted educational environments', is the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims'. Halstead and McLaughlin define 'distinctive non-common educational aims' as below:

> '*Faith schools can be said to have distinctive non-common educational aims in that they typically aspire as part of a particular holistic vision of education to present a particular religion as if it is true and good, together with a range of other beliefs, values and attitudes (particularly of a moral kind) which follow from this*' (Halstead and McLaughlin 2005, p.63).

The problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' pertains specifically to 'how what is taught is taught', and is implicated in Halstead and McLaughlin's third sense of divisiveness: '*the detailed beliefs and attitudes which faith schools are in fact seeking to develop in their students as part of the non-common educational influence which they exert*' (Halstead and McLaughlin 2005, p.65). This has further implications for children's constructions of their 'social identity', the idea that '*an individual's self-concept is derived, to some extent and in some sense, from the social relationships and social groups he or she participates in*' (Brewer 2001, p.117; similar in concept, see also McCall and Simmons', 1978, for 'role-identity theory'); and this in turn has further implications for cohesion.

Critics worry that 'distinctive educational aims' will provide greater opportunity for the promotion of narrow religious identities and beliefs. In the context of the cohesion agenda therefore, the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' expresses what can be termed the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities', and closely bound to this, the problematization of what may be termed 'distinctive non-common values'. These both reflect concerns that the content of religious education in autonomous schools with a religious character will reflect only the religious tradition of the school and disregard or only give a cursory amount of time and resources to others; and further concerns that a religious education taught primarily through a single faith will disserve the cultivation of children's capacity and inclination for critical thinking, reflection and independence of thought. Stated less temperately, some critics worry that autonomous schools with a religious character might simply '*preach and proselytize about a single religious faith*' (Ward 2008, p.320), which would not only undermine the autonomy of young minds to decide for themselves what their own beliefs are to be and reach their own conclusions, but might also have pejorative consequences upon children's moral instruction, personality development and cognitive development, which are the final three pathways which Vogt identifies through which education can promote tolerance and by extension cohesion.

The sections which follow further unpack the conceptual moorings of Community Cohesion which inform the sociological assumptions of the public and political debates surrounding publicly funded autonomous schools with a religious character and their educational aims. Successive sections firstly provide a greater working understanding of 'social identity' to provide a conceptual framework for understanding and situating the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' within. The section which follows underscores that at deeper issue is 'indoctrination'; that is, the essential conflict between a process of education per se and a process of indoctrination, between the '*critical autonomy of thought axiomatic to the aims of education based on liberal, rationalist values, and the nurturing of values and beliefs based on faith*' (Cush 2005, p. 439). The penultimate section indicates where there is a lack of research before the conclusions of the chapter are drawn.

3.2 Community Cohesion and Social Identity

A relatively underexplored feature of intergroup attitudes by social psychologists, wholly absent in Putnam but key to the final report of the CIC's 'shared future' discourse and

solution to the problem of lack of inter-group contact, are the effects of a person holding multiple nonconvergent ingroup memberships; and more crucially, the construction, through processes of recognising and construing information about one's ingroups, of social identities in relation to them. Tajfel defines social identity as '*that part of the individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership*' (1981, p. 251). Social identity is therefore the 'social categorical self', an 'ingroup' versus an 'outgroup', gained by one becoming or considering oneself a member of a group (Turner, 1999). One acquires a 'social identity' therefore when one becomes or considers oneself a member of a group; '*these identities, in turn, give individuals a way to categorize themselves and others... and also have the ability to enhance self-esteem*' (Austin 2010, p.3).

Social identity theory (see from among others, Tajfel, 1978, 1979, 1981; Tajfel and Turner, 1986, Turner, 1999) predicts that when a particular social group membership is salient and highly identified with, people may evaluate themselves in terms of their ingroup memberships through intergroup comparisons; and it is further understood that inherent in this comparison is a psychological requirement that relevant ingroups compare favourably with relevant outgroups (Turner, 1999). This can lead to the denigration of outgroup members and favouritism of ingroup members which in turn produces pressure for ingroup similarities and intergroup differences to be accentuated on relevant dimensions; in order to achieve a positive self-evaluation in terms of that ingroup membership identity (ibid). This is not to say however that in order for one to have an attachment to one's in-group requires one to have hostility toward out-groups (see Brewer, 1999, for a critique of this assumption); although, according to Allport, '*a certain amount of predilection*' in favour of the 'familiar' '*is inevitable*' (1954, p.42). Many philosophers of identity in fact point to the profound dependence of identification processes on the 'other' and '*the play of difference and similitude in self-other relations*' (Fuss 1995, p.2). Identity, as Burgat writes, '*is only the result of the encounter with otherness*' (Esposito & Burgat 2002 p21). The issue therefore, is being able to relate to the 'other' without at the same time 'othering' them, and so soften the hard edges of 'otherness' (Brah 2007, p137; see also Arendt, 1968). The CIC's answer to this lies in a particular type of 'identity work', one where the narrow identities which can be buttressed by bonding social capital are de-antagonized and broadened out (McGhee 2003, p.389).

More complex and multifarious forms of identity play a key role in the CIC report's

'shared future' discourse. Whereas privileging one single identity (for example, a religious one) to the exclusion of others can divide us and foster disharmony and disunity, 'multiple and fluid identities' on the other hand help facilitate the discovery of commonality between diverse individuals (McGhee, 2008). Members of any large and complex society invariably are, as Miller et al explain, '*differentiated or subdivided along many meaningful social dimensions*' (Miller et al 2009, p.79, see also Hewstone et al 2007). Most of these differentiations cut across intergroup boundaries in the sense that individuals can share a common ingroup membership along one dimension but may also simultaneously experience each other as 'outgroupers' along another dimension (ibid.). Complex and multiple cross-cutting social identities therefore have the potential to become either a source of increasing fractionation or a source of cohesion depending upon how individuals manage and subjectively represent the interrelationships between their competing identities (Brewer, 2001).

Peoples' separate identities are diagnosed as an illness by Community Cohesion which prescribes post-structuralist, fluid and shifting conceptions of identity as the cure. It is one's ability to have different identities and identify with different things at the same time which is also the ability to share one's hopes and fears with the 'other', and can prevent any single part of a person's identity subordinating others and being prioritized as a source of conflict (CIC 2007, p34). The report also points to research in Northern Ireland which has found that people with more complex and multiple sources of identity are more positive about outgroups, more integrated, and also less prejudiced (ibid. p.35). Single group funding, according to the report, is therefore counterproductive to 'fluid identities', since it has the potential '*to increase insularity and a sense of separation where the project funded is only or mainly for the group in question*' and '*a sense in which a "comfort zone" could be developed if communities were not encouraged to be outward facing, and therefore only mixed with others in their group*' (ibid. p161). The theme of multiple and changing identities was also a key part of the Ajegbo report (2007; see also Breslin et al, 2006), which was published a few months prior to the final report of CIC. Multiple-identities and exploring children's consciousness of these identities is placed at the heart of citizenship education and education for diversity in the report. According to the Ajegbo report '*in order to acknowledge diversity effectively, the curriculum needs to provide resources that promote 'collective identities'*' (DFES 2007 p38).

The Ajegbo report called for a fourth 'strand' to citizenship education to be explicitly

developed, entitled 'Identity and Diversity'; '*that addresses issues of ethnicity, culture, language and religion and the multiple identities children inhabit*' (ibid p16). The House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Skills, which published its report on Citizenship Education soon after the Ajegbo Report was published, accepted his recommendations and agreed there was a good case for increasing the level of attention paid to issues of identity and diversity (HMSO, 2007). The new curriculum was subsequently introduced in September 2008 (QCA, 2008a; QCA, 2008b). Importantly, this makes it harder for schools to countenance a single-faith or monocultural perspective within teaching and learning (Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005). The conjecture here therefore, can be understood to be that multiple social identities and cross-cutting group memberships may reduce the intensity of the individual's dependence on any single ingroup for meeting psychological needs for inclusion and self-esteem, and thereby reduce the potential for segmented societies and perhaps increase tolerance for outgroups in general (Brewer, 1993, 1999).

Research shows that the conjecture above is not a purely fanciful one. Research has shown that there is an association between an individual's subjective representation of the interrelationships between their multiple group identities, and prejudice of outgroups. The crucial point is that it is not how many overlapping groups an individual identifies with per se which matters most, since the actual complexity of multiple, partially overlapping, group memberships may not be reflected in the individual's subjective representation of their multiple identities (Roccas and Brewer, 2002). More important therefore, '*is how these multiple identities are represented subjectively by individuals when they think about their social group memberships*' (Brewer 1999, p441). This determines the overall inclusiveness of the individuals' ingroup memberships and whether cross-cutting identities promote outgroup tolerance and prevent intergroup conflict (ibid.). If ingroups are defined narrowly and exclusively, the potential for reducing outgroup prejudice and intergroup conflict will be reduced. A greater complexity of one's social identity is on the other hand positively associated with higher levels of tolerance for, and less prejudice against, out-groups (Roccas & Brewer 2002, Brewer and Pierce 2005).

Research on how an individuals' cognitive representation of their group memberships can influence their intergroup attitudes has only relatively recently begun to receive significant attention. Roccas and Brewer (2002) proposed that an individuals' subjective representation of the interrelationships among their multiple group identities can vary along a continuum of complexity and inclusiveness which they label 'social identity complexity'.

Social identity complexity refers to the degree of overlap and convergence which is perceived to exist between the different groups which a person is simultaneously a member of. When a person's subjective representation of his or her multiple identities is low in complexity, their subjective representation of the interrelationships among their multiple group identities has been reduced to the overlapping memberships, which therefore converge to form a '*a single, highly exclusive social identity*' (Roccas and Brewer 2002, p.94). For instance, a man who is both Italian and Catholic may perceive these two groups as highly overlapping and embedded in a single ingroup representation. Although many Italians are not Catholic, he may think of his nationality ingroup as being comprised primarily or wholly as such, or simply may not consider Italians who are not Catholic as 'real Italians'. Concomitantly he may also perceive his religious ingroup as being primarily or wholly comprised of Italians, although many Catholics are not Italian. Individuals with a low identity complexity are likely to perceive others who are outgroup members on one dimension as also outgroupers on all other dimensions.

At the opposite end of the continuum, a social identity which is complex is one where the individual recognizes that '*each of his/her group memberships incorporates a different set of people as ingroup members and the combined representation is the sum of all of these group identities—more inclusive than any one ingroup identity considered alone…* (Brewer and Peirce 2005, p.428). Having a complex social identity is therefore dependent on two conditions: firstly, awareness of membership of more than one ingroup categorization, and secondly, recognition that the multiple ingroup categories do not fully overlap (Roccas and Brewer, 2002). Roccas and Brewer's label for the most complex representation of multiple social group identities is 'merged', where an individual's '*nonconvergent group memberships are simultaneously recognized and embraced in their most inclusive form*' (2002, p.91). Such a 'merged' in-group identity is highly inclusive and transcends any single categorical division between people. Roccas and Brewer speculated that a greater social identity complexity would influence positive intergroup attitudes, for both cognitive and motivational reasons. They note that a complex representation of ingroup categorization is based on a chronic awareness of cross categorization in one's group memberships and those of others, making salient that other persons who are outgroupers along one category dimension might be ingroupers when considered on another; thus undermining the cognitive basis of any ingroup bias. Also, when one recognizes the partially overlapping nature of ingroup memberships the significance for the self of intergroup comparisons are diminished, thereby undermining the

motivation to favour any single ingroup.

Further research on social identity complexity has found support for Roccas and Brewer's hypothesis that complexity would be positively associated with tolerance towards outgroups. Brewer and Pierce's (2005) study from a large survey of adults from Ohio found, holding the number and diversity of ingroups constant (national, religious, occupational, political, and recreational), that the extent to which individuals perceived their group identities '*as partially overlapping and cross-cutting versus highly overlapping and convergent effectively predicted their attitudes toward outgroups*' (p.435). As well as measuring emotional closeness to outgroups, the survey also measured the relationship between identity complexity and attitudes towards public policy issues relevant to outgroups. After controlling for age, education and ideology, as expected higher complexity was associated with greater acceptance of positive attitudes towards tolerance and related policy preferences, for instance, that increasing the number of racial and ethnic minorities in the workplace was beneficial to the country. Brewer and Pierce's study also showed that diversity of the local environment was not a necessary condition for the development of a complex social identity; some individuals with a high social identity complexity lived and worked in demographically homogeneous environments (see also Miller et al, 2009).

'Dominance' is Roccas and Brewer's term for where an individual adopts one primary group identification to which all other potential group identities are subordinated. Such a primary and dominant group identity would be a group identity which was 'chronically accessible', as opposed to 'situationally accessible' (Hogg and Reid 2006, p.12). Chronically accessible social categorisations are valued, important, and frequently employed to regulate one's actions in a great variety of situations. Situationally accessible social categorisations on the other hand are employed less frequently in more specific situations after some weighing and assessment of the demands of the particular situation or social context (ibid.; see also Brewer, 2001). A further important distinction is the one between group-based and person-based social-identities. Tajfel and Turner refer to an 'interpersonal/intergroup continuum' to explain how social behaviour and interactions between individuals can be determined by personal relationships between individuals and their individual characteristics at one end, and at the other end by group affiliations and loyalties, '*and not at all affected by the interindividual personal relationships between the people involved*' (1986, p.9). According to Tajfel, as behaviour shifts along the continuum towards the intergroup end, outgroup attitudes within the ingroup become more consensual and more stereotyped, with outgroup members

being seen as more homogenous and less differentiated members of their group. Pure forms of either extreme are considered to occur only rarely in real life by Tajfel and Turner but psychological and social factors such as the intensity of people's ingroup identification and their beliefs about the nature of their ingroup boundaries are seen as key factors in shifting behaviour along the continuum towards the intergroup pole (ibid.; see also Turner, 1999). Whether for instance they perceive group boundaries as permeable or impermeable and the extent to which '*the similarities within one's own category, and the differences with an outgroup, are both maximized*' (Herriot 2007, p.32).

Group-based identities are neatly captured by Turner's self-categorization theory, which extended and elaborated upon social identity theory to include the idea that at times social identities and individual self-perception can be depersonalised representations of the self, the self becomes a 'we', a prototype, rather than an unique 'I'. Individuals therefore define and see themselves less as differing individual persons and more as similar prototypical members with a shared social category membership, and who share a '*fuzzy'* set of '*characteristics which are believed to describe group members*' (Herriot, 2007, p. 31). Outgroups and outgroupers become stereotypes and their manifold differences ignored; there is a shift therefore, as Turner et al explain, '*towards the perception of self as an interchangeable exemplar of some social category and away from the perception of self as a unique person*' (Turner et al., 1987, p. 50; see also Thoits & Virshup, 1997; Turner, 1999. This is in contrast to 'person-based social identities', which instead *'reflect the extent to which a group or category membership is represented as an integral part of an individual's self-concept...'* [Brewer 2001, p.118]). When the CIC admonished that '*pigeonholing can still be damaging to integration and cohesion if it means groups privileging one identity over others*' (CIC, P.98), it had in mind such 'chronically accessible' and 'dominant' group-based identities, where individuals define and evaluate themselves in terms of a single dominant group identification and therefore contract the boundaries of their social identity to subordinate all other group identities to this (see also Brewer, 2001). The effect is that harder ingroup prototypes and harder outgroup stereotypes are created, and tolerance and mutual understanding is reduced (Turner, 1999; see also Herriot, 2007).

According to Roccas and Brewer, in most cases social identity complexity should be expected to vary as a function of an individuals' motivation to think about his or her multiple ingroup identities. Support for this inference was found in Miller et al's study which found that social identity complexity was fostered by openness and cognitive elaboration in

processing and reflecting upon the social landscape, including one's own social group memberships (2009, p.92). How what is taught, is taught, therefore has implications for a young person's social identity and how they manage and subjectively represent the interrelationships between their competing identities. How whether individuals are motivated to have more 'fluid', complex social identities, or whether individuals are motivated to have less complex, chronic group-based identities. Critics raise concerns that an autonomous school with a religious character's 'distinctive educational aims', particularly in a context of 'restricted educational environments', may in practise mean a more restricted view of education, which may in turn motivate a more dominant and singular identity which subdues other possible facets of a young person's identity. Rather than the cohesion fostering 'fluid identities', helping people 'share their hopes and dreams', such 'dominance' would be inimical to 'bringing people together'; and more likely increase 'insularity and a sense of separation'. There can be, as Judge admonishes, powerful and potentially dangerous tensions between the nurturing of distinct group identities within a heterogeneous society, and an orderly process of integration and cohesion (2001).

3.3 Community Cohesion and 'Distinctive Non-Common Educational Aims'

3.3.1 The Problematization of 'Dominant Group-Based Identities'

Schools build community cohesion, according to the guidance document, by '*promoting shared values and encouraging their pupils to actively engage with others to understand what they all hold in common*' (DCSF 2007, p.6). Schools with a religious character, particularly autonomous schools, have different aims to community schools as reflected in the school ethos, building and admissions. The problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' is inseparably bound therefore to the perceived desire of autonomous schools with a religious character to nurture and form a religious identity, what I have termed the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities'; and therefore also to fears about the beliefs and values which are part of that identity and their implications for cohesion; what I have termed the problematization of 'distinctive non-common values'. Although it is important not to overemphasize the influence of school upon young peoples' religious identity development (see from among others, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle, 1997; see also p.66). Research by Bertram-Troost and colleagues, who describe religious identity development as '*the totality of the gradual change in the content and strength of*

commitments in relation to the way one looks at life and the amount of exploration in the achievement and change of these commitments' (2006, p.311; see also Bosma, 1992, cited in Bertram-Troost et al, 2006), has found however, that although only small, the way that religious education is shaped in secondary schools also plays a role (Bertram-Troost et al, 2009). The research, which was conducted in Holland from a sample of 518 pupils aged 14 to 19 across four schools, found for instance that talking about one's own identity and learning about others can in fact be symbiotic, and that the more children learn about different world views the more certain they are about their own (ibid, p.24). This emphasises the importance of 'identity' being understood as dialogical and plural (Peukert 2005, cited in Weisse, 2011).

The problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' could be further conceptualised as the problematization of peoples separate identities contra 'post-structuralist, fluid and shifting conceptions of identity'. When the CIC refers to 'fluid identities bringing people together', this expresses the hope that people will adopt an 'inclusive strategy' to managing their multiple social identities, whereby different identities are added together for a more inclusive, complex and cross-cutting ingroup (Brewer, 2001). For many of their critics however, publicly funded autonomous schools with a religious character are in essence a type of 'single group funding', where 'distinctive educational aims' are inimical to cohesion and 'bringing people together'. Importantly, according to Roccas and Brewer, to develop a more complex representation of one's own social identity, individuals must be open to information about their ingroups beyond their own personal experience, and be motivated to think about the differences among and within their ingroups. This helps individuals to put their own customs and norms into perspective and develop '*a less provincial perspective on other groups in general*' (Pettigrew 1997:174; see also Miller et al, 2009). Essentially, individuals must be motivated to tolerate a certain degree of ambiguity in defining the boundaries between ingroups and outgroups and recognize that groups are not totally distinct from one another. This would reduce the likelihood of social comparisons and distinctions being made between them, and so reduce ingroup favouritism and so also outgroup mistrust (Roccas and Brewer, 2002; see also Herriot, 2007).

If schools with a religious character use their autonomy to influence the curriculum in order to 'preach and proselytize' about the school's faith tradition, this would more likely motivate individuals to adopt a primary group identification derived from the school's religious tradition; and which then subdues other potential group identities and increase the likelihood of an in-group solidarity coupled with mistrust and prejudice towards outgroups.

Nor would mere inclusion of alternative faiths, ideas and cultures in the curriculum satisfy the requirement for critical engagement if it meant '*teaching that the other cultures are rival, alien cultures and traditions to be rejected and resisted*' (McDonough 1998, p488). As MacMullen for instance admonishes, the potential for educators to present '*other conceptions of the good in the least favourable colours, or even downright inaccurately*', should not be underestimated, in such cases exposure to diversity would only serve to reinforce the appeal of the faith of the school's sponsor (2007 p173). Expressed less lightly, according to Keith Porteous Woods (Director of the National Secular Society) '*you can't expect a faith school to do anything other than promote its own religion, usually at the expense of all the others. It's hardly going to say that every religion is pretty much the same and it doesn't matter what you believe*' (cited in Crace, 2006).

Rather than broadening the narrow identities buttressed by bonding social capital therefore, critics raise concerns that autonomous schools with a religious character are vehicles which can potentially in fact exacerbate them. This would undermine mutual understanding and tolerance and thereby potentially give '*rise (as in Northern Ireland) to hostilities, deep seated prejudices and discrimination*' (Pring 2005, p.54). '*Even before a child begins to think*', Amartya Kumar Sen admonishes, '*it's being defined by its 'community', which is primarily religion. That also drowns out all other cultural things like language and literature*' (quoted in Roy, 2006). Some commentators go further and accuse schools with a religious character of promoting narrow-mindedness. In his own condemnation of government policy of extending schools with a religious character, the distinguished scientist Peter Atkins has commented that '*no single type of school founded on religion, be it Church, Temple, Synagogue, Mosque or Voodoo tent, can contribute to the unification of society… Religions, being fundamentally irrational, are fundamentally intolerant of each other, and schools set up on the shoulders of religions inevitably propagate that intolerance into future generations*' (Atkins, 2001, p. 7; see also Beckett, 2003, for a similarly acerbic view).

It's worth noting here however that alternative narratives and perspectives of the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' are of course available. In a 2005 Demos Paper for instance, Vince Cable argued that schools with a religious character do not necessarily lead to social division, let alone violent conflict or even terrorism. For Cable the experience of Catholic schooling has been to give Irish immigrant minorities the opportunity to gradually develop a British identity while retaining the confidence which they derive from a sense of community, tradition and belief. A similar view has been expressed by Abdullah

Trevathan, then Headteacher of the Islamia Junior School in London, who believed that *'far from being divisive ...a faith school can build a child's self-esteem and confidence, qualities that lead to tolerance'* (cited in Kelly, 2001). For their supporters, schools with a religious character '*certainly do contribute towards producing a more cohesive and integrated society...*' (Donovan, 2007). Schools of a religious character also provide a moral compass and appropriate moral ethos which helps produce responsible young citizens who are fully affirmed and comfortable in their religious and cultural identity, and who can then make a valuable contribution to cohesion from a position of personal strength and confidence. Schools with a religious character can work for community cohesion by helping pupils to build and affirm their own sense of identity whilst they learn to understand and respect others who have different identities: '*I believe that to understand other cultures you need to understand your own first. Only then can you understand how others fit in*' (Rehana Shafquat, Deputy head teacher Feversham College, England's first maintained Muslim Secondary School, cited in Herbert, 2001)

3.3.2 The problematization of 'distinctive non-common values'

Theoretically at least, the greater the extent to which the beliefs and traditions of the founding religious body are infused with the school's ethos, curriculum and pedagogy , and the school therefore has 'distinctive educational aims', the greater potential exists for children '*being taught 'values and perspectives' within a particular religious tradition that may be inherently contradictory to an acceptance of a plurality of beliefs and lifestyles in a liberal democratic society*' (McKinney, 2008, p.174). Children's values can be influenced by the examples that are set by teachers in their relationships, attitudes and teaching styles, as Jackson comments, '*I can think of no other social arrangement, save parenting of course, in which the modelling component plays as large and pervasive a role as it does in teaching*' (1992, cited in Halstead and Taylor, 2000). In a school it will be the teachers first and foremost who form and carry through the school's values and cultural norms, being as they are the most stable and permanent element of the school community (McGettrick, 2005). It's an often heard assumption amongst educational researchers that values are best 'caught' rather than 'taught', and that the normative school climate and the examples modelled by teachers in their attitudes and relationships are more effective than direct teaching (see from among others, Dreeben, 1968; Jackson et al., 1993; Vogt, 1997; Halstead and Taylor, 2000; also see Arthur et al., 2006). Developing attitudes in pupils like respect and tolerance is, so the presumption

runs, ceteris paribus more likely to be successful and more enduring when teachers themselves consistently display commitment to such values and in a school climate where this is the prevailing norm, than trying to teach such values as tolerance directly.

An indirect moral influence upon children can be deeply embedded in the daily life and routines of the school and may often occur without the children or even the teachers themselves being aware of it (Halstead and Taylor, 2000; Jackson et al, 1993; see also Hansen, 1993, cited in Halstead and Taylor, 2000). Teaching values indirectly happens in this way through the Durkheimian concept of socialisation, which emphasises the process of adaptation by which pupils learn and internalise the surrounding values and norms of their school. Much can therefore depend on how things are taught, as well as what is taught, as values are inherent in teaching; and also as it is unlikely that students will be able to wholly avoid the influence of their teacher's values even where teachers do not consider setting a moral example to be part of their role (Halstead and Taylor, 2000; see also Carr, 1993, cited in Halstead and Taylor, 2000). Although however, '*evidence will never be sound enough for us to know for certain whether direct or indirect effects are more powerful*' (Vogt 1997, p.105). Simply put, it is significantly more difficult to test the effectiveness of indirect approaches vis-à-vis direct approaches (ibid.).

The above has important implications for cohesion and naturally leads onto the question of what are the values that a school internalises, about a range of matters, and seeks to transmit and instil into its pupils. Halstead and McLaughlin's third sense of divisiveness concerns the beliefs and the attitudes which schools with a religious character develop in their students; '*the beliefs and attitudes in question here include claims that (for example) a certain religion and its associated values and perspectives are true and that others are false or at best suboptimal, that certain lifestyles and moral choices within the law are in fact morally unacceptable from the point of view of that religion, and so forth*' (2005, p.65). Moral instruction is also a further way identified by Vogt in which education can promote tolerance. From the perspective of cohesion therefore, the desirability of the school's educational aims is conditional upon the desirability of the values embedded within these. If there is cause therefore to question those values and therefore by extension the beliefs and assumptions which underpin those values as being divisive and disserving cohesion, there is therefore cause to question whether public money should be given to support such educational aims which may contribute to division within society.

Concerns that 'distinctive educational aims' will entail young people receiving a restricted view or limited type of education imposed upon them by the schools founding body, can be found in a wide range of expressions. For instance, according to the British Humanist Association, '*some faith-based schools exist in order to protect children from ideas that are different from those of the parental faith group, or disapproved of by that group*' (2002, p33). Halstead and McLaughlin's third sense of divisiveness will press with greater force in particular when the values and views which the school formally transmits (and more informally through the normative school climate, and the tacit assumptions made by teachers about the truth of religiously based teachings which prohibit certain activities as being gravely wrong) discriminate in terms of gender, sexuality, and generation. It is important however not to overestimate (nor indeed underestimate) the actual influence exerted by the school and education upon the personal and social moral formation of its pupils. The influence of school can never be seen on its own as the transmission of values from a school to its students is moderated by other influences such as friends and the personal character of pupils (Bertram-Troost, 2011). Research also consistently shows that the influence of school is much smaller than the influence of home and parent (see from among others, Stringer et al., 2010; Hyde, 1990). Even for cognitive outcomes which belong more exclusively to the domain of school, the contribution of school is normally found to be between 10-15%, for non-cognitive outcomes and areas of learning less exclusive to the domain of the school, such as the ways in which children come to hold their more deeply held values and beliefs, the school effect is often even smaller (Bertram-Troost, 2011; see also Dijkstra, 2002, cited in Bertram-Troost, 2011).

3.4 Indoctrination

There is, underlying both the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' and 'distinctive non-common values', a deeper issue which is more fundamental to the aims of education based on Western-secular and liberal philosophies of education (Cush, 2005; Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005); which is indoctrination. This is related to the desire of a school with a religious character to nurture and form a religious identity, and how this may be antithetical to the important development of young people's capacity and inclination for critical thinking, reflection and independence of thought. Indoctrination goes to the heart of the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims'. There is a view that all faith is blind faith and therefore irrational and not cognition, and as Parker-Jenkins et al comment, '*that the*

aims of religious education are about obtaining blind obedience, fostering ritualistic pursuit of religious duties and showing unquestioning deference to authority' (2005, p.118). There's a big difference therefore, according to Mick Brookes, then General Secretary of the National Association of Head Teachers, '*between learning about religion and promoting religiosity; the latter shouldn't be part of the education system'* (cited in Crace, 2006). Simply put, it is understood that the nurturing of faith should not therefore be an educational task, cultivating children's capacity and inclination for critical thinking and independence of thought however should be.

Autonomous schools with a religious character which both prioritise its teaching of one set of beliefs, and also to whom it teaches these to, over others, will attract the concerns of many an external observer who would see such an educational aim as not just distinctive and non-common, but also as educationally inappropriate (Copley, 1997). Such an approach will be seen by many as a strong form of indoctrination, being undermining of the autonomy of the individual pupil and antithetical to the liberal framework of values which underpins most education in the UK (Copley, 1997; Hare, 1992; Humanist Philosophers Group, 2001; Halstead, 2002). Indoctrination however, is a highly emotive term and like tolerance (see p.37) is typically not easily and unarguably defined precisely (for useful discussions of the concept see Snook, 1972; Astley, 1994; see also Atkinson, 1965; Thiessen, 1993; for within a schools with a religious character context more specifically, see Hand, 2003, 2004; Siegel, 2004; Groothuis, 2004; Short, 2003b). Nonetheless, to achieve personal autonomy however, as Pring explains, '*there has to be a careful and delicate initiation into different forms of understanding so that one might understand them and appreciate them 'from the inside''* (2005, p.57). Put another way, and more simply, if children are to make an autonomous choice whether to accept or reject their familial culture of upbringing at some later date, they must first be competently informed as to the nature, limits and possibilities of that upbringing. Intimately bound to this is the necessary development of an adequate capacity for critical reflection and a lively sense of oneself as an agent for change within oneself. Without this, we allow for the possibility of pupils accepting different truth claims from teachers unquestioningly; as well as accepting societal norms and/or group prejudices more broadly speaking. Indoctrination therefore, is not a matter of content so much as it is a matter of intention, of teaching so as to prevent or curtail the likelihood at any later date the critical reflection upon what has been taught (Pring, 2005).

At issue here therefore, is to what extent an autonomous school with a religious character disserves pupils' capacity for critical reflection (ibid; Alexander and McLaughlin, 2003; Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005; Mason, 2000). To curtail the individual pupil's capacity for critical thinking, would be to teach 'about' or teach 'that', rather than to teach 'how'. Teaching how, as Atkinson explains, involves '*providing adequate support, by way of proofs, reasons, evidence, whatever may be appropriate to the field in question, for the conclusions it has sought to impart*' (1965, p. 172). Teaching 'about' does not require this, and makes it less likely that pupils will be able to question what they're being told, and so make an uncritical (and possibly also sectarian, see Brighouse, 2006; also 2005) endorsement of what they're being told more likely. We may therefore, uncontroversially say that teaching 'about' or teaching 'that' would be one form of indoctrination, the antithesis of education, and which, among other things, may also be detrimental to a young person's personal identity development and by extension their tolerance (Vogt, 1997; see also Pring, 2005).

Research has in fact found an association between being more educated and being more tolerant; '*the more educated person is a more tolerant one...*' (McGettrick 2005, p.110; also see Vogt, 1997). More educated people are more likely to make principled decisions rather than emotive ones and therefore adopt a more tolerant position; '*the better informed are more likely to have learned to frame the issues using the applicable civil libertarian principles rather than in terms of their attitudes about the groups involved*' (Chong 1993, p.870; see also, from among others, Hyman & Wright, 1979; Jackson et al, 1993; Lawrence, 1976; see also Jackman and Muha, 1984, who dispute the association between education and tolerance). Developing pupil's capacity for critical thinking and reasoning, is, according to Vogt (though he himself uses the term 'cognitive sophistication'), the most likely mediating link between the association of education and tolerance, being an indirect way in which education affects more tolerant attitudes and outlooks (1997; see also Selznick and Steinberg, 1969, cited in Vogt, 1997). Results from some past studies have found support for this. Research by Bobo and Licari found that approximately 33% of the education effect on tolerance was mediated by cognitive sophistication (1989, pp.285-290). (Though Bobo and Licari found that education was unimportant for tolerance of extremely disliked groups, this could be interpreted as displaying intolerance of the intolerant, that is, non-conformist groups whose ideas and actions involve '*violence or law-breaking*', [p.305]).

Disserving pupils development for a capacity to think and reason critically may by extension therefore disserve pupils' tolerance. Of fundamental issue is to what extent any

school of a religious character is concerned with the development of young people's capacity for critical thinking and reflection. Key to this is the extent to which schools 'reflectively' transmit the school's religious tradition and thereby encourage what Herman calls 'authoring'. This is a process of personal identity formation which requires learning processes involving both the transmission and transformation of religio-cultural elements; where students are encouraged to appropriate and transform the distinctive cultural values and beliefs, stemming from the school's religious tradition, into personal meaning, and in their own way (Herman, 2003, cited in Vermeer, 2009; see also Meijer, 2006, cited in Vermeer, 2009). This is a process which does not happen when religio-cultural elements are presented to students with an 'authoritarian voice' (ibid). An education which curbs young individuals growing autonomy, would not be a process of education but rather would for many represent a process of authoritarian indoctrination, the very antithesis of education and '*hence the argument against faith schools*' (Pring, 2005, p.58). Critics are suspicious therefore that the 'distinctive educational aims' of autonomous schools with a religious character may entail forcing young people into something like a 'religious strait-jacket' at a formative time in their lives (Hare 1992), as well as restricting children's autonomy and their right not to be indoctrinated or be trapped in a restrictive culture, but rather form their own concept of the 'good life' (Humanist Philosophers' Group 2001).

The problematization of 'dominant group-based identities and 'distinctive educational values' therefore have important implications for young individuals' personal and cognitive development, in particular young individuals' personal and social identity development, and how they categorize themselves and others. All of the above however belies the fact of the variety of educational aims of schools with a religious character, which the next section now discusses and indicates that there is a paucity of research which attempts to define and categorise different faith-based approaches to education and their potential wider consequences for cohesion.

3.5 The need for Further Research and Thoughtful Debate

Despite being a widely and hotly debated topic, little empirical work has actually been conducted in this area. The available evidence, in the UK and elsewhere, on the educational aims of schools with a religious character and their actual impact upon personal development, and their wider consequences for cohesion, remains underdeveloped. It is rare for any discussion to go much beyond claim and counter-claim. Limited knowledge mounted upon an

intellectual prejudice and bias often pervades the public and political debate about the issue of schools with a religious character. Rarely is any evidence cited in support of these claims and counter claims. Although a popular topic for the media, the term 'faith-based school' or 'faith school' is often widely defined with an unwillingness to grapple with the details of a more complex situation. Although the heterogeneity of schools with formal links to religious organisation, including amongst schools run by the same tradition, is clear even from a brief acquaintance with these schools (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005; Johnson 2002, Short and Lenga, 2002), often little or no care or attention is paid to the differences and distinguishing features of schools which comprise schools with a religious character, with criticisms of these schools tending to group all such schools together. As Gerald Grace, writing in 2003, complained, the debate on schools with a religious character '*is conducted at the level of generalized assertion and counter-assertion, with little reference to educational scholarship or research*' (p149).

A Runnymede Trust report on faith schools and Community Cohesion noted that discussions '*on the role of faith schools and their effect on community cohesion often create more heat than light*' (Berkeley 2008 p4). Yet despite acknowledging this, and despite the reports' own lack of supporting primary evidence, the report goes on to present a series of strong claims about the malign impact of schools with a religious character. Schools with a religious character according to the report '*are much more effective at educating for a single vision than they are at opening dialogue about a shared vision*' (ibid p5). It is far from clear however how accurate any generalizations can be. There is little research on the educational differences between schools with a religious character and community schools, and less still on the differences within schools with a religious character. As Grace comments '*the need for systematic, scholarly and impartial research on faith-based schooling is very clear*' (2006, p151). Examples of mainstream educational study and research which attempts to define and categorise different faith-based approaches to education are also rare; particularly research which has both a strong theoretical basis and empirical underpinning.

The report by the Runnymede Trust defined 'faith schools' broadly as '*state-funded institutions that educate pupils within the context of a particular faith or denomination*', reporting that around a third of all maintained schools conform to this definition (Berkeley 2008, p.4; see also Chapter 2). The report however contains no further thoughtful debate to the variety of characteristics and cultures of such schools so defined; nor indeed their potential contribution to cohesion. A relevant though somewhat opaque distinction which is

sometimes made between different schools with a religious character, is expressed in terms of the extent to which a school is either 'liberal' or the extent to which it is 'narrow'. A narrow religious school for MacMullen would be one which exemplified rules and structures of authority which were designed to encourage children's beliefs in the faith tradition of the school, and one where large parts of the school's formal curriculum were similarly designed to encourage these beliefs (2007). The narrow school would also be one which was relatively closed to those outside of its community of faith, and as such both the school's student population and school staff would be heavily drawn from that community. The narrow school would also make little or no effort to encourage interaction with children at other schools that are either secular or organised around other religious traditions' (ibid, p.30).

Halstead also makes a distinction between 'old' and 'new' schools with a religious character, between Anglican and Roman Catholic schools on the one hand and schools founded by other religious groups on the other. 'New' schools are those which have been established in the past 30 years and which provide an education in harmony with the distinctive beliefs and practices of the school's faith tradition, and aim to strengthen pupil's commitment to that faith (2002, p.148). Further, Halstead distinguishes between three philosophies of 'religious schools'; schools which serve the whole community and do not place any religious restrictions on pupil admissions; schools which emphasise the intellectual and spiritual nurture of children of the faith, but also have open admissions; and thirdly, schools which do restrict admission to children from members of the school's faith tradition. For Short *the charge of social divisiveness relates only to those faith schools that admit children from the founding religious community*' (2002, p.570); what I have termed autonomous schools with a religious character. Fundamentally though, there is a clear need for further research and insight into faith-based approaches to education. In particular, there is a need for further scholarly and impartial attempts to define and categorise these and their potential effects upon students and wider consequences for cohesion. Such research is essential if there is to be thoughtful and evidence-based discussion of the nature of the environments and aims of these schools. Without such research, the debate and moreover the schools themselves, will suffer (Gardner and Cairns 2005).

3.6 Conclusions

This and the preceding chapter have elaborated and expounded upon the conceptual moorings of 'Community Cohesion' and the problematization of autonomous schools with a religious character. What has emerged is a cohesion agenda which aspires to a cohesive society differentiated along multiple dimensions and lubricated by large amounts of Putmanesque bridge-building capital. 'Meaningful contact' is the conduit through which negative associational manifestations (bonding) will pass through and be transformed into positive and desirable ones (bridging). Interrupting processes of how individuals recognise and interpret information about their ingroups is understood to play a significant role in the opportunity for meaningful contact being taken up and greater positivity toward outgroups in general. Autonomous schools with a religious character may be important sites where these processes are interrupted however, where narrow identities are exacerbated rather than broadened out. Intimately bound to this are concerns that autonomous schools with a religious character 'indoctrinate' children, in so far as children may receive a restricted view or limited type of education imposed upon them by the schools founding body, and one which disserves the important development of young people's capacity and inclination for critical thinking.

The problematization of 'dominant group-based identities', expresses the fear that 'restricted educational environments' and 'distinctive educational aims' will encourage young people to define and evaluate themselves in terms of a single primary group to which all other potential group identities are subordinated.To begin to develop a more complex representation of their social identity, it is understood that children need to be motivated to think about the differences within their ingroups, and be willing to tolerate a degree of ambiguity in defining ingroup–outgroup boundaries (Roccas and Brewer 2002). This is a key way in which a school can interrupt those processes in which individuals recognise and interpret information about their ingroups, how they categorize themselves and others, and whether and to what extent they see themselves and others as similar or different. In this way schools can significantly contribute to a cohesive society which is differentiated along multiple dimensions rather than one which is split along central, be it ethnic or religious, or both, fault lines (Hewstone et al, 2007). Will or do autonomous schools with a religious character however develop young people's capacity and inclination for critical thinking and independence of thought? And will or do they encourage critical thinking and reflection about the social landscape and expose children to that kind of open-minded and sympathetic engagement with significant cultural and value diversity?

If the continuation and expansion of schools with a religious character *is a hard-hat area of education policy: you enter at your peril*' (Bunting, 2008); then with all due feelings of imperilment, and with hard hat duly donned, it is a (too) simple a thing to assume that autonomous schools with a religious character are domains in which more '(religious) dominant group-based identities' and 'distinctive non-common values' are transmitted. Although I believe that valuable work and progress can be made without engaging in the difficult task of empirically investigating autonomous schools with a religious character, no philosophical argument alone can determine whether and how autonomous schools with a religious character foster 'dominant group-based identities' and instil 'distinctive non-common values'. This thesis therefore also makes a modest entry into the field to investigate the educational environments and aims of autonomous schools with a religious character and their potential contribution (or lack thereof) to cohesion. The next chapter will discuss in greater detail the ways in which addressing these research aims was approached.

Chapter 4

Research Design and Practice

'*…the historic dual settlement in British education, demand a conversation about the continuing and growing presence of faith schools, which is grounded in research evidence, both of a theoretical and empirical nature'* (Lawton and Cairns 2005, p.245)

4.1 Introduction

The previous two chapters have established a deeper understanding of the conceptual moorings of the cohesion agenda, and have also indicated a need for further research with both a strong theoretical basis and empirical underpinning, as called for in the quote above, which attempts to frame and understand different faith-based approaches to education. This chapter will now detail how the research was conducted and which data collection methods and analytical processes were employed, and why they were considered appropriate to address this research need.

The chapter begins by outlining the research questions in this study before explaining the choice of research methods and justifying their appropriateness. The choice of schools in which the primary research was conducted is discussed, and also the ethical issues that arose in the course of the research. Finally I describe the process of data analysis, and discuss the reliability of the research methodology and the validity of the conclusions drawn from the data.

4.2 Research Questions

As shown in Chapters 2 and 3, any consideration to the question of whether schools with a religious character disserve cohesion must address the threefold categorisation of divisiveness suggested by Halstead and McLaughlin, and what they term the 'restricted non-common educational environments' and the 'distinctive non-common educational aims' of these schools;

➢ Do schools with a religious character have restricted non-common educational environments?

➢ Are restricted non-common educational environments necessarily divisive?

➢ Do schools with a religious character have distinctive non-common educational aims?

➢ Do these distinctive non-common aims have distinctive non-common intentions and outcomes which disserve cohesion?

These questions involve not just complex empirical judgements but also deeper educational and sociological considerations too. School's 'restricted educational environments' are implicated in categorising and separating children from others and the problematization of too much bonding social capital. Whether restricted environments are necessarily divisive however, that is, whether separating children along religious and ethnic lines leads to ignorance and prejudice, is one claim. This claim does not necessarily press upon educational aims at all. Some indications of the fragility of this claim have also already been given in Chapter 2. A further claim however, is that the educational aims of schools with a religious character, through their curriculum and pedagogy, are themselves divisive. This further claim embroils the educational aims of schools with a religious character in interpretations of indoctrination and disserving children's autonomy, reflected in the desire of the school to nurture and form a religious identity. These concerns are captured by the problematization of 'dominant group based identities' and the problematization of 'distinctive non-common values'. These educational aims have potential implications for the important development of young people's capacity and inclination for critical thinking and independence of thought, and these in turn may have consequences for young individuals' personal and social identity development.

The lack of scholarly research studies which attempt to define and categorise faith-based approaches to education raises a significant number of questions which this research contributes to the answers thereof;

➢ How do schools view their own educational environment?

➢ How do the schools view their own educational aims?

➢ How do the students view their school's environment?

➢ How do the students view their school's aims?

➢ What are the potential outcomes of the school's educational environment and aims?

➢ What are the actual outcomes of the school's environment and aims?

The more fundamental research question which this study asks therefore is how, and in what ways, might different faith-based approaches to educational environments and educational aims contribute to the cohesion agenda. As will be discussed in greater detail below, this question was seen to be most effectively approached using methodological pluralism.

4.3 Choice of methodology

The methodology was designed in order to tread a path between what schools had to say for themselves, much as any kind of school is able to, and what I needed to know in order make conclusions and inferences about their educational environments and aims. The research was also firmly guided by more practical influences and considerations. The field of schools with a religious character is vast, and one could not focus on all such schools. Practical and logistical restraints on the scale of what could be achieved therefore meant that more modest and exploratory research would therefore be necessary. I therefore considered that concentrating on a small number of schools with a religious character which could be examined in greater depth was the most appropriate way forward; and in these schools focusing upon those areas of a school's educational environment and aims relevant to the problematization of these schools, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. These studies could be considered to be both intrinsic and instrumental case studies; each school would be of interest in all of its particularity and distinctiveness, but would also provide insights which would be very likely generalizable and relevant to the wider population of schools with a religious character (Stake, 2000; cited in Silverman, 2005). Analysis of the primary data could in this way allow for the emergence and construction of empirically grounded theories of different faith-based approaches to education; which would close the gap between theory and empirical evidence.

A non-probability sampling strategy was considered to be both the most appropriate and desirable way forward, as any primary research would have to be driven by strategic choices of both theoretical and practical considerations about where and how to conduct the research. This strategy was also consistent with the broader aims of the research which were to introduce a new vocabulary and a new framework, by which to consider schools with a religious character, into the public and political debate over the continuation and expansion of these schools (rather than to provide categorical truths about the entire population of schools with a religious character). This more modest approach also had some methodological advantage too, as a large random or statistically representative sample of schools with a religious character would likely be so large as to preclude the kind of in depth analysis which I felt was necessary to begin to answer the questions above and address the aims of the research (Mason, 1996).

Given the complexity of the research questions, as a starting point a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods was considered to be the most appropriate means of gaining information about a school and building up a rich picture of each school's educational environments and aims. That said however, the research remained anchored on qualitative moorings and a predominantly semi-structured qualitative method was employed in order to produce a richer study of what the schools had to say for themselves in their own terms. This also had an important advantage in allowing the research a greater flexibility which would not have been possible if working to a more rigid methodology fixed at the research design stage (Robson, 2002; Mason, 1996). This was especially advantageous given the exploratory nature of the research. A further important methodological decision was to choose a multi-perspective approach and include the childrens' as well as the teachers' perspectives. Listening to the teachers' views and how they understood and experienced the school's environment and aims would be important, but it would yield only one perspective, and to learn more about a school's educational environments and aims I felt it was important to add the perspective of the children too.

Three schools with a religious character, two Roman Catholic secondary schools and one Church of England secondary academy participated in the research. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with members of staff together with a focus group in each school with the student council/representative body; each explored aspects of the schools' environments and aims relevant to the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' and 'distinctive educational aims'. A questionnaire was also completed by a

sample of final year students using questions from national surveys to allow statistical comparison between school and national data; data from the 2012 School Census was also analysed and compared to data from the 2011 National Census to gain further insight into the school's educational environment. Finally, official school documents, such as prospectuses, were consulted to give further insight into the schools. The choice of schools included in the research and the choice of research methods employed in each school are now discussed more fully below.

4.3.1 Choice of Schools and Gaining Access

It was decided that all the schools included in the primary research should be schools which had faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria, what I have termed autonomous schools with a religious character. These schools could properly be said to have 'restricted educational environments' intended for a sub-group within society; rather than society as a whole (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005). These schools would also count for many as schools for which the primary aim was 'religious nurture', and nurturing a particular religious identity, rather than religious education per se (Halstead, 2003; Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005; see also Short, 2002); and would therefore also have 'distinctive educational aims' (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005).

Ian MacMullen, in his discussion of permissible 'faith schools', argues that primary schools should be treated quite differently to secondary schools. Secondary schools for MacMullen should be required to expose children to and encourage open-minded, rational engagement with different moral frameworks and worldviews; primary schools however, should be regulated differently and altogether less extensively than secondary schools (2007). For MacMullen primary schools can more effectively lay the foundations for children's future autonomy not by exposing them to diversity or teaching them to think critically about their family's values and beliefs, but rather by consolidating their grasp of their primary culture and identity, and encouraging a limited form of ethical reasoning within that framework. To adopt the former goal for primary education would make unrealistic demands upon young children's cognitive faculties and reasoning, as well as miss the important opportunity to lay the foundations for their future autonomy by teaching them to understand and value personal commitment, and also to reason within an ethical system (ibid; see also McLaughlin, 1985).

The desire for consonance between home and school can therefore be understood to be more desirable and necessary at primary rather than secondary level, lest the stability of children's development be compromised by an environment in which their parents' most important beliefs are subjected to criticism and treated as if being of no more value than beliefs which their parents reject (Halstead 2002; see also Ota, 1997, cited in Halstead, 2002). At primary level, 'transmission of beliefs' is therefore more appropriate, rather than the 'development of critical rationality', in order to help children learn a framework of provisional commitments (Thiessen, 1987; see also Crittendon, 1988, cited in MacMullen, 2007; O'Keeffe, 1992). The development of critical rationality is more appropriate at secondary level, where children should be exposed to critical reasoning and reflection upon the framework of provisional principles and commitments consolidated at primary level. It is at secondary level therefore where the 'autonomy goal' is more appropriate, and where concerns over 'religious nurture' and 'indoctrination' press greatest (MacMullen, 2007). Following these considerations therefore, within the research the decision was made to focus on secondary schools.

The vast majority of secondary schools with a religious character in England are Christian, around 98% in total. Around two thirds of the 98% are Roman Catholic, with the majority of the final third being Church of England. For these reasons I decided to focus upon these school's providers. This decision had important methodological advantages too in keeping the focus and key variables of the primary research constant. Focusing upon faith-based approaches within the Christian tradition kept the primary research within the education providers which, for historical reasons, were the most deeply embedded within the maintained state education sector, and so too therefore embedded within the aims of education based on Western-secular and liberal philosophies of education (see also p.53 and p.66; see also Chapter 1). Research within maintained schools with formal links to other religious organisations would have added additional complicated, interpretive 'cross-cultural' difficulties related to the religions' 'position' within British society, and possibly also differing cultural interpretations of the 'critical autonomy of thought' so important to the aims of western, liberal-based education (see also p.223-224). Research within such schools would also have added additional ethical issues (see p.90).

The educational aims and theological involvement of the Church of England in their schools has historically been more complex than other providers (Francis, 1993a). Since the Durham report the Church of England has formally understood that there were two roles to its

educational mission; to serve the nation through its children, the general function, and secondly Christian nurture, the domestic function (Church of England 1970; see also Francis, 1993a). These twin roles have always been present and were reiterated and reaffirmed in the 2001 Dearing report. The emphasis between the one and the other has never remained constant however (Skinner, 2002; see also Chadwick, 2001; Francis 2000). This dual mission and the push and pull between the twin roles were considered to make a potentially interesting case study, if the right school could be found. Similarly to the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church has had a long history of running schools in England. In contrast to Church of England schools, the mission of the Roman Catholic Church and Roman Catholic schools has historically always been to provide a catholic education for every Catholic child, and Roman Catholics have historically always vigorously defended their schools to ensure the protection of their minority interests (Brown, 2003; Chadwick, 2001; Grace, 2002). Roman Catholic schools therefore, are the most populous schools with a religious character which give priority for admission to children on the basis of religious affiliation when oversubscribed, and therefore I considered it important to include Roman Catholic schools in the research.

The issue of gaining access to schools is generally considered problematic in educational research; in my own case however it was remarkably straight forward and unproblematic. Although I began the research without any known personal connection to any school with a religious character, or to any individual with a connection, a serendipitous coincidence eased my passage into three maintained secondary schools. Although in so many other ways full-time employment was a hindrance to undertaking and completing the research, it was also the source of my most significant piece of good fortune. This sprung from a chance conversation between me and a work colleague about the research and what I was hoping to do. It happened to be the case that this work colleague was related by marriage to a lady who had just that year taken up the position of a diocesan director of education (DDE). Suffice to say, contact details for the DDE were swiftly gained and an email sent with an information sheet about the research (see appendix A for information sheet). A meeting was arranged in February 2010 at the director's office, where my research interests were broadly discussed without going into too much specific detail.

Two maintained Roman Catholic secondary schools, which were within reasonable travel distance of my home address, were recommended by the DDE, who also offered to contact the schools on my behalf. The Roman Catholic DDE also passed on contact details

for the Anglican opposite number. Again, a meeting was arranged in the summer of 2010, the research broadly discussed and a suitable school identified. In this way the sample can be considered to be an opportunity or convenience sample of schools driven by me essentially being in the right place at the right time. The schools, whilst being examples of the phenomenon in which the research was interested in, were also reasonably close to hand, readily available and accessible, and could therefore provide data relatively conveniently (Silverman, 2005).

Having acquired contact details for three maintained secondary schools each were contacted by email with an accompanying attachment which briefly summarised the aims of the research, and informed them of what taking part would involve. In all cases responses were quickly received due to their expecting my email from having already been pre-contacted in regard to the research by their respective DDE. A meeting was subsequently arranged in each school at a convenient time. These initial meetings were arranged with Assistant Headteachers at the two Roman Catholic schools and with the Principal's personal assistant at the Church of England Academy. All subsequent access arrangements were made primarily through these initially designated contacts. Both of the Roman Catholic schools were voluntary aided and oversubscribed, and could therefore set their own admissions policy; which in both cases were faith-based. The Church of England school included in the research was an oversubscribed academy which reserved up to 40% of its places for the admission of students who could, or whose parents/carers could, demonstrate commitment to their religion. The Church of England had also only recently taken ownership of the school which had hitherto been an undersubscribed community school rated by Ofsted as having serious weaknesses in the school's final year. The school's partial faith-based oversubscription criteria and the journey the school had been on since becoming a Church of England school represented a complex and interesting case study of a further model of faith-based education. All three schools had been rated as Good by Ofsted in the most recent inspection prior to research being undertaken, Appendix B shows further school characteristics for each of the three schools on a range of indicators.

A potentially negative aspect of gaining entry to schools in this way is that it gave control to the DDE's over which schools were included in the research, which would likely signal a bias in the sample towards willing schools which were more likely to be making a positive contribution to the cohesion agenda, or at least seeing themselves as doing so. This selection bias was not considered to be problematic however, but in fact, in some important

ways desirable. The public debate around schools with a religious character does not allow all voices to be heard with equal strength. Although 'faith schools' are a popular topic for the media, the terms are often ill-defined, or only defined insofar as any given definition which prejudices schools with a religious character without further thought given to the fact of the variety of different faith-based approaches to education. Accusations of being antithetical to cohesion and imposing a restricted view of education are often treated as being intrinsic features of these schools. These are assumptions which although recurrent themes in critical opposition to schools with formal links to religious organisations, are grounded in theory rather than empirical evidence. The research offered an opportunity for two important correctives to this. Firstly, by giving a voice to schools which could be reasonably expected to consider themselves as making a positive contribution to cohesion (this was also an important caveat as although the schools might see themselves as such, how cohesion was understood by the schools may not have been entirely consistent with the cohesion agenda as understood by the research, and so did not represent a guarantee that the research would find the school in a positive light) to reflect upon and articulate what they are about, and also the wider purposes the schools set for education and how these purposes were rooted in their sponsor's traditions, principles and values (Lawton and Cairns, 2005). Secondly, by focusing upon where Pring identifies a justification for 'faith-based' schools should lie, in exploration of the meaning and aims of education, the importance of certain traditions in our understanding of what it means to be human, and a defensible idea of autonomy compatible with participation in those traditions (2005), the research offered a further important corrective to the more sensational headlines of some of the more oft-rehearsed public and political debates around the continuation and expansion of these schools.

The research therefore represented selection and investigation of the dependent variable, schools which saw themselves as best or at least good case examples, but also schools which would provide an understanding which would be relevant to the wider population of faith-based approaches to education. In this sense the sample of schools was also purposive and a theoretically guided choice based on knowledge of the schools and the purposes of the research. Mason describes theoretical sampling as '*selecting groups or categories to study on the basis of their relevance to your research questions...*' (1996, p.93-4). In this research the sample was derived from its focus, the problematization of schools with a religious character and the paucity of scholarly research with both a strong theoretical basis and empirical underpinning which attempts to define and categorise faith-based

approaches to educational environments and aims. In this sense the sample could also be considered a 'paradigmatic sample' of schools which could be reasonably described as exemplar of a certain class (Given, 2008). Here the class is autonomous schools with a religious character which identify themselves as making a positive contribution to cohesion. Here however, the dependent variable is not understood in terms of the more measurable and demonstrable outcomes of education, such as exam results, but in terms of more important philosophical issues and the traditions, practices and values through which schools seek to achieve the wider aims of their education (Gardner and Cairns, 2005).

4.3.2 Choice of research Methods

The aim of the primary research was to investigate the schools' and also the pupils' own understanding and perception of the educational environment and aims of their school. It was decided that methodological pluralism would be the most effective way to investigate these understandings and perceptions. Semi-structured interviews were arranged with school heads/assistant heads and key subject leaders in each school, exploring the school's ethos and educational aims relevant to the cohesion agenda; focus groups were also held with the student council or representative body in each school exploring the school environment and community, and the values which the students felt their school wished to pass onto them. More general observational comments, theoretical notes and personal reflections were also recorded during the time spent in the schools. Official school documents, such as inspection reports and prospectuses, were also reviewed in order to give a further perspective on the schools. The table below summarizes these methods and shows their links to the research questions.

Time and availability were limiting factors in the number of interviews it was possible to undertake in each school, and the total number in each school varied with four interviews being conducted in one of the Roman Catholic schools and six interviews in the Church of England Academy. The range of respondents varied only little; the head of Religious Education was interviewed in each school and an Assistant Headteacher interviewed in each of the Roman Catholic schools; the School Principle was interviewed in the case of the Church of England Academy (see Appendix C for the full list of participants). An interview schedule was developed and emailed in advance to the interviewees in each school; this schedule remained consistent for all interviewees in all three schools. The themes developed

for the semi-structured interviews were also then applied to the data analysis (further discussed below). I felt it was important however that the interview encounter and research was not entirely a one-way process and the interview guide was therefore construed as a list of 'suggested topics'. Interviewees were free to add/amend or delete the list as they wished. This allowed the interview to be a more two-way process and let the interviewee feel more involved in the research process. Only at one of the Roman Catholic schools however was an addition made to the interview schedule, in this case the topic 'equity and excellence for all' was added as this was something that the Assistant Head Teacher felt was important to the school (for full list of interview topics see Appendix D).

Research Objectives	Research Questions	Method
Investigate the school's educational environment.	Does the school have a 'restricted non-common educational environment'? How does the school view its own educational environment? How do the students view their school's environment?	Semi-structured interviews with diocesan directors of education. Semi-structured Interviews with Head/Assistant Head Teachers and subject leaders. Focus group with student representative body. Analysis of official school documents. Analysis of national and school census data
Investigate the school's educational aims.	Does the school have 'distinctive non-common educational aims'? How does the school view its own educational aims? How do the students view their school's educational aims?	Semi-structured interviews with diocesan directors of education. Semi-structured Interviews with Head/Assistant Head Teachers and subject leaders. Focus group with student representative body. Analysis of official school documents.
Identify the contribution to cohesion made by the school's environments	What are the potential outcomes of the school's environment and aims?	Review of educational and sociological literature in light of analysis of interview and focus group data

and aims.	What are the actual outcomes of the school's environment and aims?	Survey of final year students and comparison to national data.

The semi-structured interview format was a very simple and practical way of recording and probing opinions and feelings about a school. The more flexible format was advantageous as it could look in more depth and more subtlety at the interviewee's perception and understanding of their school's environment and aims with only minimal direction from myself and prejudgement on what would or would not be discussed, and what was considered important information (though some questions were expanded upon and further clarified if asked to do so by the interviewee). This flexibility allowed the interviewee more time and latitude to talk for themselves in their own terms about their schools environments and aims in greater depth and detail, although it also allowed enough of a structure for me to retain control and prevent aimless rambling (Drever, 2003). The semi-structured format also allowed me the freedom to ask further questions as they arose naturally during the interview, to probe and clarify emergent interesting areas and themes suggested by the interviewee's responses, rather than limiting the interview solely to predetermined concepts and questions (Drever, 2003; Flick, 1998; Robson, 2002). Some of these were prepared questions but others occurred to me in response to the interviewee's comments and reflections, and reflected ideas and information which had not been considered by me prior to the interview.

Interpersonal skill and positive rapport between interviewee and interviewer is understood to be important in helping to minimise misunderstanding between the two (Opie, 2004). Some time was spent therefore chatting to the interviewee in polite conversation before the interview began, and in most cases I and the interviewee had met and spoke about the research on at least one previous occasion. The structured questions and the questions which occurred naturally during the interview were generally kept open ended, and the interviews felt more like a naturally occurring exploratory conversation than would have occurred in a more structured one-to-one setting. I remained engaged and encouraging throughout, though without expressing an opinion myself which might have counted as positive assessment to a statement of opinion (Fairclough, 1995). A second phase of interviews reflected the 'progressive focusing' of the research and focused further upon ideas and themes brought up during the first phase of interviews as a result of the interviewees responses. The second phase of interviews in particular were key to the primary research coalescing into the two conceptual faith-based approaches to educational environments and

aims which are discussed in more detail in the next three chapters. In addition to the semi-structured interviews conducted in the three schools, as the opportunity to do so was available, additional semi-structured interviews were undertaken with the two DDEs. An additional interview schedule was tailored to the directors exploring general themes, but again the semi-structured format allowed the interviews to probe into more specific issues which emerged during the course of the interview (see Appendix E).

There are some disadvantages of using face-to-face interviews as a research method. First amongst these is that they consume more time than a quantitative survey would have. The process of arranging a convenient time so as to minimize inconvenience to the interviewees, travelling to and from the school, conducting the interview and the post interview transcription and analysis for all interviews, extended over a period of 15 months. Often times and dates would be arranged only for these to be cancelled by the interviewee at short notice; generally, the two-four weeks between exams finishing and the summer break beginning was the most convenient time for interviewees. A semi-structured interview is also difficult, if not impossible, to repeat exactly, since the more flexible format is more akin to a conversation as opposed to a more rigid interview, and no two conversations are exactly the same. This may raise concerns about the reliability of the methods used and the validity of the conclusions and insights drawn from the interview data. These issues are discussed more fully below.

A survey of the final year students was also conducted, exploring the students' values and how they saw themselves. Though the causal relationship between a school's ethos, curricula and pedagogical methods on the one hand, and the ways in which children come to hold their most deeply held values and beliefs on the other, is an extremely complex one (MacMullen, 2007), and certainly not one which can be addressed in this thesis; the survey still facilitated a broad snapshot overview of student's identities and attitudes at each school at the time at which the data was collected. This offered tentative insights into how the school might be influencing their student's values and how they saw themselves and others. Aside from any cases where students had recently transferred from another school, the final year students had been with the school for a number of years and were also at the age when young adults begin to form their own self-identity (Bertram-Troost et al, 2007). The anonymity of the questionnaire also increased the chance that the students would give honest as opposed to socially acceptable responses (Munn and Drever, 1999). The short nature of the

questionnaire, which was designed to be completed in 25-30 minutes, would also only minimally interfere with exam preparation.

The student questionnaire was in three parts, firstly demographic questions, secondly identity and social network questions, and finally questions about respondents' values. The questions used in the questionnaire were all taken from previous Home Office Citizenship questionnaires administered in 2007/2008, 2008/2009, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011, with two exceptions, the first being the final question which asked respondents how warm or cold they felt, on a scale of 1-100, towards different religious and non-religious groups. This question was used in the 2008 British Social Attitudes survey. The second exception was the set of four questions which attempted to gain a measure of respondents' social identity complexity, these were bespoke questions designed for the student questionnaire. Taking questions from existing national surveys had some potential benefit in the questions being tried and tested, though as Czaja and Blair caution, just because a question has been used before is no guarantee of it being flawless or even very good (2005). The greater and more significant functionality lay however in the fact that it allowed for statistical comparisons to be made not just between the responses from the different schools, but also with responses from young people nationally, to see if the responses were statistically significantly different (Munn and Drever, 1999). For the full list of questions see Appendix F.

A weakness of quantitative surveys however is that it misses the more nuanced and subtle differences behind the different responses as well as the reasons behind responses (Arksey and Knight, 1999). Additional student data was therefore obtained from a focus group with the student representative body. A schedule was again developed exploring the student's perceptions of their school's environment and the life of the school community, and the values which the students felt that their school wished to pass onto them. As well as asking open-ended questions however, a further tool used to elicit responses from the students was an informal vignette. Hazel describes vignettes as '*concrete examples of people and their behaviours on which participants can offer comment or opinion*' (Hazel, 1995). In the focus groups the concrete example was the oft quoted comment from Rabbi Jonathan Romain in relation to autonomous schools with a religious character:

'*They* (schools with a religious character) *may be designed to inculcate religious*

   values, but they result in religious ghettos, which can destabilise the social health of the

country at large'; separation '*leads to ignorance, which can breed suspicion, spiral into fear and deteriorate into prejudice'* (Rabbi Doctor Jonathan Romain).

By giving the students a concrete example of a considered viewpoint on schools like theirs', the students were encouraged to articulate their feelings in response to that view. By quoting a third party I also gained some distance from the viewpoint itself so as not to be positioned in agreement or opposition to it. This proved to be the most effective tool in all the focus groups and was met enthusiastically with many if not all students wishing to express their views in each group.

The student focus group format saved considerable time in comparison to interviews with individual students, and allowed for a range of views; giving an opportunity for the students to spontaneously disclose their perceptions and opinions about their school among their peers and in surroundings which were familiar to them and where they would feel validated. This would help the participants feel more at ease and increase the likelihood of open and honest responses (May, 1997). A concern which this raised however, was that the focus group may not be reflective of the student population as a whole. However, it was felt that the focus group was a practical approach within the limited resources and operational constraints of the research; individual interviews with a statistically representative number of students in each school would also have been impractical if not impossible to achieve within the resources and timeframe, as well as generating a body of data so large as to preclude an in-depth analysis (Mason, 1996). Finally, national and school census data was also analysed to compare the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the school to the surrounding area and measure school characteristics on a range of indicators. This analysis gave additional information into how the school's oversubscription admissions criteria might be acting as a criterion of exclusion and in what ways, and gave further insights into the possibility of the school's 'restricted educational environment' affirming more exclusivist, rather than inclusive, identities.

4.4 Researching within the schools

Initial meetings with the contacts at the school were undertaken during the academic year 2010-2011. The first phase of semi-structured interviews with staff members and the focus groups were conducted in 2012. The student questionnaire was run in all schools between

January and June 2012, and the focus group with the student representative body was also conducted during this time period in each school. The second and final phase of semi-structured interviews with staff members were undertaken in the following year. A total of 14 interviews were conducted with staff members across the three maintained secondary schools. Notes were also made during the interviews and focus groups. All of the interviews lasted between 1-2 hours; the focus groups with the student representative body were each 30 minutes long approx. The whole process of gaining entry into the schools and collecting all of the data took approximately 33 months from September 2010. See Appendix C for a basic research schedule.

4.4.1 Ethical Considerations

Before commencing the research, the methodology to be used was submitted to the University of Southampton's School of Social Sciences Ethics Committee for ethical clearance, and before undertaking the research I gained CRB clearance. One concern was raised by the School Ethics Committee regarding the potential inclusion and subsequent identification of a school with formal links to a religious organisation which only had a small cohort of schools. This proved not to be an issue however, as only Roman Catholic and Church of England schools were included in the research. In accordance with School and University research ethics guidelines, all interviewees granted their informed consent to participating in the research. After initial contact was made a meeting was arranged with the relevant gatekeeper to the school in which the research was fully discussed. There was complete disclosure of all relevant information; what would be asked of participants; data protection issues; the degree of confidentiality and anonymity afforded; how the data would be used, and the right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the research at any point for any or no reason, and without adverse consequences. The benefits which the study would have for participants and the wider issues and debates were also discussed to ensure that the school identified with and was favourably disposed towards the project and its purpose, thereby helping to eliminate any potential role conflict or anxiety which might have been felt during the research by myself (Ahern, 1999). Though the nature of the methodology and the investigation of the dependent variable in theory limited the likelihood and/or degree of criticism of the school, it was still nonetheless made clear to participating schools and interviewees that as the results of the research were not yet known no promises could be

made about the nature of the findings, and which might not necessarily present the school in a unreservedly positive light.

Throughout the research the confidentiality and anonymity of interviewees and participating schools was maintained. All of the data generated by the primary research was treated as confidential and was stored in a secure location by myself. All recordings and transcripts were kept securely on a personal laptop which was both password and touch chip protected; codes were used on all records to protect the identity of the interviewees. As far as possible all possible identifiers have been eliminated. Pseudonyms have been used for the participating schools in the research; the anonymization key is not included in the References or the Appendices. The names of participants have not since been used on any documents resulting from the research, and interviewees are referred to by their role within the school, i.e. Head of Religious Education. The two DDEs included in the research are referred to as such, although further differentiated by their denomination, i.e. Roman Catholic and Anglican. Referring to interviews by their role was preferred to using a pseudonym as the respondent's role within the school was important for understanding and interpreting their response. The confidentiality and anonymity of the students who participated in the research was guaranteed throughout; the identities of the students participating in the focus group were unknown to me and were not sought during or after the research. During the transcription process however, gender specific pseudonyms were generated for each to allow identification and avoid confusion. The questionnaire would not allow me or any third party to be able to identify any of the respondents. Recording the audio from the focus group was discussed in advance with the schools, none of which raised any issues with this save that the students should be informed before the start of the focus group, and the audio recorder should not be used should any student feel uncomfortable with the group conversation being recorded. At none of the focus groups did any student raise any concerns or show any discomfort, or indeed pay any particular attention at all, to the digital audio recorder.

None of the schools felt that parental consent for the completion of the student questionnaire or participation in the focus group would be necessary and was therefore not sought in any of the three participating schools. Informed consent of the students in advance of the questionnaire and focus group was left to the school, though written instructions detailing what the students should be told before completing the questionnaire was left with the school; the questionnaire also had an introductory first page which briefly explained the nature and purpose of the research and their right to skip any questions which they did not

wish to answer. Otherwise, after creating the survey on Survey Monkey and sending a link unique to the school, the administration of the completion of the student questionnaire was left to the schools. In accordance with British Educational Research Association (BERA) guidelines, the process in which participants were engaged and why their participation was necessary was made clear to the students before the focus groups began, so too how the research would be used and to whom it would be reported (2011). Ethical issues, including the right to withdraw from or not participate in the group for any or no reason, were also explained to the participants. After an initial introduction by the teacher in each school responsible for running the student council/representative body, I was then left alone with the group for the duration of the 30 minutes approx. period. Participants were treated fairly, sensitively and with dignity throughout, though I did seek during the focus groups to try to ensure that as many voices were included as possible during the group conversation, rather than solely relying on a small number of more loquacious participants.

4.4.2 My Position as Researcher

I attended a Church of England primary school but otherwise I am not nor ever have been formally religious, and have not ever been a church goer of any regularity. The research was entered into I believe with an open mind and only minimal preconceptions and possible sources of bias, and therefore formally no issue of impartiality. Serendipitous good fortune was my way into the schools which were included in the primary research. At no point throughout the research were any personal questions asked of me, only of the research, and at no point did I feel there was any issue or perception from the schools of the research being conducted by an 'outsider', or indeed an 'insider'. Absolute objectivity is ultimately impossible however (Ahern, 1999; see also Crotty, 1996, cited in Ahern, 1999; Schutz, 1994, cited in Ahern, 1999), and during the period of research I established positive relationships with several of the teachers at each schools. I was in particular humbled and grateful for the warm, friendly and helpful manner in which they welcomed me into their schools. This likely made me on some level and to some degree incline towards presenting them and their schools in a positive light, and this underlined the importance of maintaining personal distance during the data analysis. An aid to this is what Ahern terms 'reflexive bracketing', to reflect upon, rather than try to eliminate, one's behaviour and motives in order to make sincere effort to put aside personal feelings and analyse and interpret data with an open mind (1999; see also Tufford and Newman, 2012). Referring back to field notes and personal reflections made

during the time spent researching in the schools aided in recognising any personal feelings which could indicate a lack of neutrality and the origins of these feelings.

4.5 Analysing the Data

The methodological pluralism employed in this research necessitated a variety of techniques being employed in the analysis of the primary data. The data analysis is described generally here in quite broad terms with further more specific detail of the statistical analysis of the student survey being given in Chapters 6 and 7. Once the student questionnaires were completed the results were downloaded as an excel spreadsheet from Survey Monkey. The results for each school were given a unique reference number which allowed subsequent analysis to identify which school the results were from. Data from each school was then added to data from previous home office Citizenship Questionnaires and data from the 2008 British Social Attitudes Survey, each given a unique reference to distinguish them from each other and the school data. The school responses were coded to match the codes used for the same questions used in the national surveys. This allowed for direct statistical comparisons to be made between the school respondents and respondents from the national surveys to test whether the responses from the schools were statistically significantly different from young people nationally. Once all the school and national survey data were collated and coded, the spreadsheet was uploaded into SPSS and basic descriptive analyses performed. Hypothesis tests were also performed; in each test the explanatory variable remained constant, i.e. which school or national survey respondents were from, the dependent variable changed however depending on which question was being interrogated, this determined which hypothesis test was performed. For questions which were ordinal, for example, the question which asked what proportion of a respondents' friends were the same ethnic group as they were, chi-squared tests for performed. For questions which were continuous, for example, the final question which asked respondents how warm or cold they felt towards different religious/non-religious groups, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were performed. During the analysis and hypothesis tests some categories for some questions had to be collapsed due to low counts in some of the response categories, for example the 'strongly agree' and 'agree' categories sometimes had to be made into one single 'agree' category. This was due to chi-square tests being considered unreliable if more than 20% of cells have an expected count lower than 5.

With one exception, all of the interviews and the focus groups' permission had been granted to digitally record the audio, therefore all interviews and focus group conversations were fully transcribed by me soon after the interview/focus group was conducted (the one exception to this, was the interview with the Assistant Head teacher at Sacred Heart which was conducted by phone with notes being taken by me). Transcribing immediately or soon after the interview or focus group had the further advantage that I was able to remember the content of the conversations, this was advantageous for helping to decipher any passages of audio which were difficult to hear. The interviews and focus groups transcriptions were then analysed using thematic analysis to enable identification of patterns (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This transcription and analytical process was time consuming, although NVivo, a computer aided qualitative analysis package, was used to assist in the analysis of the interviews and focus group data. After the interviews were fully transcribed the transcripts were loaded into NVivo. Each transcript was then carefully read through and themes and codes were identified within the data. Some of these codes were quite broad such as the ethos of the school, whilst others were more specific such as pupil autonomy. Whilst most of the codes were determined a priori, and generally followed the list of suggested topics for the interview guide, others emerged from the data. These themes and codes were also applied to the notes taken during the interviews and the analysis of the official school documents. Electronic folders were created within NVivo for each of the codes and the relevant data extracts were exported into these folders. As each successive transcript was uploaded and analysed more codes were identified.

When all the transcripts had undergone the same process the contents of each code were carefully re-examined and re-evaluated, and a process of auditing the codes was then undergone to ensure that the data extracts in each were roughly thematically the same with little to no overlap between codes. The two overarching themes which were used throughout the examination and interpretation of the data were Halstead and McLaughlin's twin terms, 'restricted non-common educational environments' and 'distinctive non-common educational aims'. Generally the final codes within each of these two themes closely followed the list of suggested topics for the interview guide, with four codes being applied to the educational environment theme, and five codes being applied the educational aims theme, as below.

Themes and codes	
Restricted non-common educational environments	Distinctive non-common educational aims

The ethos/theological basis of the school.	The values the school promotes.
The school community/life of the school community.	Exploring and affirming pupil's identities.
The points in school life and culture where faith and education meet.	Exploring diversity.
	Pupil autonomy.
School diversity.	Critical Thinking/Indoctrination

In desiring to analyse and interpret the interview and focus group data in as comprehensive a manner as possible, insight and understanding from a relevant and wide range of philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research was drawn upon, and which provided the basis upon which the primary data was explored and analysed. The work of Gordon Allport and social scientists working in his tradition, who could be broadly labelled 'contact theorists', provided insights into the analysis of the school's educational environment and its potential implications for cohesion. So too did the work of Robert Putnam and social capital theorists. Similarly, the work of education theorists and philosophers such W. Paul Vogt and Simone Weil provided inspiration for the analysis of the schools educational aims. Using such a framework for the theoretical analysis of the interview and focus group data was insightful and analytically helpful as these social scientists and philosophers had/have devoted their professional careers to studying key themes which provided insights and linkages to the problematization of schools with a religious character and their contribution to the cohesion agenda.

4.6 Reliability of Methodology

Mason argues that qualitative researchers should not be satisfied with producing research and presenting findings which are '*idiosyncratic or particular to the limited empirical parameters of their study*', rather qualitative research should be '*generalised in some way, or which have a wider resonance*' (1996, p.6). However, the strength of the research is not in its statistically representative breadth. Only a small number of secondary schools were included in the primary research and this raises questions about its generalizability, which was in essence a key aim of the research. As this was not a large nor random sample of schools the research is not , nor could it have aimed to be, representative of schools with a religious character in any statistical sense, nor does the research make statistical generalisations to the whole population of autonomous schools with a religious character. Rather the sampling in the research, as explained above, was theoretically grounded and endeavours to define institutionally

important and policy relevant models of faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims. The primary research conducted in the three sampled schools therefore only serves as an instrumental empirical starting point for this further theoretically informed typology of different approaches of autonomous schools with a religious character, rather than the results of the primary research itself being the intrinsic subject.

The research methodology shares similar aspirations with Glaser & Strauss' 'grounded theory' (1967; see also Strauss, 1987), whereby the systematic analysis of the empirical data allowed new understandings of autonomous schools with a religious character and their approaches to education emerge. Like grounded theory, the research methodology does not aim for the categorical 'truth' about the population of autonomous schools with a religious character, but to rather conceptualize and frame these environments and aims by drawing from the empirical research. Like grounded theory the research findings also contain a high degree of 'ecological validity', being the extent to which the research findings accurately represent real-world settings. Though the different approaches to education drawn from analysis of the primary research are suitably abstract (since my goal is their generalizability to other autonomous schools with a religious character), they are also idiosyncratic, since the primary research was focused upon the individual schools and their particular characteristics and aims; and are therefore also context specific and tightly connected to the empirical data. Grounded theory though also emphasizes there should not be a pre-research literature review for its tendency to give preconceptions about what to find from the primary research. In this research however, the literature review works more constructively with the empirical data and allows for a more 'engaged theoretical' approach which moves from theoretically driven empirical research and analysis, to theorizing and framing of the sampled schools. The research therefore, in following a theoretical and purposive logic, rather than a statistical logic, is less interested in numbers and percentages and more interested in understanding and framing different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims. It therefore has analytical, rather than statistical, generalizability to other cases of '*theoretical propositions*' (Bryman 1988, p.90).

The mixture of both qualitative and quantitative methods also allowed for a triangulation of the data which enhanced the validity and reliability of the insights and understandings drawn from the primary data (Yin, 2003). Using a computer aided analysis package to analyse the interview and focus group data also had advantages in terms of a more effective and more reliable data analysis. Codes and additional avenues of exploration could

be generated quickly and themes in data could be interrogated more systematically and consistently (Fielding and Lee, 1998). The more systematic and critical nature of the computer aided process also helped to ensure saturation and 'comprehensive data treatment', that the insights and understandings which were drawn from the data were based upon all of the data; rather than a more anecdotal approach which was based upon a few choice selected examples consistent with these insights and understandings, and which overlooked data which offered different analytical conclusions to those drawn (Silverman, 1993, 2005; Bryman, 1988; Cohen et al, 2000; Paterson & Groening, 1996, cited in Tufford and Newman, 2012). The survey of final year students gave valuable insight into how the students saw themselves and others and their values. The transmission of values from a school to its students is moderated by other influences however, and it's highly difficult to objectively separate the influence of school (see also p.66). Therefore the extent to which conclusions may be drawn on the relationship between the schools' and children's values and beliefs must be viewed at best as tentative.

There are also some interpretive problems in analysis of the student questionnaire, for instance, one of the questions asked respondents to indicate on a four-point scale what proportion of their friends were the same religious group as they were. It is impossible to know how the pupils read and interpreted this question exactly. Children from Roman Catholic families for instance may or may not consider friendships with other Christian denominations as counting as friendships with people of a different religion. As Bertram-Troost explains, in working with questions like this, there are several layers of interpretation involved; beginning with the respondent's interpretation of what is meant by the question, then the researcher's interpretation of what the respondent's answer means, and finally the interpretation of people to whom the research findings are presented (2011, p.277). Even with these interpretive problems however, the student questionnaire was still informative and helpful in forming a picture of the degree of contact with 'others' that the respondents saw themselves as having, and how respondents viewed themselves and others.

Questions of interpretation were also raised in correspondence between me and the schools. For instance, at one of the Roman Catholic schools the Assistant Head Teacher explained that several students were unsure what score counted as hot, and which score counted as cold, when answering the feeling thermometer question. This consideration was taken into account when analysing this question. Instead of calculating an ingroup score and comparing to outgroup scores, instead I calculated and compared the standard deviation and

also interquartile ranges (see Diamond and Jefferies 2006, p.73, for the difference between the two) of scores across the different religious and non-religious groups for each respondent. As measures of the spread of data, these then served as a proxy for ingroup bias. In this way the analysis was not affected by differences in individual interpretations, so long as each individual respondent was consistent in his or her interpretation across the different groups.

The theoretical and purposive selection of the three maintained secondary schools was considered appropriate therefore, for the collection, analysis and interpretation of the primary research, and for addressing the aim of the research, namely, to define institutionally important and policy relevant faith-based approaches to educational environments and educational aims. Although the limited breadth of the research and small sample of schools means that it cannot be considered statistically representative, the three sampled schools constituted cases which were very likely to be generalizable and relevant to the wider population of autonomous schools with a religious character (Mason, 1996). The research does not, nor should it be seen to be trying to, provide categorical truths about these schools however. Nonetheless the research has a wider resonance beyond its particular empirical parameters and is therefore generalizable, not in any statistical sense of being descriptions of what other schools are doing, rather, the research is generalizable as descriptions of what any autonomous school with a religious character could do; and how different faith-based approaches to education can potentially serve or disserve cohesion. The term 'extrapolation', rather than generalisation is perhaps more appropriate therefore, and better captures how the purposive sampling research strategy and analysis has relevance for schools beyond those included in the primary research (Alasuutaria, 1995; Ragin, 1987; Yin, 2003; Silverman, 2005).

Rather than the strength of this research lying in its' breadth, it instead lies in the depth of its primary research and in particular in the depth of its analysis and theoretical and philosophical insight. The primary data and its analysis were consistently related to the aim of the research and the problematization of autonomous schools with a religious character as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. The different faith-based approaches to education developed are tightly connected to the empirical data. By consistently focusing the examination of the primary data upon the discussion given in Chapters 2 and 3, I was able to keep the sociological, philosophical and theoretical concerns around autonomous schools with a religious character at the centre of the data analysis. This process was sustained and applied throughout the examination and the interpretation of the data.

Notwithstanding the limitations of the methods and the breadth of primary research adopted for this research, it was felt that the methods employed were appropriate for reasons of both practicality and theory for the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data used in the main part of this study, and for addressing the aims of and ambitions for this research. The fine grained analysis of the interview and focus group data, and insights gained from relevant literature, have enabled me to contribute new insights to the public and political debate around schools with a religious character and their contribution or lack of it to the cohesion agenda, as will be laid bare across the next three chapters.

Chapter 5

The Primary Research: Initial Analysis of the Evidence

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the initial findings from analysis of the primary evidence conducted in two Roman Catholic voluntary aided secondary schools, hereafter called St Anthony's and Sacred Heart; and Church of England secondary academy, hereafter referred to as All Saints. This and the next two chapters outline what I believe to be two conceptually and institutionally important faith-based approaches to education, the 'religious passing' approach and the 'religious engaging' approach. These different faith-based approaches are drawn and developed from, and also grounded in, analysis of the primary research; together with consideration of the ways in which schools with a religious character are problematized in the context of their contribution to cohesion, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. This Chapter makes an initial introduction and framing of the two faith-based approaches to education, and provides a framework for structuring and situating further discussion of these approaches within, in the succeeding chapters.

Below I draw upon the primary research in order to develop the 'passing' and 'engaging' approach to education, and demonstrate the fact and validity of this distinction. Though the chapter remains firmly anchored in the primary research, it also discusses and references further insight from relevant philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research. In this way the chapter presents a symbiosis of the two and also represents a template for the succeeding chapters, which further discusses these two faith-based approaches. Across this and the next two chapters therefore, the empirical research serves as the starting point for further theoretical discussion and elaboration, rather than the empirical findings being the single intrinsic subject matter. This chapter will give an overview of the characteristics of my two faith-based approaches to education; their ethos, school routines and activities, and the points in school life where faith and education meet. The schools as a

whole are looked at from both the school's perspective, from interviews with school staff, and from also that of the student.

5.2 Engagement and Passing

The distinction which I draw between 'religious engaging' and 'religious passing' should not be interpreted as a strict or impermeable separation wherein the different approaches are engaging in mutually exclusive phenomena. Rather an overlap should be seen as existing between each and there may be to varying degrees what I term 'engaging' and what I term 'passing' in both school types. The two different approaches should be seen, by way of a Wittgensteinian metaphor, as sharing family resemblances which are akin to the overlapping fibres of a thread (see also Hand, 2003). Each of the two faith-based approaches to education share many of the same fibres, but the strength of these different fibres vary, and herein rests the distinction which I draw between them. Specifically, the engaging approach expresses an invitation to 'all-comers' from the school's immediate community, to people of different faiths and none, to engage with and understand the faith of the school's religious tradition, it's stories, narratives and values. In a 'passing' school on the other hand, passing on the religious beliefs of the schools religious tradition to members of that faith community will be a stronger 'fibre'. I use the words 'pass' and 'passing' purposefully to denote a qualitative difference between 'religious passing' and 'religious nurturing' per se (see also Hand, 2003; Siegel, 2004). Specifically, in a religious passing school the religious beliefs of the schools' tradition are 'passed' on by way of reasoned-arguments and apologetics, and students will be expected to reflect critically and independently upon the nature and limits of what they are being told and any beliefs they may hold. In this regard the school takes the 'risk' that in their questioning and doubting some students may find that they have questions and doubts which they are unable to move past, and therefore could lose or reject their faith. The benefit to the maturity and integrity of their faith which can result from this critical reflection will be valued more however.

I believe my concept of a religious engaging approach will share a great deal of raison d'être with many Church of England schools, and the concept is drawn from the primary research conducted in All Saints and from interviews with the schools DDE. The ideal of 'engagement', as opposed to 'passing', was most plainly and succinctly articulated by the Anglican DDE:

'...what we ask of all the people that come to our schools, whatever their background, engage with us in a discussion and a conversation and a dialogue about our faith and what it means to us. Let us tell the story, challenge us, question it, add to it, add your experience to that… My aim isn't to provide little Christians at year six that pop out of the system or at year eleven, twelve, thirteen either. It's to have provided the opportunity to explore and to be part of a community where faith is important and values lead the work that we do and lead the teaching that we do.'

The engaging approach of All Saint's emphasised inclusivity, although an inclusivity within which the school community celebrated the Christian faith; and did not attach any special importance to passing on and/or nurturing the faith of the school's tradition. The school principal contrasted the school's purpose and mission with that of his perceived purpose of Roman Catholic schools;

'It's not about in the Catholic sense of church school education of ensuring that we produce lots of good little Catholics who go to church on Sunday, it's irrelevant as to whether or not they do worship on a regular basis, most of them don't, but they worship on a regular basis here' (Principal, All Saints).

The theme of inclusivity was also emphasised by the school's DDE, when speaking about Church of England schools more broadly:

'... it's not about whether you go to church, it's about us demonstrating that for our faith God tells us that there are these certain things that we must be aware of and if we are all made in the image and likeness of God who are we to turn one of those children away, because we're turning the face of Jesus Christ away from us'.

The 'religious passing' approach will, I believe, share a primary degree of raison d'être with all Roman Catholic schools. McLaughlin, when discussing Catholic schools since The Second Vatican Council, characterised them as having 'openness with roots'; thus he writes that '*such schooling can be seen to be... providing a substantial starting point for the child's eventual development into autonomous agency...*' (1996, p.147; see also Bryk et al, 2003; Fullen 1992, 2000; Grace 2006). The passing approach to educational environments and aims goes further than this however, and I would characterise this approach as 'critical thinking with roots'. The 'religious passing' approach is drawn from the primary research conducted

in the two Roman Catholic voluntary aided secondary schools, St Anthony's and Sacred Heart. The term 'religious passing' expresses, in particular, two distinctive features of the religious education curriculum in these schools. Firstly the schools concern for religious education taught primarily through the school's faith tradition; and secondly, the desire of the school that students reflect critically upon the nature and limits of what they are told, and also any claims they make regarding any belief they themselves hold. This was especially expressed in interviews with the Head of Religious Education at St Anthony's;

'*On a scale of 1-10 what degree to which are they* (students) *encouraged or made to examine and argue their beliefs*' (BC).

'*Oh ten, without a doubt...*

... the way we approach RE is, is critically, is in fact maybe super critically, it's a bit like, you know, when the Vatican has to investigate whether miracles have occurred in the case of sainthood, they send out, you know, some Jesuit with a PhD..., who's going to be ultra-critical at any evidence that they think they might of found because they know that if at some point later someone comes along and says, 'well, that was a load of rubbish, we can find out the, you know, physical cause for this so called miracle', then the church is made to look stupid and I guess in a similar way if we send our kids out with half-baked, uncritical ideas then they too... I think I said it before is that idea of them being, going out and being religiously literate and able to cope with, you know, the ideas that, and experiences that, life throws them...'

In this way the religious passing approach engages in what Meijer calls 'reflective transmission' of the school's religious tradition, and does not in any way present the faith of the school's sponsor as self-evident. Rather the schools expected pupils to critically reflect upon whether the values and beliefs of the school's faith tradition have resonance and personal meaning (2006, cited in Vermeer, 2009; see also p.69).

For both St Anthony's and Scared Heart, the religious education curriculum was fundamental to the schools' understanding of its nature and mission, and was the key vehicle through which the religious beliefs of the schools' tradition was 'passed' on. For both schools the curriculum primarily covered religious themes in the context of the theology, beliefs and teachings of the school's religious tradition, and was a compulsory subject for all students up

to and including GCSE. Students at Sacred Heart followed an internally devised course. At Key stage three students followed a programme of study called 'the pilgrim journey' made up of study of the themes 'faith', 'covenant' and 'justice', each with a focus upon Roman Catholic belief, tradition and history, but which also introduced students to Hinduism, Judaism and Islam. At Key stage four all students undertook a foundational unit which focused upon the study of 'religion and life' based on a study of Catholic Christianity. For more advanced students further units were optional which focused upon religion and society, again with a focus upon Christianity, but also together with one other religion; and a further unit focused exclusively upon beliefs and values, tradition and worship in the Catholic tradition. At St Anthony's students followed an internally devised course up to key stage four where students followed the Edexcel syllabus taking the modules which focused upon Christianity.

At All Saints, in contrast, religious education differed little, if at all, from a community school and the school followed the AQBA B GCSE course in Religious studies. At All Saints what the Anglican tradition comprised and comprises was accorded no additional weight or greater importance on the curriculum;

> '*I'm a practising Christian, however, I've always, always taught the different religions sort of from a 3rd person perspective… I would teach them all exactly the same, the same, you know, weight and respect… It's a community school, a standard curriculum there's nothing... you couldn't, you know, transplant into or from any other, any other community school*' (RE Teacher, All Saints).

In this respect the difference in the religious passing and engaging approach to religious education is similar to a distinction which Vermeer makes between religious socialisation as the transmission of faith and religious socialisation as personality development (2009). The pedagogical function of the passing approach can be understood as passing on the religious beliefs of the schools sponsoring body to members of that faith community, and the pedagogical function of the engaging approach can be understood as facilitating the formation of personal identity (though within a religious ethos which brings the faith and non-faithful together to learn alongside each other). Again however, the distinction just made should be considered as a question of emphasis rather than as strictly defined categories. Nonetheless, this begins to highlight the different strengths of different fibres drawn from the primary research, which meaningfully distinguish the different faith-based approaches.

The engaging and passing approach had further implications for the characteristics or fibres of the three schools. McGettrick gives us the following list;

1. *A concern for religious education taught through a particular religious tradition;*

2. *An interest in the way teaching and learning in other areas of the curriculum are being set in the context of a particular faith (e.g. the place of biology, social studies, physical education);*

3. *Building a special ethos of the school characterised by the nature of the relationships which arise from a particular faith tradition;*

4. *Paying attention to the spirituality of the school which emerges from its faith base;*

5. *Monitoring the admission of students who will be able to benefit from this form of education;*

6. *Giving attention to the appointment of staff who are supportive of the particular faith of the faith-based school* (2005, pp.107-108).

Of the six listed above, as already shown above, 1 was a stronger fibre in both St Anthony's and Scared Heart. The school's concern to 'pass' on the religious beliefs of the schools sponsoring body to members of that faith community was also reflected in the school's oversubscription admissions criteria which prioritised Baptised Catholic children. In contrast All Saints had a split admissions policy, and the school emphasized serving the school's local neighbourhood. Rather than being a public institution which tried first and foremost to serve the educational needs of children from families of the school's religious tradition, the Principal of All Saints emphasised the school's service to its local community, though this service was driven by the ideals and values derived from the faith of the school's tradition;

'*...we do have within our admissions criteria forty-sixty split, so we will take up to forty per cent church references... but sixty percent will always be the kid across the road and local, and that will never change because what we would not do is seek to create a school that was all church references...*

Differences were also found between the three schools for the sixth of McGettrick's list

above. Interviewees at both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart emphasised that a core of staff, and in particular the leadership of the school, should be practising members of the school's religious tradition, in order to create and sustain the pervasive atmosphere of the school in which the school's faith tradition was overtly transmitted and experienced; the fourth of McGettrick's list above;

'Do you think you can still have a Roman Catholic school without any of the staff being actively practising? Do you need a core of staff' (BC)?

'I think your SLT does... because at the end of the day our strategic vision, where we go as a school, what we place focus and impetus on, I think ultimately, has to be, has to be led by a Catholic, or at least part of that leadership team has to be Catholic' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'Church is the people isn't it, and you need to come into contact with people who bring the message and tell the story fairly regularly… in any subject, kids can see through people who are, who are being dishonest… in a instance, and if they thought, you know, that any one of us had, I don't know, genuine problems or disagreements with what the whole school was about… I think they would respect that persons difference of opinion but then they would question I think why they were here' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

Contrastingly, at All Saints there was the lesser expectation upon behaviour of staff rather than upon their beliefs; staff were expected to be supportive of the schools ethos, though there was no expectation that they themselves should also be practising members of the school's religious tradition. The school principal himself was Roman Catholic rather than Anglican;

'...at interview, you know, it's critical that everyone answers the question positively when asked 'can you support the Christian ethos of the school'… you don't have to worship, you don't have to go church, but when we're here we do go into worship and I expect you to be supportive and expect you to be publicly seen to value that in front of the students' (Principal, All Saints).

Having initially established the fact and validity of the distinction between the two different approaches, the sections which follow further explore the different fibres of the engaging and passing approach.

5.3 The Theological Basis and Ethos of the Schools

Faith traditions are highly diverse in their theologies, values, beliefs, and practices, and since the publication of Alan Race's book Christians and Religious Pluralism: Patterns in the Christian Theology of Religions in 1983 (see also 2001; Race and Hedges, 2008), 'exclusive', 'inclusive', or 'pluralist' has become a commonly used tripartite description of Christian's attitudes toward non-Christian religions. Put more simply, the difference is whether one is closed (exclusive), partially open (inclusive) or completely open (pluralist) to other Christian faiths as sources of revelation, truth and salvation (for a critique, in particular of the pluralist view of religion, see D'Costa, 1986, 1996, 2009; Markham, 1993; Schubert Ogden, 1992; the categories have also been adapted and applied to religions other than Christianity, see for example Hick, 1995). Both the religious passing and religious engaging approach reject an exclusivist theology, as defined by Race as being one that holds '*the revelation in Jesus Christ as the sole criterion by which all religions can be understood and judged*' (1983, p.11). The religious passing approach of St. Anthony's and Sacred Heart can be defined instead by its embracement of an inclusivist theology, which, whilst still maintaining that its path was the true path to salvation, recognised and embraced salvific pluralism in so much as other paths may also be part of God's plan for salvation; and faithful adherents of other faiths may therefore find salvation by following their own path. Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart presumed therefore that other faiths were valuable and saw the value and importance in supporting and helping pupils attending the school (who were not of the faith of the school's sponsoring body) to pursue their faith and walk their own path on their way to becoming more aware and committed within their own traditions.

Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart had an explicitly denominational and cultural identity, derived from the teachings, forms and contents of the Roman Catholic faith, and both schools primarily functioned to serve and pass on the faith and morality taught by the Church to children from Roman Catholic families. Although both schools would reject pluralism, viewing such a theology, as defined by Race (1983, p.72), as necessitating a relativistic view of truth (that all the major world religions can be considered equally true,

good, or salvific), they saw themselves as being as welcoming and respectful as possible to the individual self-understandings and consciences of all its pupils, and did not have an expectation that all their pupils would share the beliefs and values of the school's own tradition;

'It's a Catholic school, it says Catholic on the front door but I suppose there's that big c and little c isn't there, there's that kind of worldwide welcoming as far as you can whilst maintaining a particular identity, a particular way of educating children....' (Assistant Head St. Anthony's).

'Yeah, I mean we are a Catholic school, that's what we are, that's what we do but... we well appreciate, you know, where other people's views fit in, we certainly don't present ourselves as being above or better than anyone I think...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

The engaging approach, in comparison, nominally embraces a pluralist theology and does not see the faith of the schools sponsoring body in any doctrinal or dogmatic sense. Generally, the religious engaging approach I believe will be marked by oversubscription admissions criteria which prioritise vulnerable children (children in the care of a local authority) and proximity to the school first and foremost. Though the school's emphasis on 'engagement' with the stories, narrative and values of the faith of the school's tradition, will be served further by reserving a minority of places for parents who can demonstrate commitment to this tradition or other faiths; as was the case at All Saints. In this, the engaging approach is reflective of the Anglican philosophy of schools with a religious character, and straddles both the Church of England's dual inward-looking domestic and outward-looking general function. A religious engaging approach at once both includes 'a service provided by the church' and also a service 'provided for the church', and maintains a greater denominational distinctiveness than voluntary controlled schools; reflective of the re-emphasis upon denominational distinctiveness within the Church of England during the 1990s (Francis and Lankshear, 2001; Lankshear, 1996; see also Nugent and Hewitt, 1996, cited in Francis and Lankshear, 2001). The distinctiveness of All Saints was still not so overt however as either St Anthony's or Sacred Heart. Religious education, as noted above, was not seen in 'domestic' terms (Church of England, 1970).

'Ethos' can be a nebulous term and very difficult to quantify or measure, though schools with a religious character are often valued for having or being perceived to have a

distinctive religious ethos and a more explicitly moral environment. Ethos is also widely understood by researchers to be an important element in school effectiveness and developing the values attitudes of young people (Halstead, 2002; Halstead and Taylor, 2000; see also Taylor, 1998, 2000, cited in Halstead and Taylor, 2000). Ethos generally refers to the pervasive atmosphere within a school or underlying philosophy, a set of ideas, activities and behaviours (Parker-Jenkins, 2005). When asked to give an overview of the ethos of the school, interviewees in St Anthony's and Sacred Heart articulated the school's ethos in terms of educational mission and values, the school culture and moral purpose, rather than language couched explicitly in the school's religious position or any reference to the tenets and authorities of Roman Catholicism. Rather than being schools where structured teaching and learning explicitly underpinned the teachings and tenets of the school's sponsoring body, St Anthony's and Sacred Heart were schools where the teachings and tenets of the school's sponsoring body more implicitly, rather than explicitly (and often in quite subtle ways) underpinned the philosophy of, and infrastructure for, educational mission, and the place and nature of ethos, values, character and spirituality in the school;

'*The ethos of the school I think is summed up in your code of conduct that we've got, and it's about caring and welcoming people into the community and celebrating each other's identity and differences, and accepting those differences, and how then we can work together as a school community to move forward, and how the students can be most equipped for the changes that happen in their local communities and the wider community...*' (Head of RE, Sacred Heart).

'*I suppose the simplest way to sum up what St Anthony's is about is, is St Anthony's idea of doing ordinary things extraordinarily well, that's one of the kind of simple catchphrases that the children know very well from kind of beginning to end of school. We've also got two ideas running, this idea of walking with students as, as kind of professionals but walking on not only kind of an academic journey but more importantly kind of a spiritual and moral journey, meeting them at appropriate points, guiding them in the right direction within, very often, you know, the teachings of the church and of course their own traditions from where they come from. There's also this kind of third phrase that we use which is the 'St Anthony's way' , so there's like the St Anthony's way of doing X, Y, Z, and that's very much to do with... equity and excellence in every aspect of students' lives with us here*' (Assistant Head, St. Anthony's).

Both schools also emphasised charity work and fund raising, and how important this was to the mission of the school. The school's DDE also emphasised the importance of charity work to Catholic schools more broadly speaking and referenced a recent piece of research conducted by CAFOD;

'*What are the points in school life and culture where faith and education meet?*' (BC)

'*…Apart from RE I suppose you've got all sorts of things like charity, that's, we, you know, we serve others, but not just because it's a nice thing to do or it makes us feel good about ourselves but because it's the right thing to do… So there's lots and lots of charity work and lots that the children choose for themselves as well*' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's)

'*…CAFOD did a piece of research… they were looking at what are the sort of outcomes you get from Catholic Education… the interesting piece of research was that statistically… I think they looked at an age group of something like 24-30 year olds, those who had been in Catholic schools were significantly, proportionately, more likely to be involved in social action and charity giving than their peers. So if that's one thing that catholic schools have brought about, that, that is in effect social transformation and I think that's greatly to be, to be encouraged and I think… our catholic schools particularly in terms of their charity work, that's something that is hugely important to them and, and they would, you know, they see that as absolutely, significantly important… and those things are done because of that Christian faith, not alongside it, they're done because our schools are Catholic schools, because they're catholic schools this is what they do*' (Roman Catholic DDE).

For all three schools it was the schools religious foundation which was the rock upon which the school's distinctiveness was built, as well as being the basis of the schools' purpose and ethos; and interviewees at all schools felt that the faith emphasis and values of the school were made clear and apparent to parents and pupils;

'*...there is a very clear understanding that the families that commit to this school and children will have a particular experience that they wouldn't have in a state school. So for example, you know, there's the worship, there's the presence of Reverend Claire...*'

(Principal, All Saints).

'…the first assessment that they do, you can see it behind you on the wall, is… how it is you know that Christ is important in our community and they can identify any number of physical and more, kind of notional aspects, answers to that question, to that statement. And that's part of the induction into the school. So I think parents know the school, the kids know the school fairly quickly... I think because the parents have sent their children here, they expect certain things like prayer, and the worship, and the R.E., and being tolerant and behaving well and all the rest of it, and if we're not, we're not delivering that, then that's kind of, that's cheating' (Assistant Head, St. Anthony's)

'We have a catholic ethos of the school, it's a very visible ethos that we, that we commit to as a school, so as soon as the kids arrive I think they're acutely aware of the fact they're within a faith school' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

All Saints reflected a conscious decision by the diocese to serve the poor and disadvantaged, and families who were generally from a low socio-economic background; and in that choice, the diocese and the school had taken a reputational risk in an increasingly competitive education quasi-market. The Principal of All Saints felt however, this was where the school should be;

'I would say that the types of families who we're serving are generally from… (a) lower aspirational end… families who lives are often characterised by varying degrees of chaos; perhaps single parents, blended families, unemployment, successive generations of unemployment, in some instances alcohol, substance abuse, domestic violence… what our kind of underlying ethos of that is, that is exactly where the church needs to be… raising the aspirations of the poor of the parish so that they might lead better and more fulfilling lives, and you know, to quote John 10:10, to live life in all its fullness'.

This sentiment was also echoed by the head of RE for whom working with the disadvantaged had been a driving factor in his career choices;

'...traditionally this is the kind of the place that they've been isn't it, it's the place the church has been. Umm, and yeah, it's an ideal place for them, it's one of the reasons… that I'm here. I worked with the homeless some years ago for about three years… kept

coming across the same stories quite a few times you know, 'all started in school', so, you know, I decided that maybe, I dropped out the other end and see what we could do before they got there.'

In this the engaging approach can make a particular contribution to the cohesion agenda by being a public institution which tries to lift the aspirations and life chances of the less privileged from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, motivated by viewing each and every pupil as being God's child entrusted to their stewardship, and each being uniquely created and known by God and having unique God given gifts and talents;

'...our ethos is about letting children know that they are all unique, talented, have a valuable contribution to make, and it's our job as educators in the service of those children to find what it is they're good at, and to push them in that direction so that they can celebrate their talents and achieve success in life...' (Principal, All Saints).

Important to All Saint's invitation to 'engagement' was being a space within which faith was valued and lived, and where students, and also staff, for whom their faith was important to them, felt comfortable and able to speak about and openly express their faith;

'...what's happened this, to me, this week, was that a colleague who works in admin... I went into the office and I couldn't have had a very good look on my face... and she said 'ooh, can I pray with you'? Now it's a glass office, everybody walking by can see, and I said 'oh that would be lovely'. And she just sat there and lay hands on me and prayed for me. And for me that, that was just perfect, that was just lovely, you know, the fact that people feel able to do that here' (Reverend Claire, All Saint's).

'I tell you it's brilliant cos I was beaten, I was verbally abused, I was emotionally abused at school because of my faith and I think it's brilliant that people can be in school and not have to face that' (PDC Teacher, All Saints).

Awareness of All Saints' ethos of valuing faith was also shown by a student in the focus group with the student council who had transferred from a community school, and noted the difference in ethos compared to her last school where she had felt less comfortable expressing her faith and unable to be herself;

'It was a lot different when I came here, because of the way that everyone respected everyone else, that they didn't like, single people out because of their religion; and it was nice when I came here that everyone did respect everyone else. Even if they were like a Christian, that they understood that, and that's ok' (Jane, All Saints).

The engaging approach of All Saints, may in particular be attractive to people of faiths other than the school's religious tradition, attracted by their perception of the school being a more sensitive space which is freer from discrimination than community schools, and one within which faith is valued and lived (for discussions on cultural consonance between school and home see MacMullen, 2007; McLaughlin, 1984; Merry, 2007; Short and Lenga, 2002; also see Callan, 1995; Gardner, 1998). This was emphasised by the All Saints DDE in conversation about Church of England schools more widely, though also by the Roman Catholic DDE;

'…as a head teacher and my experience in this job as a director of education… the other faith families are very often the families that seek out a Church of England school because it's a place where their children are safe to talk about God in their lives' (Anglican DDE).

'…it's interesting that there are significant numbers of people from other world faiths who also want their children in a faith school, and for whom that is, that's important because they actually want a faith dimension for their children, so it's something about this, it's something beyond a secular environment that people are looking for, so they're looking for that religious dimension that takes them out of a secular environment' (Roman Catholic DDE)

Valuing faith and treating it as a positive and normal element in everyday life will add to the distinctiveness of the engaging approach's (and also the passing approach's) distinctiveness to a greater or lesser extent to community schools, depending upon to what extent community schools fail to be a place where students can engage with religion as a lived reality. Interviewees at all three schools and both DDE's still felt that a community school was a tough place to be a person of faith and could become an obstacle to their academic progress, but this was also something which was true more broadly of wider 'secular society';

'Do you think a community school is still quite a tough place to be, to be openly faithful' (BC)*?*

'Yes, I mean, to be honest, even in a Christian school that's still quite hard, but you hope that you give them opportunities, you know, Christian unions or somewhere they can be that, they, they can do that' (Reverend Claire, All Saints).

'...I think, in a very secular society, a wider point is that, you know, it's not fashionable, it's not kind of well-regarded to be a teenager and have a faith, and I think we do have students who have very profound, very strong faiths here, but I think if they weren't in a faith school I think they would be kind of regarded as quite odd, quite apart from, you know, the rest of the school maybe' (PDC Teacher, Sacred Heart).

The assistant head of St. Anthony's also mentioned how the children were often mocked as they walked to school by children from a local community school;

'...the kids getting called bible bashers on the way to school.'

'Do they?' (BC)

'Oh yeah, absolutely, and actually I always say to them, do you know what, you should be proud, you know, they say that sought of thing to you, can just kind of take it as a badge of honour and you know, just carry on your merry way, but, you know, that is kind of symptomatic I think of just a wider spread of social, cultural kind of ignorance'.

5.4 School Routines and Activities

Prayer, worship and the physical environment of the schools were the most visible ways in which the identity and ethos of the three schools was explicitly expressed; themes chosen for assemblies and tutor/mentor time in particular were key channels through which the identity and values of the school were transmitted to both staff and pupils, and the schools tried to create a relationship with their faith tradition, its history and ritual practises. Religious iconography and texts were displayed in classrooms and around the school's building, there were also places provided by the school where students could engage with religion as a lived

reality; opportunities for prayer and worship were built into the pattern of school life. All three schools also employed a religious minister or lay Chaplain on either a part time or full time basis, and the schools parish and diocesan links also added further to the school's distinctiveness. In the student focus group, students at All Saints felt in particular that the school's full time chaplain Reverend Claire was an important element to the school being a 'Christian' school;

'*What difference do you think it makes having Reverend Claire at the school*' (BC)*?*

'*It wouldn't like feel the same because there wouldn't be anywhere for us to go and talk about God and stuff with other people*' (Claire, All Saints)

'*I think without Reverend Claire there wouldn't really be a Christian aspect of the school, cos it's supposed to be a Christian school and I think that it, it is, and I don't think it would be without Reverend Claire here, umm, that supports people and runs all sorts of clubs for the different people*' (Ian, All Saints).

The religious education teacher also singled out the contribution of the school chaplain to the distinctive Christian character of the school;

'*we've got a Chaplin that walks around with her collar on and is quite happy to talk about God, is quite happy to be, you know, in assembly and being practically the only one singing at the font…*' (Head RE, All Saints).

More widely however, as the engaging approach placed no extra emphasis on 'passing on' the school's religious tradition, together with All Saints more inclusive admissions criteria, this limited how distinctive all aspects of school life could in practise be. This was reflected in the staff interviews at All Saints, where interviewees, although still feeling that the school was unambiguous about its identity and ethos, contrasted their school's distinctiveness with their perception of Roman Catholic schools. Interviewees felt that All Saints could not be as explicitly Christian and/or denominational, and nor would the school wish to be so. Owing to the 'broader church' which the school served and the lower level of congruence between the cultural and Christian values of the school and those of the home, it was felt that being more explicitly Christian or overtly denominational could in practise be

excluding;

> '*I think with a 40% maximum of kids coming from a practising Christian family, you know, doing, being as, as outwardly Christian as, or outwardly Church of England, Anglican, as a Roman Catholic school would be, would be quite difficult*' (Religious Education Teacher, All Saints).

In both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart however the Roman Catholic identity of the schools was more visible in the statues, pictures and other religious objects and texts which were displayed around the school building, and in both schools there was a crucifix in every classroom. But rather than being an overt (or covert) attempt to foster a ritualistic pursuit of religious duties, these served to aid the schools in their 'passing' on of the religious beliefs of the schools Catholic tradition to members of that faith community, as well as aiding to foster an atmosphere which nurtured students spirituality and their understanding of the spiritual. Mass, prayer and worship, as well as residential experiences and community service, in both schools, were the behavioural counterparts to the physical environment of the school;

> '*What are the points in school life and culture where faith and education meet*?' (BC)

> '*It's mass and prayer and worship, it's actions and it is, you know, the kind of physical things that are around the school I suppose that remind us what we're about... you could list lots of things couldn't you, from the crucifixes, to the, to the statues, to the crib that's just about to be put up, to the, to the mission statement… to the charity stuff. It's the point we make about in that assessment that the physical is important and it is a reminder, but it's what you do that's more important. We, we could live in a, I dunno, a, a modernist white shell and still do the things we do, but as human beings it's kind of easier to have little reminders about why it is that we do what we do* (Assistant Head Teacher St. Anthony's)

This was echoed by the focus groups in both schools;

> '*are there other perhaps regular routines or activities in the Catholic tradition?* (BC)'

> '*Prayers in the morning*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

'Yeah, we have prayers, umm, one day of the week, each year... an assembly, they always start it by putting us in the presence of God... we have a, we have a hymn, we have quite a lot of regular whole school masses but we have like more frequently just year masses so it's just the whole year coming together as a community to have a mass' (Richard, Sacred Heart).

'Well, cos we're Catholic they hold regular masses' (Paul, St Anthony's)'

'Well, at the beginning of the day and at the end of the day during registration there's like a prayer, that's how we start the day' (Nathan, St Anthony's).

Students in both schools were also very aware of the iconography around the school;

'I haven't actually entered every room, but I've heard somewhere that there's a crucifix in every room' (Paul, St Anthony's).

'There's loads of stuff around the school like crosses and just things like that really' (Hollie, St Anthony's).

'Yeah err, in the assembly hall there's like different saints on the walls for every tutor group, so there's like Saint Benedict, Saint Dominic and things, so there's like a little bit about them on each side of the hall' (Simon, St. Anthony's).

'I think like as soon as you come into the school there's a chapel immediately there which kind of signifies it, we have like in every classroom there should be a cross' (Richard, Sacred Heart).

'Our uniforms obviously have the big cross on, so do our blazers so we are always kind of forward about our religion' (Gareth, Sacred Heart).

Regular worship was also built into the routines and structures of All Saints, and the school's educational culture had a rich symbolic life, though encouraging students to participate positively could be challenging in light of the school's constituency;

'...we have acts of worship each week and we also have the big events, that we come

together as a whole school for worship. So last week when we had ash Wednesday, many, many students came up to be ashed, or for ashing, if that's a verb, I don't know!.. and an increasing number participate positively and actively in those services, which has moved from a hostility, a few years ago, an open hostility of ridiculing the service… to a passive participation whereby they just sit there and grin and bear it… to now where they're actively taking part in it and, you know, we've planted a seed and they're exploring something, and at some point later in their life they might develop more fully' (Principal, All Saints)

'I welcomed my first year seven cohort, and I got all the students into the hall and we gave all the year sevens a candle, a lighted candle, and I fell out with my health and safety officer who told me I couldn't do it and I said well, I am doing it, you know, we're a church school and I don't care... So you get one when you arrive in year seven, and one when you leave in year eleven. And the year elevens who we give it to each year, I would say to them, look, you know, you've been at a church school, you might or might not have been touched by what we've offered and shared together, but, you know, one of the gifts for you is we wanna give you this candle… and, you know, we do a bit of symbolism about you're taking your light out into the world....' (Principal, All Saints).

In the school focus group, some students showed more diffidence when they were asked to talk about the Christian character of the school and no student referred to the physical environment; perhaps indicative of All Saints not being as overtly distinctively Christian or denominational as the two passing schools, and the different constituency which the school served;

'If I asked you to point to the specific Christian bits of the school, the bits that make the school a Christian school, what would you point to' (BC)?

'I couldn't really point to like, a specific part because like, it depends on like, also the teachers, incorporate into the lessons or if they don't; so it just depends on who you have and what they believe and what other people believe as well' (Jane, All Saints).

'Probably like assemblies and sometimes mentor time, our like mentors will do like

active worship' (Becky, All Saints).

'*...like, we have carol services… I can't remember exactly how long ago but we had one of those, then every, every assembly, it's inspired by faith...there's always bible readings in there and there's always like prayer at the end and there's respect in it, and you know, it's just, very, very, very regularly... and I think, I'm not sure cos we definitely had them two years ago, we had umm religious prefects as well, like three prefects...*(Peter, All Saints)

For the Scottish moral philosopher John MacMurray, whose philosophy influenced Tony Blair (Blair, 1996; see also Sopel, 1995) 'the family' is the original human community and the basis of all subsequent communities; '*the more society approximates to the family pattern, the more it realizes itself as a community, or, as Marx called it, a truly human society*' (MacMurray 1961, p.157). In a similarly rich vain All Saints interviewees emphasised the 'family feel' which the school tried to foster and which was driven by the school's Christian foundation;

'*...at the end of each term now we have a whole school meal... and they are served a full kinda roast meal by senior staff and prefects and there's a bit of entertainment on stage, my deputy stands and, you know, entertains them with a few jokes and there's a couple of songs… And we do that as a coming together as a community that is not a time when it is obviously Church School, but we do it out of a sense of, well, you know, a significant number of the children will not know having a sit down roast dinner experience with their family, because that's not what they do... So we offer them that experience as part of, if you like developing the family feel to the school and the family values of togetherness.... So a lot of what we try to do is develop a family feel to the school that I would describe as Christian values…*' (Principal, All Saints).

'*...it is about community and family values as well in the school, so it's not just a, an individual student but we're part of a, a family here, I think that's the atmosphere that we try and create*' (School Chaplin, All Saints).

5.5 The 'ethos effect'

How we measure the effectiveness of education in our schools, and what we measure, is an area of significant underdeveloped research and intimately caught up with concerns that a preoccupation with the more visible outcomes of academic achievement overshadows and diminishes the value of the outcomes of Bernstein's concept of invisible pedagogy (1970). This has particular relevance for schools with a religious character which would wish to stress the benefits of their more 'holistic' philosophy of education which attends to the spiritual, moral and social formation of the pupils more so than a strictly secular model of schooling. Whether there is any 'faith school effect' upon academic performance is hotly contested, in particular whether, in accepting that there is one, this is explained by school intake rather than by any 'magic ingredient of faith ethos' (see for instance Accord, 2014; Benton et al.,2003; Gibbons and Silva, 2011; Morris, 2009, Schagen et al., 2002; Schagen and Schagen, 2005). Any magic ingredient of school ethos is difficult to quantify or measure in any hard and fast way however, and this difficulty was touched on in conversation with the Principal of All Saints;

> *... (a) distinctly Christian ethos and identity, and living out those values... embrace all of what Ofsted tick, but... they add something extra to it. How do you tick that? How do you, how do you measure the impact of Reverend Claire... who walks around the school all day, 'loitering with intent', to pick up children who need picking up. How do you measure that as opposed to having a school councillor in a secular school? I don't know'.*

Despite this however, interviewees in all schools showed no ambivalence or reticence in expressing their belief that their school's ethos was the underlying cause of the success of their school. The school's ethos, underpinned by its Christian narrative, gave children something additional which they would not experience in a school without a religious character, and which was key to better academic performance. This was something interviewees felt parents believed too:

> '*There's something children are getting here that they wouldn't in a community school*' (BC)?

> '*Yeah and you come to a parents evening, you know, parents are kind of like 'you really feel there is something different here', they really feel there is something, there is an*

underlying kind of feeling within the way, you know, the way the kids are, the way the staff are, just the whole, it just feels very different and I think it feels different because we have that ethos we have those values… in a very subtle way it's there and you realise it almost immediately, it's different and it's somehow, I don't know, better' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'I think we do better with the children than lots of other schools because of the ethos, quite simple as that' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

Both Sacred Heart and St. Anthony's showed no reticence in their belief that key to their academic success was that they offered a more holistic philosophy of education and development of their pupils and a fuller view of life. Motivated by viewing each and every pupil as God's child entrusted to their stewardship so as to nurture and develop their innate gifts, both passing schools emphasized the education of the whole person and developing every aspect of the individual to their maximum potential; the social, moral, emotional and, importantly, spiritual development of people, in addition to intellectual and physical development;

'I think the first line of the mission statement is we're all children of God and Jesus is our teacher… I think it encapsulates that idea that each child is seen as a unique, important individual made in God's image and therefore any interaction that we have with them should be as the conclusion to the sheep and the goats, you know, whatever you do for the least of these, you do for me…. and then, if you see Christ in the child, then the pedagogy has got to be right, the pastoral systems have got to be right… I don't know who said it, it might have been Basil Hume, but there was that line about preparing, you know, what's education for and most people say 'oh, it's mainly for your job and possibly going abroad and all the rest of it', and he, or someone else much wiser than me said 'oh it's preparing children for death, preparing people for death'. I think if you have that view of humanity and this particular institution which seeks to nurture and encourage these particular humans, then that's got to make a difference hasn't it. It, it is the whole mind and body and soul and spirit as opposed to get a good job, earn lots of money…' (Assistant Head St. Anthony's)

'We are about getting kids achievement and making progress and all of that, but I think

if you spoke to every member of staff in this school, you know, they're big priority, what they feel we deliver as a school, what makes us different, is that, you know, we are thinking about the spiritual, the person, the child, you know, their well-being, emotional, you know, is there at the forefront of everything we do... I've only taught in faith schools apart from one school, and there's a visible difference between what we're able to deliver on because we have that unique place, that unique ethos, and I just didn't feel it, that's why I would only ever work in a faith school personally... I just think when you have a faith school it's a lot more profound, it's a lot more obvious, it's a lot more meaningful...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

Generally less diffidence was shown at the passing schools, particularly St Anthony's, on the difference in philosophy of education and educational mission compared to community schools. This was especially evident in conversation with the Assistant Head teacher of St Anthony's who felt that the school could offer different responses to questions arising from the experiences of daily life, and was more open to the sphere of ultimate meaning and purpose. The spiritual and transcendent dimensions of the schools educational mission attended not only to 'how' but also to 'why', in order to ensure children were encouraged to search for the meaning and the purpose of human life and values by which to live by (Russell, 2007);

'I guess we can say things which are different from community schools… I guess practically where it comes in for example would be, is answering those questions of ultimate meaning so, you know, when, when we talk about euthanasia for example or abortion or those kind of hard life and death, birth and death situations, you know, you can have perfectly rationale, reasonable humanist answers to why things happen… Whereas I guess the kind of answers that we would give might be, might be different and I think sometimes might be harder… You know, when Christ is asked questions he doesn't often give a straight answer, he kind of tells a story or gives a, or asks a question back… in some ways what we do here is we give a right, old testament, kind of biblical, in fact biblical thinking and biblical talk is very often narrative and it's based on experience... what we've inherited in this country via the kind of empiricists I think is a kind of national view of talking sometimes which, you know, quite enjoy a story but actually when we get down to things we want the, the hard nitty-gritty, show me the, show me the truth of something so that I can see it, and the narrative kind of gets lost.

Where is I think as human beings we respond to narrative which is not as precise, which is sometimes woolly and incomplete, but actually, which is more human'.

Similar feelings of a more holistic education and also a more caring and sensitive Christian community in which all children can develop fully were also expressed by the School Chaplain at All Saints;

'*It is, I think it is more here* (holistic)... *So you get the caring, there's concern for what goes on outside of school and family life umm, yeah so that we'll, we see the person as a whole person, it's not just about creating a, a whole person through the education process but it's about seeing and valuing the whole person... I think that prayer and worship is what we offer that's a different way and means* (to community schools) *of students being able to express their spirituality*' (Reverend Claire, All Saints).

Prior to becoming a Church of England school in 2007, All Saints was a failing community school which had several times be placed into special measures by Ofsted. Since becoming a Church of England school, and then a Church of England Academy, the school had become oversubscribed and had risen above national averages. The school Principal similarly showed no ambivalence or reticence in expressing his belief that more than anything else it was the Christian ethos of the school which was the underlying cause of the turnaround in the school's fortunes and performance;

'*Now this is a school that historically has been a failing school that is improving at a pace and will go on to improve and be a school that will be significantly above national averages in the next two to three years but still serving the same community. So something's happening there that is if you like contributing to the school improvement agenda that Ofsted would measure... and I've argued this with Ofsted inspectors, cos, you know, they'll say well school improvement happened... because you really focused on teaching and learning, you know, you sorted out discipline, leadership and management... And I will say well I accept all of what you're saying, but if anyone asks me what has been the single biggest contributor towards turning around this once failing school, I would see it as being, developing, the distinctly Christian ethos and identity, and living out those values...*' (Principal, All Saints).

The turnaround which had occurred at All Saints was similarly highlighted and extolled by the Anglican DDE;

'...(All Saints) *had been a school that was failing its community and its children from several years, and became the sink school for the borough… And the community that I met knew that and felt that everybody had given up on them, so why would the church be in the least bit interested in them. And to actually express to them, the fact that the church thought that every single person that God has created has something unique to offer to society and to the community, and that they are the only people that can do that… was something they'd not heard, they thought they were just the dustbin of society there, and over a period, a very short period of time, comparatively speaking, the church staff, who were then appointed, demonstrated that in everything that was going on in the school, in their daily lives, and the difference has been amazing...*'

5.6 The curriculum

As already discussed, the religious education curriculum at both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart primarily covered religious themes in the context of the theology, beliefs and practises of the school's religious tradition; at both schools the personal development curriculum also supported this, and for all three schools the faith ethos of the school permeated the classroom more widely and in often quite subtle and nebulous ways. The emphasis upon Christianity in the Roman Catholic tradition, though being as inclusive as possible at the same time, was summed up by St Anthony's RE teacher as follows;

'*How much is the religious education curriculum taught from the Catholic tradition*' (BC)?

'*I think it would be almost impossible to put a number on it... There are things that we do that would have no, you don't need to do from a faith base, it's like a skill for example, so, you know looking up a bible reference is neither catholic, protestant or Sikh, it just is what it is, but there'd be lots of issues that we'd talk or ways of doing things or traditions that you would just say, say you know, kids when they went to primary school or when they went to mass, it's a bit like this isn't it, if you go to, you know, St. John's the Anglican church down the road, it's gonna be a bit like this, and,*'

you know, my non-Christian students, sometimes you can draw analogies between
faiths and how we do things and what have you, I think the idea of including as many
people as you can is important while clearly explaining what Catholicism is all about'.

As with all publicly funded schools the engaging and passing approach still had to conform to government stipulations as regards National Curriculum requirements, but at opportune moments in both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart the ethos and identity of the school could permeate the content and method of the secular taught curriculum in subject areas other than RE or PDC, sometimes in quite subtle and potentially person forming ways;

'...whatever lesson we're doing, in some way we will kind of hark back to, you know,
where does this fit into the school ethos, you know, and that can be quite explicit, that
can be quite subtle and implicit...... I think when we do look at, you know certain issues,
we do kind of touch back on faith and you know, so when we do the holocaust or when
we look at slavery or look at Victorian factory conditions, you know, we are looking at
the ethics, the morality of it, and I think that's where the RE and where the faith, you
know, it does, it does creep in, it's there, you talk about it...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'I think each particular subject has, has things that it can bring to the ethos and to the,
to the religious nature of the school, sometimes, sometimes they are hard to pick out,
but very often they're quite easy, so the way that you deal with, I don't know, slavery in
history, or look at black history month, or the way you deal with, I don't know, identity
in English or a particular play, or the effect of globalisation in geography, and
bringing a moral, to, to those questions, I know the science curriculum at the moment
has got new, kind of, has more of an ethical bent I think in some of it's, some of its
papers...' (Assistant Head St. Anthony's).

Generally though, students in the student focus groups did not feel that their lessons were different to a community school;

'Do you think any of your lessons are different here? (BC)

'I wouldn't say they are, I wouldn't say the lessons are different, I wouldn't say they're

bias towards, say science lessons, I don't think they avoid the question, the big bang and evolution, they don't avoid it, they teach you, teach you the facts and they teach you what theories there are' (Sophie, Sacred Heart).

Interviewees at All Saints similarly felt that in practice the ethos of the school could still permeate the classroom in sometimes a more or less nebulous way; this could be as simple a thing as teachers feeling able to talk about their own faith. More than this, the school was looking at having drop down days in the future which would have a biblical theme;

'*... I can talk about the fact that I'm a Christian, and I couldn't do that in a community school. I can actually openly say I'm a Christian and this is why I'm a Christian... I can do that because I'm in a faith school; and that's actually really, really nice, it's a really nice thing to be able to do; to say this is part of what makes me who I am, you know*' (PDC teacher, All Saints).

'*...it being a church school it does make it, does make it a little bit easier* (teaching religious education)*, being a, a faith school because they can see that they have to do RE, so that just makes it a lot easier in the first place... But if you're gonna push me to say what the difference is* (between teaching RE at All saints and in a community school) *I would have to say it's quite, quite subtle, and quite hard to grasp*' (RE Teacher, All Saints).

'*...at the moment we are looking at how we weave scripture and the bible into the curriculum. So we have, we call them at the moment creativity days, where we take students off timetable for a day and do something creative with them in their curriculum, in a particular curriculum area... but next year the idea, I think the idea is that we're going to theme them around bible stories or parables, so science might do the parable of the seeds. I thought sort of modern foreign languages, you know, you could bring Pentecost in there. So we're looking at bible stories, ways in which, you know, you can bring those in, not so that you're studying those parables in particular, but to see that you can use parables through your everyday, everyday life, and they've got relevance for today*' (Reverend Claire, All Saints).

The engaging approach at All Saints also meant that there were further extra-curricular

opportunities for further 'engagement' with the stories and narratives of the faith of the school's Anglican tradition; to develop spiritually and experience and investigate Christian faith in order to have further motivation and opportunity for a basis upon which to make choices, and come to conclusions for themselves, about Christianity and Christian commitment. These were available for students who either sought such engagement or else found a curiosity to seek out such engagement, for continued exploration and learning;

'... *so the opportunities are Christian Union, there's an Alpha, there was an Alpha course this year and we offered confirmation, Baptism at the end of that if people wanted to go on to do that umm, and then there's communion here once a week...*' (Reverend Claire, All Saints)

These extra-curricular opportunities were like an 'open door' which the school would keep as wide open and as welcoming as possible, but ultimately it was the students' decision whether to walk through or walk passed that door. One of the students in the student focus group however did feel that there was more 'engagement' with the religious or spiritual aspects of life at All Saints than there would be at a community school;

'...*that's their choice isn't it at the end of the day... it's not me that's converting them, it's God, you know, by his spirit working in people's lives and he's taking them to the next step, umm, and he might use me to do that, or he might not*' (Reverend Claire, All Saints).

'*I think it might be like effort that's put in because if you come to a Christian school then you'll probably know that it'll be Christian and probably put a bit more effort in, but if you just did something in like a community school they might not... and no one would come to Christian union or stuff like that*' (Jasmine, All Saints).

5.7 Mission and Markets

When asked specifically why parents sent their children to All Saints, interviewees felt that parents, for whom their faith was important to them, also valued an environment where religious values and beliefs, and the role of religion in society more broadly speaking, would be sincerely respected and celebrated; and where the faith of their children could flourish in a

secure and stable environment. For many more parents though, for whom faith was not an important part of their lives and who were not regular church goers, a generalized moral sense and an orderly climate was valued, the school being viewed as being a better place to transmit what is morally right and wrong; something which could lead not just to the development of character and virtues which would serve children well throughout their adult lives, but also have a significant impact on their academic achievement. The schools Christian character and ethos was viewed as a special, extra 'ingredient', that would not be offered in a community school;

> '*I don't know if, if they choose it specifically because of the faith aspect, some will because that's part of the admission you know, we encourage a certain percentage of people from faith backgrounds to be here at the school, and I think part of, part of doing that is so that students who do come from a faith background feel happy to be somebody of faith here, you know, they don't have to hide it, it's acceptable to have faith here*' (Reverend Claire, All Saint's).

> '*I tease them* (parents) *when they choose the school and I say why this school, and they say because it's a church school, and I say where is it you worship, and then they look very embarrassed and look at their feet and say, well I don't worship, mines an active Christianity, and that means they don't go to church really. But what they do say is that you do that for us… it's so they* (parents) *can say, well, you know, you know right from wrong, you went to the church school, and their children then know what it is to be... to have had a Christian Education, and that is attractive to them… that is an extra bit of education, of learning, and of life experience that they don't get if they go to the school down the road, that is a regular state school*' (Principal, All Saints).

Similar themes of parental desire for a more moral and orderly climate, and for something additional that would not be experienced in a community school, were also expressed with interviewees in Sacred Heart and St Anthony's, as well as by the schools DDE. Though for many parents, as might be expected, it was a Catholic moral sense, more specifically, that was desired:

> '*Why are catholic schools so popular, well, isn't that an interesting one. I mean, for some it will be because they want their children educated in a catholic school, no*

doubt. Their faith matters to them and they want their children in a Catholic school. For many people, perhaps for whom faith is perhaps a bit more flexible, fluid, they still, they want their children in a, in a school which, very often they would say 'it's a good school because it's got values', and people talk about values a lot, they talk about the values of the school and sometimes they find it quite difficult to explain what they mean; sometimes that comes down to discipline, they say it's an ordered school 'the school is very orderly the children are well behaved' that really matters to us... (Roman Catholic DDE)

'...we would love it if every child went to mass every Sunday but the reality is that's not what goes on... but I think where there perhaps is a perceived gap, although we wouldn't treat it as such, I think we kind of fill that gap with what we do at the school. So if they're not regularly attending mass or if they're not, you know, from a family that perhaps is that keen on faith or religion, then I think, you know, in a subtle and in an appropriate way, we fill that gap, and we, and we kind of fulfil or fill sort of the spiritual part of that person's life... I think we retain a very strong ethos because we are what we are, you know, we are what we are; we are what it is says on the tin almost and I think most parents although they choose us for our, you know, our excellent results, I think they're also choosing us because we are a Catholic school, that our ethos is so strong and that, you know, it's something that students can only ever benefit from. So I think, you know, it's, it's that really, if that makes sense' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

All contemporary schools in England find themselves however in a quasi-market for school places and schools must ultimately deliver upon the more utilitarian and measurable outcomes of education that more explicitly serve job prospects and social mobility in an increasingly competitive world. Interviewees in each school were asked whether, if exam results unexpectedly worsened, how this would affect admissions. Here, the Principle of All Saints showed less diffidence and optimism than the interviewees at Sacred Heart and St. Anthony's, perhaps indicative of the school's different respective constituencies and mission:

'...I think we may have to compete a bit more ... I don't think we would see a massive drop off because I think... the behaviour here is much better than perhaps other schools, the discipline... the way everything is done really I think, and that I think is in

large part due to the faith ethos of the school. So although I think we would potentially see a dip, I think the compelling reason is just us as a school, what we're about...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'...I think there would be some tailing off because I wouldn't be so naive to say that every parent who sends their child here only did so because we're a church school, because we have a good, a particular ethos, and some would; and not all the Catholics who come here are practising Catholics. I'd say probably about a quarter, maybe of the 80%, 85% are probably practising but that's not up to me to question that's entirely down to them. I would hope that they would still come but, I know some wouldn't. I think that's society in general isn't it... education is a market place isn't it, you're gonna go to the best, the best stall, if you happen to like the shop owner all the better, but...' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

'I think you would find very quickly, that those parents who were saying they wanted a church school education would not be placing their children at a church school if it didn't deliver some exam results, and they would place their children, and Christian families would place their Christian children, at the school that was not a church school if the church school was not seen to be delivering results' (Principal, All Saints).

In an out-put driven education quasi-market, with an increasing preoccupation with standards in schools and the need for schools to continuously improve, an oft heard view is that the overriding or sole purpose of education has become gaining qualifications, which has been to the detriment of other educational goals (Lawton and Jo Cairns, 2005). There is a potential for any school therefore, not just a school with a religious character or a religious passing/engagement school more specifically, to become overly preoccupied with the more visible and measurable in education to the impoverishment of other educational goals, goals that the realisation of which cannot easily be measured in any hard and fast way. Where *'performance is defined and measured narrowly'*, as MacMullen argues, *'then schools have an almost irresistible incentive to adopt a similarly narrow conception of their goals'* (2007, p.207). Tensions may however be particularly acute between the secular academic success culture and the more holistic and spiritual perspective of schools with a religious character. Gerald Grace's study of sixty Roman Catholic schools found that a *'characteristic stance was to say that spiritual development was not amenable to a contemporary target-setting and*

performance indicator culture which was currently dominating educational practise' (2002, p.217). Conversely however, interviewees in both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart did not themselves see any difficulty in synthesising their mission with 'market' values and thereby serving both ends, but rather, echoing Michael Novak (1993) and Gerald Grace (2002), that with clear leadership and judgement a more symbiotic relationship between them could be maintained;

'*Are there practical difficulties in sustaining the school's mission statement? Is it difficult at all to not fall into being a kind of exam factory and let that overshadow or push out the 'hidden curriculum*?'(BC)

'*It shouldn't be if the leadership of the school is very clear about what is important and follows that through in the practical every day... Timetabling for instance... so I was just talking to the Chaplain earlier and we take the children off to a parish, over to the parish church to join in the parish mass... last year we would go when they had tutor so they wouldn't miss a lesson and now we've swapped that around it means that the children will have to miss a taught lesson. Now there will be some people in the particular curriculum areas who'd be quite unhappy about that… However, the head is very clear that we go to mass, it's of great benefit to the tutor group and to the tutor, to their relationship, our relationship with the parish, the parish priest and so on. So if they have to miss a taught lesson then they have to miss a taught lesson, and if things need catching up then they can be, they can be caught up with. I think you've got to have a will to make those things happen, and it is hard because, when it gets to exam time in the run up to May there are all sorts of demands being made on children from all sorts of different people. But the, I don't know whether it's either the parallel or the primary demand upon them, is still, that they are good people and they engage with what, what it is we're really about*'(Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

'*All schools have to deliver academic results, do you think it is difficult to not let that crowd out the so called 'hidden curriculum*" (BC)?

'*I don't, I don't, I mean, at the end of the day we are judged as a school primarily on results, and, you know, my wife went to this school, she now teaches at this school, she will tell you that Sacred Heart has always been a highly successful school, yet running*

alongside that has been a real strong clear ethos, a commitment to Christian values, and to be honest, they help one another really because, you know, your ethos talks about self-respect, self-discipline, about, you know, important values, about important ways of behaving and so forth, and that could only ever really benefit the academic side, and I suppose with academic fulfilment, reaching potential, there's that self-esteem, that self-awareness which feeds into the sort of spiritual and self-being, if that, if that makes sense as such, that they kind of mould into one another almost; but I don't think they ever clash as such. I mean, I think they can only ever complement one another' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart)

Interviewees in All Saints however, generally showed more diffidence than the interviewees at Sacred Heart and St. Anthony's, expressing a more 'survival' position than any distinctive Anglican position in response to the 'realities' of market forces and values (Grace, 2002); perhaps again indicative of the different realities for the different schools and the school's different respective missions and communities served;

'*Is it hard getting that in, fitting that in? Obviously, all schools have to be to some extent an exam factory'* (BC).

'*Absolutely, yeah, that's the nature of the beast at the moment… you are judged on, your, your A-C rate and that's, that's the sole judgement and that, I mean that's completely wrong, completely, that's unfair and completely unjust and it just needs to change but at the moment that's, that's what we're measured on. You're not measured on how many kids go home happy at the end of the day, you know, how many come out well rounded individuals, how many guys are supported, who are carers at home who are supported within school and how many guys that come in not being able to actually speak in front of a class to going home at the end of five years being able to do presentations and, you're not measured on those things. As I said before, in some ways they're not measureable'* (Head Religious Education, All Saints).

'*We have to be an exam factory, to use your phrase, but it's a good one and it's true, because that is what's gonna raise children's life chances and their aspirations and being an exam factory is gonna allow them to know life in its fullness. Because those bits of paper give them access to opening doors that they would not be able to open if*

they didn't have those bits of paper, and the church's mission is to raise those aspirations and to provide those opportunities and open those doors, and how do you do it, you do it through being an exam factory and producing students who pass exams and have opportunities later in life; and you do that because each child is uniquely created and loved and known by God and all of that; you can't distance yourself too much from the exam factory model because we have to be' (Principal, All Saints).

5.8 Conclusions

This chapter has introduced and demonstrated the validity of two faith-based approaches to education, a religious engaging approach and a religious passing approach. Each have been drawn and developed from the primary research. Both approaches are demonstrably distinctive alternatives to community schools and schools without any formal links to religious organisations. The religious passing approach in particular can be a distinctive alternative where the school's faith identity is not a special extra but a constitutive characteristic which pervades its philosophy of, and infrastructure for, educational mission, and the place and nature of ethos, values, character and spirituality in the school. This I believe is generally reflective of the educational mission of the Roman Catholic Church which serves first and foremost pupils who share or support the Roman Catholic faith. The religious engaging approach alternatively, can straddle at once both of the Church of England's dual 'domestic' and 'general' functions (Francis and Lankshear, 1993; Francis 2000). Though the distinctiveness of the engaging approach is not as overtly denominational as the religious passing approach, the approach offers more characteristics of faith-based education than community schools and serves the educational needs of the community (principally the local, rather than worshipping community), but within a religious ethos underpinned by the beliefs and values of the school's faith tradition, and which give impetus to the school's mission.

In practice all three sampled schools shared many of the same broad aims of offering a distinctive religious ethos, character and identity within which predominantly common educational aims were pursued and the personal, moral and also spiritual development of students could be encouraged; most visibly embedded in the school's daily routines and collective activities. The difference between the engaging and passing approach was therefore essentially a question of emphasis or different strength of different fibres. The next two

chapters further consider the desirability of the engaging and passing approach, and their educational environments and aims from the perspective of cohesion.

Chapter 6

Engagement, Passing and the Problematization of 'Restricted Non-Common Educational Environments'

6.1 Introduction

This chapter continues to develop and expand upon my concepts of the 'religious engaging' and the 'religious passing approach' to education, as drawn and developed from the primary research conducted in three English secondary schools. This chapter considers these different approaches more specifically in the context of the concerns bound to the 'restricted non-common educational environments' of autonomous schools with a religious character as discussed in Chapter 2. The engaging approach will entail either having an open admissions policy, or may at most reserve a significant minority of places for children from families of the school's faith tradition as All Saints did. Accepting that greater cultural and religious diversity in schools should be preferred and encouraged, it would appear at surface level at least, that All Saints' educational environment is more functional for cohesion than either St Anthony's or Sacred Hearts', both of which had faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria. This I believe is a key fiber for the passing approach, and all passing schools would be therefore, like St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, voluntary aided or otherwise another type of school which was its own admissions authority; existing as they do to primarily serve, and pass on the faith and morality taught by the school's religious tradition to children from families from that tradition. The passing approach therefore entails faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria and the explicit emphasis of the school on passing on the school's faith tradition will result in a further strong element of self-selection. Parents who send their children to a 'passing' school will either support or at least accept the religious emphasis of the school, and parents who were unsympathetic would be considered unlikely to apply. This was understood by the schools themselves;

'well, if you were a committed atheist I think you would be stupid to send your child to a faith school…. I think if you really did have a huge problem with it I would… really kind of wonder why you would send your child to a faith school' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart)

The admissions policies of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart can therefore serve as a criterion of exclusion whilst the schools are popular and oversubscribed. This implicates the schools, and the passing approach more generally, in the concerns discussed in Chapter 2 around the educational environments of autonomous schools with a religious character disserving opportunities for people from different communities and different faiths to mix together. In the words of social capital, the 'restricted educational environments' of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart may embody strong bonding capital but exhibit very little bridging capital. This could then exacerbate exclusionary practices, particularly when faith-based separation combines with cultural separation to maintain race and ethnic barriers (Portes and Landolt, 1996). Such a separation by extension is then understood to have implications for the cultivation of values understood to be essential to cohesion in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies, such as mutual tolerance and respect for other peoples' beliefs and cultures, as Bauman and Romain admonish (see Chapter 2).

This chapter is divided into two halves. The first half discusses the primary research conducted in the three sampled schools in the context of the inherent difficulties in defending the problematization of 'restricted educational environments', as discussed in Chapter 2. Firstly, that one need not accept that ignorance must necessarily be the outcome of an absence of direct contact; and secondly, that focusing upon just one dimension of diversity, a school's religious diversity, will not capture the full picture of bridging social capital in a school. As noted on p.98 however, the results and analysis of the primary research cannot be generalised in any statistical sense, and no categorical truths about the educational environments of passing schools, in terms of ethnic and faith composition, can be offered here (see also p.50). Nonetheless, the second half of the chapter gives a symbiosis of further analysis and insight from the primary data together with further review of, and additional insight gained from, additional secondary philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research. This is to highlight two further points which the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' either deemphasizes or misses completely. Firstly, that both bonding capital and bridging social capital can bestow benefits upon its members, and

the relationship between the two is not zero-sum (both of which are points which Putnam himself makes, as shown in Chapter 2); and secondly, that the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' masks that 'religious homogeneity' is not so easily defined and measured.

This chapter therefore draws upon the primary data collected in the three sampled schools, and uses extracts from staff interviews and the student focus group to show how staff and students in each perceived their school's environment; these extracts however are anchored in further elucidation of the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' and those themes as discussed in Chapter 2, social capital and (direct) contact. In this way the empirical research continues to serve as a starting point for further discussion of, and elaboration upon, my evolving typology of the different faith-based approaches of autonomous schools with a religious character and the implications of their educational environments for cohesion. Results from analysis of the 2012 School Census and 2011 National Census are also discussed, together with results from the survey of final year students to gain further insight into how the educational environments of their schools might be restricting their students' peer groups. The chapter concludes that it is not so unproblematically clear that the educational environment of the passing approach will be necessarily less functional for cohesion than the engaging approach, or indeed the educational environment of a 'common' school.

6.2 Direct Contact

In continuing to follow the structure of the problematization of 'restricted educational environments', as conceptualized in Chapter 2, I wish in this section to further consider 'contact', that is, direct physical contact between people who experience each other in some significant sense as 'different'. This section draws from the primary research conducted in the three sampled schools and analysis of the 2011 National and 2012 School census to (re)highlight firstly, why for many the educational environment of the engaging approach will seem compellingly more functional for cohesion than the educational environment of the passing approach; and secondly, how focusing upon just one dimension of diversity, a school's religious diversity, will not capture the full picture of bridging social capital in a school. Simply put, despite the deceptively simple form of characterising autonomous schools with a religious character as a 'Putmanesque problematization of excessive bonding social capital in a context of insufficient bridging social capital', this belies how much harder

it is in practice to qualify and sustain such a characterization.

6.2.1 Engaging, Passing and Direct Contact

When critics argue that schools with a religious character separate children by religion, which could also mean separation by ethnicity, they have in mind specifically those schools with a religious character which are their own admissions authority (Jackson, 2003, Pring, 2005), and being its own admissions authority was key to both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart's passing approach and their passing on the religious beliefs of the school's religious tradition to members of that tradition. The passing approach, as I have said previously, will I believe share a primary degree of raison d'être with all Roman Catholic schools, which after the 1944 Education Act developed a distinctive system of denominational schools to serve the needs of their religious communities. The mission of the Roman Catholic Church was praised by the Assistant Head teacher at Sacred Herat;

> *…it is my opinion… over the past 100 plus years, faith based education, from my perspective Catholic, but also the industrial revolution evangelisation churches based in urban areas of deprivation, in England has done more to promote community cohesion than anything else, and also championed inclusivity and aspiration...*

The difficulty and controversy in setting admissions however, was discussed in conversation with the passing school's DDE:

> '*The governing body of the catholic school, who are the admissions authority and they are allowed in law to give priority to catholic children, and so, therefore, the places in that school first of all... first priority looks after catholic children, second priority baptised catholic children; and for the schools that are oversubscribed with Catholics, this often gets into the public domain, so this is really difficult, you know, who's going to define what sort of level of practice puts you further up the list... and then, when you come to other applicants for catholic schools the next priority will be people from other Christian faiths, and then how do you define that practice and then other faiths, other world faiths, and then anybody else who happens to be there, so all those things have to be thought about really carefully… But in some of our very oversubscribed schools with very complex, different criteria for oversubscription… it gets very, very difficult.*'

As admissions prioritise children from families of the faith of the school's sponsor, theoretically at least, this could lead to 100% of the school's enrolment being children from just such families; though in practise one may uncontroversially suppose that in many cases a passing approach will still entail admitting pupils from other faiths and none. Conversely, the engaging approach emphasizes inclusivity and service to the school's local neighbourhood. The difference in emphasis was touched upon in discussion with All Saints' DDE;

'So I think it's again back to the inclusivity of Church of England schools, we serve a community regardless of their background. Now a sweeping statement, of course, Catholic schools teach the Catholic faith, if you can find me a Church of England school that teaches the 39 articles of religion and the doctrine of the book of common prayer... ummm well, I might be prepared to write you a large cheque for that.... our attitude is very much we take those who live nearest to the school, and it's not about teaching the faith. Church of England schools are not about maintaining the Church of England's future; they are about educating young people to the best of our ability.

The engaging approach ideally only reserves a portion of its places for children from families of the school's religious tradition, as All Saints did. This was key to All Saint's invitation to engage with the faith of the school's religious tradition, since that invitation was one which was made to children and families (who were not from the faith of the school's tradition) to engage not just through the prayer and worship, and the curriculum at the school, but also ideally through mixing with a core of students who were from families of the school's religious tradition. This was succinctly expressed by the school's Chaplain;

'I think it's good to have the split… because you've got students here who, who do have some understanding and I think for me there's… let me think… there is a missionary based aspect to what you're doing… you want to be, you want to be showing those of non-faith the positives, you know, of having faith, as well as giving them something that's hopefully better than they, you know, than they could get from a community school. But students are as much a part of that mission, so Christian students are as much a part of that mission as any staff member might be, and I think they are probably in a better place almost to be doing that. So it's more a case of the adults supporting and helping students to do that, cos it will be by other students saying 'I'll prey for you', or inviting them to Church or Christian union or something, you know… that's a

much better way of students coming to know more about things as well, you know, for making decisions, they can see in practice how it works for somebody else of their own age.

A fundamental difference between the engaging approach and passing approach to educational environments therefore, is that a religious engagement school, like All Saints, may often find itself turning away children from families of the school's religious tradition in order to prioritise children of another or no faith, or as the school principal expressed it to me, to prioritise '*the kid across the road*'. The passing approach however would rarely if ever consider this.

Should the educational environment of All Saints therefore be considered to be more functional for Amin's 'micro-publics', which as discussed on pp.37-38 are sites wherein the micro-politics of everyday social contact and encounter benefit cohesion by extending opportunities for young people to meet others whom they experience in some important way as being different from themselves. In particular, should the engaging approach be seen as more functional for bringing people of different faiths (though mainly from the school's faith tradition) and people of no faith, together? This was certainly how the staff interviewees at All Saints saw the school's educational environment, and they expressed their own conceptualization of the problematization of 'restricted educational environments';

'*I do think you should have a mixture in there, I don't think it should be all one because then you're just making it very isolated, and it's them and us and it shouldn't be them and us; that we have all Catholics or you have all Christians, Church of England Christians, or you have all Muslims or you have all Jewish people. I think that's when it becomes very dangerous because how do you show the tolerance?*' (Citizenship and PSHE teacher, All Saints)

'*It's all well teaching it, but you think you've got to practise it?*' (BC)

'*Yeah, I think you've gotta practise it, I think you've gotta show it. I know that I've got one year seven and he's a Muslim and my, my rule is, is that when we do the prayer, I say whether you're of a different faith or you have no faith at all, can we just be quiet and show the respect for the people that are of the faith and that's what they do, just showing respect*' (Citizenship and PSHE teacher, All Saints)

These may seem clear waters and intuitively convincing reasoning; however, as discussed in Chapter 2 the compulsion of this reasoning belies the fragility of the assumptions upon which they proceed from. Firstly, that despite the deceptively simple form in which the 'contact hypothesis' is presented, a persistent pattern in research has been partial and ambiguous findings (Vogt, 1997; see also Chapter 2); and secondly, that direct contact is not the only means through which one may be, or seek to be, exposed to and engaging towards the fact of society's diversity. Consistent with the objections to the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' raised in Chapter 2, the students at the two religious passing schools were highly dismissive of Romain's concerns that ignorance, and by extension prejudice, were inevitable in the absence of direct contact. Students at both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart did not believe that direct contact was necessary to foster respect for people of different faiths, though discussions in both schools did indeed emphasise the importance of being taught about different faiths;

> '*No... I don't think you necessarily have to meet them* (people of different faiths), *but you do certainly have to know what they believe and you do certainly have to respect what they believe*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

> '*Yeah, I mean I know for GCSE RE they've, the RE department, specifically chosen to do the Islamic faith because they know that people, they've had a bad press, they've had, you know, with 9/11 and all the things like that. They've specifically chosen to do that so they can teach us about their religion so we're not fearful of them, or don't think of them as, you know, as different people*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

> '*Even if we came across someone with a different religion we've sort of been learning about it in school, about different religions, so it wouldn't be entirely new to us....*' (Paul, St Anthony's).

Generally, the students' comments are consistent with the point made in Chapter 2 (see pp.43-44) which emphasized the value of academic teaching in schools developing appreciative and positive images of others. This emphasizes that schools should therefore provide pupils with information about different religious traditions, worldviews and cultures, and also offer opportunities to develop a sense of understanding and appreciation of these; this is discussed further in Chapter 7. Nonetheless, for now I wish to emphasise that to show

that direct contact between people who experience each other in some significant sense as 'different' is not necessary, this would not be to show that it is necessarily undesirable, nor do I believe this to be the case. In the focus group at Sacred Heart the students were in fact very open towards and positive about the benefits to understanding and mutual respect from direct encounters and dialogue with people of different faiths. Furthermore, they expressed '*the idea of a symbiotic relationship and reciprocity in the meeting of faiths*' (Donlevy 2008, p.165), with each participant gaining in perspective and sense of self from such dialogical encounters;

> '*I think... it's a good experience for you to meet somebody of a different faith and have a talk with them...* (Hayley, Sacred Heart)

> '*Yeah, you kind of learn, you learn from other peoples' experiences, from other peoples' views, so I think that does kind of fully help you build your personality and your faith and what you feel you believe*' (Richard, Sacred Heart)

> '*I think only once you've learnt about other religions and spoke to people from other religions you can only fully understand your religion and whether, whether you actually do agree with that, or whether you've just kind of been brought up that way*' (Gareth, Sacred Heart).

This echoes the student comments from research carried out in Roman Catholic schools in Canada by Donlevy (see also p.55):

> '*You feed off each other, and if all your feeding [is from the] people...who are the same as you, that is good, but it can only offer you so much. But when you have people with different views – different beliefs, it heightens yours and it brings them up at the same time so everyone just grows...maybe not in the same direction of growth but you will grow to a better understanding and more mature life*' (2003).

These comments are significant for two reasons. Firstly, it's important to note here as a prelude to further discussion below and in the next chapter regarding the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims', that the student comments did not show any signs of 'particularised trust' or the 'dark side' of communities, or that the school was encouraging

religious understandings which required a strong boundary from 'the other' (as implicated in the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims'). Secondly however, it still shows that the more religiously homogenous a school is, we might consider it to be disserving the diverse stimuli to which students are exposed to and the possibilities for deliberation and reflection with living representatives of, and advocates for, alternative religions or world views. In this regard then, St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, and the passing approach more generally, may (potentially) disserve their students' personal and spiritual development and exploration, and by extension become implicated in the concerns of Bauman and Romain (see Chapter 2). Nonetheless, as discussed in Chapter 2, autonomous schools with a religious character, notwithstanding the faith based oversubscription admissions criteria, may still draw their pupils from a variety of cultural backgrounds and in fact have a greater ethnic mix than local authority schools (see p.48). Focusing upon just one dimension of diversity therefore, such as a school's religious diversity, will not capture the full picture of bridging social capital in a school. Analysis of the primary data is consistent with this point as shown in the following two sections.

6.2.3 Bridging Social Capital

The potential for inter-ethnic diversity in any school will depend upon geographic context, though potentially less so for the passing approach to educational environments, as like St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, passing schools will be able to draw their intake from a wider surrounding area than schools which are not their own admissions authorities. For the present purposes it is important to note that any form of ethnic segregation would not be intrinsic to the concept of the religious passing approach, or indeed the engaging approach, and interviewees in all three schools emphasised their school's ethnic, linguistic and socio-economic diversity, particularly at Sacred Heart which had a larger student population than the other two schools;

> '*We've got twenty-eight different languages spoken here... we've got a very diverse student number... I think the perception of lots of people is that, you know, faith schools in this part of the world are, you know, just sought of middle class kind of ivory towers... we've got people that have, you know, that are immigrants that have come over here, they've made their home* (here)... *We've got people from different social backgrounds, got people from really, really poor backgrounds to sort of very*

comfortable, so I think we are quite a diverse school and I think the criticism that is always made of faith schools wrongly is that we, you know, we're just kind of privileged, kind of elitist, kind of, you know, sort of pseudo-public schools for the middle classes, which I think is complete nonsense really and I think as a school we wouldn't want any of that anyway because again that commitment to, you know, community, faith. I just think, and I think a lot of people, you know, especially when faith schools become academies, is they become increasingly cynical of that move, they perceive it as being one whereby faith schools can then, you know, cream off the best students, I think that's complete nonsense really, I think for us as a school we wouldn't have anything to do with that. Umm, so yeah I think we're an incredibly diverse school, just as diverse as any other school in our federation in fact' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

Alluded to above is the phenomenon of 'cream skimming' of more 'desirable' pupils, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see p.49). As shown in Chapter 2 however, there remains a poverty of research into the complex causal relationships between choices made by parents, a schools admissions criterion, and the offers it makes; and thus far the research paints an incomplete picture. However, as suggested in Chapter 2, where there is freedom of choice, parents from more privileged backgrounds may go to extraordinary lengths to secure what they consider to be the best education for their children; and will also likely have more resources at their disposal to do so. If schools with a religious character are perceived to be high performing, then they will likely do all that they can to get their children accepted by such schools. This was acknowledged by the Head of PDC at Sacred Heart;

'we're all aware of the fact that sometimes it's pushed perhaps too heavily, that, you know, parents turn up at church and get the priest to sign it so they can get their kids in to a good school but I don't think that's really the case here'.

Some indication of parents from more privileged backgrounds being better placed than others to influence the religious-based admissions criteria was seen in the comments from Peter in the focus group at All Saints. Peter had earlier emphasised how he had turned down the opportunity to attend a local grammar school in order to attend All Saints. Coming to All Saints had been helped however by his attending Church, something which he had not done before;

'like to get into this school, like I didn't use to go to church, but to get into the school I had to go to church, well it was good for me to go to church because I really, really, really wanted to come here' (Peter, All Saints)

So long as schools are allowed to collect additional information from parents and religious leaders (for instance from supplementary information forms to gain some measure of religious adherence), this will for some inherently mean a way by which schools may still socially select pupils, and a system which is not so transparent so as to remove all doubt (Crace, 2006). The seriousness with which the issue was taken by the diocese was emphasised by the Roman Catholic DDE;

*'...a lot of governing bodies, take account of other things that families do, for example, they might, parents might help as catechists in the Parish, they might be Eucharist ministers, they might serve on a, on a Parish committee, and, and Priests particularly have to be quite careful about this because there may be some families who can't get to Mass every Sunday, either because their a single parent family, or they've dependent elderly relatives, or they work... they work shifts and they happen be on Sundays. So all those things have to be taken into account so that we don't disadvantage people. And this is a very, **very** hot potato... it has to be looked at very, very carefully to **not** be discriminatory, socially discriminatory, and to be inclusive as we would want our schools to be'* (DDE's emphasis).

In some areas and demographic contexts, a religious passing approach may still potentially also (unintentionally) offer opportunities for 'white flight' and parents to avoid their children mixing with members of ethnic minority groups (see pp.48-49; see also Bunting, 2008). Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart used SIFs, and this is an area where the need for further research is clear. However, without school level school information about applications to schools and offers received by parents and their characteristics, no conclusive link can as yet be made between any faith-based approach to education and school composition (see also p.50). Here the research is limited to emphasizing again that any form of socio-economic or ethnic filtering would not be intrinsic to the concept of either the religious passing approach, or indeed the engaging approach, and where any such filtering existed it would be incidental. This was emphasised too by interviews in both passing schools when asked whether they had any concerns over the intake of the school becoming socially-selective as a result of the

market economy in education, and its emphasis on the more measurable outcomes of education;

'Ethically we wouldn't do it... ethically we would never want to do that, that's certainly not what we're about as a school. I think we, we serve the community that we're, that we're in, you know, umm, and I think, you know, there's no way legally, you know, because of the transparency that we have in schools, rightly have... I just don't think it's a possibility really. Even if it's the perception, I don't think it's a possibility' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'*...that* (social selection) *would go against why the people... built the school, and they built the school first and then the church, which kind of tells you a lot I suppose'* (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

'They (other schools) *seem to think that, because it's a Catholic school, we're kind of a Grammar, that we are selective with the children who we take in and that you're bound to do well, which is <u>not</u>, <u>not</u> the case <u>at all</u>* (his emphasis, Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

Generally, interviewees at All Saints were less enthusiastic about the school's ethnic and linguistic diversity, though this was related to the school's geographic context rather than the engaging approach to educational environments and the mission of the school; which was to serve the educational needs of the local, mostly white, community from the 'lower aspirational end' of the schools surrounding area';

'*... I think yeah, and you do, you do get that* (insularity) *with coastal towns I think, but… we've got quite a surprising amount of, of different individuals, obviously not as many as you would get in you know, Southampton or somewhere. But umm, but certainly we've got you know, we've got a reasonable amount of Muslim children, we've got, I know we've got a few, quite a small amount of Buddhists, whose parents are practising Buddhists, couple of Hindus, so we've got a diverse, it is quite diverse. I think probably the biggest, the biggest contingent is probably atheistic really, or perhaps I'm doing them a disservice, maybe agnostic is a better description, umm and obviously we've got quite a large significant number of students whose parents are*

practising Christians… (Head Religious Education, All Saints).

'*There's not a huge social mix* (in the surrounding area)*… it is pretty white, although we, we do have a higher than average mix of ethnic groups in the school which includes, you know, a number of white Europeans, particularly Polish and also Portuguese, Portuguese speakers who are Brazilian… we were attractive to them because numbers of those Brazilian and Polish students were Catholic but couldn't get into the Catholic school, but came into the church school which was us, so we do have a slightly higher proportion of ethnic groups, but that's growing out as the school is full in years seven, eight, nine and now ten, that when those kind of students arrive… and they're looking for places to go, we're full, so they'll be going to other schools and they'd be very welcomed if we had spaces but we just don't have the spaces anymore*' (Principal, All Saints).

6.2.4 Statistical Data Analysis

Analysis of the student survey, 2012 School census and 2011 National Census was consistent with the interviewee comments above. Analysis of the 2012 schools census shows in fact that those legal categories of Roman Catholic and Church of England Schools which may control their own admissions are on average more culturally and linguistically diverse than those schools which have an open admissions policy (See Appendix G for full tables and charts). Similarly, analysis showed that that there was no issue of the passing school's faith-based oversubscription criteria acting to create monocultural schools. Both schools in fact had a higher degree of ethnic and linguistic diversity than the local authority secondary school average, or than the school's surrounding area (for tables and charts see Appendix B). Similarly, All Saints also generally had a higher degree of ethnic and linguistic diversity than the school's surrounding area, though the school had a higher percentage of white British students than the local authority average. The 2011 census also showed that all three schools were in locations with little religious diversity in the surrounding area, with people who self-identified as either Christian or as not having a religion making up around 90% of all usual residents (see Appendix B). Though this may present a misleadingly heterogeneous picture, and children at all three schools may still consider friendships with Christian denominations other than their own as counting as friendships with people of a different religion. Figures for different Christian denominations in the surrounding area are not available however.

A point often raised in response to the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' is that it wholly ignores that a pupil's social life is not restricted to school or school classmates, and students may make friends via a host of additional settings which are both unrelated to school and can satisfy Allport's optimal conditions for positive intergroup contact (see pp.36-37).This very point was in fact raised by a student in the focus group at St. Anthony's; '*not everyone's social life is restricted to in-school*' (Karen, St. Anthony's). In the student questionnaire a sample of Year 11 (approximately 50% St. Anthony's, 50% All Saints, 70% Sacred Heart) were asked what proportion of their friends were the same religious group as they were. Analysis of the results did not show that attendance at their school meant that the students did not have inter-religious friendships, though some preference for friends from the same religion was seen. A chi-square test was performed to compare the answers from St Antony's and Sacred Heart to the answers from 16 year olds nationally in the 2010/2011 Citizenship Survey (formerly known as the Home Office Citizenship Survey). Chi-Square tests can show whether there is a (statistically) significant relationship between two categorical variables (in the present case, which school or survey respondents are from, and their inter-religious friendships) by calculating the statistically expected results, and comparing them to the actual results. By further calculating the 'adjusted residuals', the test can also show which individual results are significantly less or more than the expected results (for a further, highly reader-friendly introduction to Chi-Square tests, see Diamond and Jefferies, 2006).

The Chi-Square test found that there was a statistical association between the proportion of friends which were the same religious group and which school/survey respondents were from. The test showed however, that fewer than expected respondents from both St Anthony's and All Saints had friends who were all the same religious group; the adjusted residuals showed this was significantly the case at All Saints (perhaps tentatively showing a somewhat greater degree of inter-religious friendships due to the school's broader mix). Slightly more than expected respondents from Sacred Heart had friends which were all the same religious group, but not significantly so however. Some further preference for friends from the same religious group was seen at St Anthony's too, where significantly more than expected respondents had friends more than half of which were the same religious group. The survey results were also compared to regional results from 16 year olds from the 2007/2008, 2008/2009, 2009/2010, 2010/2011 (previous Citizenships surveys were included in order to increase the sample size). A chi-square test this time found no association

between the results from the two passing schools and the results from 16 years olds in the Southeast of England. An association was seen between the respondents from All Saints and the respondents from 16 year olds in the southwest of England however. Generally respondents from All Saints had more inter-religious friends than their regional peers. However, even when including 16 year old respondents from 4 previous citizenship surveys the sample size from the national surveys was still small (South West n=44, Southeast n=20), which makes these findings again highly provisional (for full tables and charts see Appendix H).

In the student questionnaire students were also asked what proportion of their friends were the same ethnic group as they were. The results were again compared to the national results from 16 years olds from 2010/2011 Citizenship survey, and to the regional results from 16 year olds from the 2007/2008, 2008/2009, 2009/2010, 2010/2011 (in order to increase the sample size). Post analysis showed little indication that students in each of the two passing schools were developing fewer inter-ethnic friendships than their peers nationally or regionally; students from All Saints however had fewer inter-ethnic friends than their national peers, though importantly more than their regional peers. A chi-square test found that there was a statistical association between which school or survey respondents were from, and their inter-ethnic friendships. The results showed however that less than expected respondents from both Sacred Heart and St. Anthony's had friends which were all the same ethnic group, in comparison to their peers nationally; the adjusted residuals showed that this was significantly the case for St Anthony's (see Appendix I). Significantly more than expected respondents from All Saints had friends which were all the same ethnic group however. The regional results largely repeated the patterns for the two passing schools, though in the case of All Saints, school respondents were developing more inter-ethnic friendships than their peers regionally (for full tables and charts see Appendix I).

Some anecdotal evidence for there being an optimum amount of religious heterogeneity, and that in a school with near equal numbers of two or more faith groups, children (active intervention notwithstanding) might well segregate themselves into subgroups within the school (see also pp.45-46), can be seen reflected in further analysis of the student questionnaire and the final question which asked respondents for their feelings towards different religious groups from 0 ('Very cold') to 100 ('Very warm'). Respondents were asked to rate the following groups; Muslim; Protestant (including Church of England, Church of Scotland, Anglican, Methodist and others); Catholic; Buddhist; Jewish; Deeply

Religious; Not Religious. Standard deviations and interquartile ranges were calculated for each individual as a proxy of ingroup/outgroup bias, the smaller the amount of variation being interpreted as a smaller amount of ingroup bias. A series of 'bias' scores were also calculated for each respondent by comparing the score which a respondent gave for an individual group (for example, Catholic), to the mean of the scores given for the other groups. The results from the sampled schools were then compared to the responses from 16-21 year olds from a 2008 British Social Attitudes Survey which asked the same questions.

A One-way ANOVA test (similar in concept to a Chi-Square test, though performed when comparing means instead of counts) was performed to investigate whether there was a statistical association between ingroup/outgroup bias and which school/survey respondents were from. No association was in fact found between the standard deviation or interquartile range mean scores and which school/survey respondents were from. The largest score however was recorded at All Saints on both the standard deviation and interquartile range measure. Within the group of schools however, All Saints' standard deviation score was significantly higher than St Anthony's score. St Anthony's also recorded the lowest ingroup/outgroup bias score overall on both measures. Unsurprisingly, some preference or generally warmer feelings towards Roman Catholics was seen at both of the passing schools. The bias scores for Roman Catholics in Sacred Heart was 12.87 and St Anthony's 11.57; these scores rose slightly when restricting analysis to respondents who self-identified as Christians for both Sacred Heart (15.04) and for St Anthony's (13.25). When the analysis was restricted further to those respondents who self-identified as actively practising, the score for Sacred Heart increased again slightly (15.49) but lowered slightly for St Anthony's (12.28). The largest positive bias score was seen in All Saints however for 'people who were not religious' (15.42), this score rose to 28.62 when restricting analysis to respondents at All Saints who self-identified as not having a religion.

Respondents from All Saints also felt less warm towards Protestants than all other respondents, significantly so compared to the BSA respondents and Sacred Heart. All Saints was also the only school/survey which gave a negative bias score to the group. This is perhaps surprising given that All Saints is a Church of England school. Given too the large bias scores for people who are not religious, this would not be indicative of the school's near equal split between Children from Christian families and local children encouraging more mixing and more positive feelings, but perhaps might tentatively be consistent with students in the main self-segregating and generally keeping to within their religious/nonreligious

ingroup (for full tables and charts see Appendix J)

6.3 Engaging, Passing and Bonding Social Capital

Thus far this chapter has discussed the problematization of 'restricted educational environments', as conceptualised in Chapter 2, in the context of analysis of the primary data. The chapter has begun by acknowledging that the religious passing approach to educational environments will be implicated in the concerns discussed in Chapter 2 around the educational environments of autonomous schools with a religious character disserving opportunities for people from different communities and different faiths to mix together. However, consistent with the problems inherent in defending the problematization of 'restricted educational environments', the chapter has shown how the students themselves did not feel that direct contact was necessary to foster respect for people of different faiths; and secondly has shown that, notwithstanding the faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria, both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart still drew their pupils from a variety of cultural, ethnic, socio-economic and linguistic backgrounds. This 'diversity', which according to O'Reilly is any difference between individuals on any attribute which may lead to the perception that another person is different from the self (1998, cited in Bertram-Troost, 2011), may place further 'bridging' demands upon pupils and be a context in which the skills, understandings and qualities required for bridging can be absorbed and practised (Furbey et al, 2006; see also Furbey, 2008). Despite primarily existing to serve, and pass on the faith of the school's religious tradition to children from families of the faith of the school's sponsor, the passing approach can therefore still provide important social spaces where pupils experience diverse contexts of learning and practice for building bridging social capital.

Critics may however still wish to emphasise that the passing approach may still entail 'too much <u>religious</u> bonding social capital, in a context of too little <u>religious</u> bridging social capital' more specifically. This brings the chapter to its second part where I wish present a symbiosis of further analysis and insight from the primary data together with further review of, and insight gained from, additional secondary philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research. This is done to raise two further points which I believe that the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' either misses completely or deemphasizes. Firstly, religious homogeneity is in fact far harder to qualify than at first it might seem; and secondly, that bonding social capital can also bestow benefits upon its members, and that the relationship between bonding and bridging is not zero-sum.

6.3.1 Religious Diversity

In this section I wish to highlight how (though further insight is needed into the impact of religious diversity in education on the development of young people) religious diversity is in fact hard to qualify. I believe that that is something which the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' completely misses. As Bertram-Troost comments; an important question is in whose eyes is there religious diversity or not at a school; '*it could very well be the case that a school which is labelled by researchers as being without religious diversity is described by the pupils themselves as a school where religious diversity is present*' (2011, p.275). Often an understanding of 'religious diversity' is limited to an institutional level, i.e. 'Catholic', 'Anglican', 'Muslim', 'Hindu', 'Sikh' and so forth, with little or no attention paid to the 'religious diversity' which may exist within a 'single faith' (Bertram-Troost, 2011). Religion is inherently diverse with fluid boundaries in terms of religious expression and cultural manifestation (Jackson and Nesbitt 1993; cited in Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005). Debate and differences of opinion, and also understandings on many theological and doctrinal points, characterise the major religions of the world. Each has within it different ways of relating to and living its traditions and identity, and can therefore '*sow the seeds of both the conflictual and the dialogical*' (Levin 2005, p.139; see also Jackson, 1997).

In whose eyes is there religious diversity or not at a school is especially pertinent if, as Bruce comments, the way people who still strongly associate with organised religion has shifted from being 'loyal followers', to 'selective consumers'; '*they choose which God to believe in and in what manner… individual consumers chart their own paths of preference*' and are the final arbiters of truth and utility (pp.37-42, 2006). This refers to what Bruce and Schweitzer term 'individualised religion'. According to Schweitzer individualised religion is characterised by a distinction between one's own faith and the faith maintained and taught by religious institutions, and also a conviction that everyone has the right to choose their own faith and no-one is allowed to interfere with such choices; '*consequently, the choices wished for by them do not equate with aggressive marketing of religion and certainly do not correspond to attempts to proselytize them*' (2007, p.92; also see Schweitzer and Boschki, 2004). Similarly, as Vermeer comments, '*present-day society is individualistic and pluralistic! People no longer just accept traditional roles or abide by traditional norms but look for a lifestyle of their own*' (2010, p.204).

Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart prioritised Baptised Catholic children, and though

both St Antony's and Sacred Heart had a student population which was just over 70% Roman Catholic, both the student focus groups felt that their school had a diverse population and that this was something they welcomed. Neither focus group felt that the school's faith-based oversubscription criteria served as a criterion of prejudice in the school, rather, difference was accepted and allowed to flourish in a respectful social atmosphere (Donlevy, 2008):

'I think that like a good thing about (our) *school* (is) *that we welcome difference so that it's a skill that we can bring out to the world when we finish here...'* (Nathan, St Anthony's).

'yeah, umm, you just like learn to experience like learning life with different people from different faiths so like, it's like, just learning to live with other people without like being judged on it or anything' (Paul, St Anthony's).

'...like everyone can get involved in things, it's like no one will stop you because of your faith or any other reason' (Paul, St Antony's).

'like umm, loads of people from other faiths can come to this school even though it's a Catholic school' (Nathan, St Anthony's).

Are there many people of different faiths here? (BC)

'Yeah, I know one of my friends I know is in year eight I think, she's a Muslim and I know there are other people who are not Catholics but are other types of Christian, new life Christian, Anglicans, Baptists, umm, yeah there doesn't seem to be much of a problem between them, we all, we all work together' (Sophie, Sacred Heart).

'Yeah, we have quite a wide variety of kind of different faiths and religions' (Richard, Sacred Heart).

'If it comes up in a class then people will like say I'm this religion, they'll kind of say their views on it but then I think it just helps other people like to further understand their religion, like just the stuff you don't get out of textbooks, you actually first hand get to experience this with like your peers' (Richard, Sacred Heart).

These sentiments were echoed by the Head of PDC at Sacred Heart;

'I think that the way that we do religion here, if such a thing could be said, is in a very subtle, it's not in a kind of fire and brimstone kind of, you know… we kind of view ourselves as a Christian school, we're a catholic school very obviously, but I don't think as, you know, I don't think non-Catholics would feel that they weren't part of the furniture, that they were somehow isolated. You know, we've got two Muslim students here, which is hardly amazing, but, you know, I don't feel they feel out on a limb or kind of isolated as such.

Further insight is needed into the effects of religious diversity and its absence in schools and how meaningful interfaith contact in schools interacts with the religious diversity present there. In particular, further insight is needed into how 'religious diversity' should be defined in order to measure it, or the lack of it. Future research will need to take into account in particular to what degree and how young people themselves experience religious diversity at their school (Troost, 2011). What may appear therefore from the perspective of the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' to be a bonded community of shared religious belief and strong internal ties, may from the inside be a more complex picture where students are still exposed to a variety of religious views, forms of lived practise and dialogical contexts; and therefore experience many of the other members of the school as 'different' and the task of bridging and a commitment to reciprocity as both important and challenging (Furbey et al, 2006; MacMullen, 2007, see also Callan, 1997). In the following section I wish to raise a further point drawn from the primary data collected in the three sampled schools. Notwithstanding the difficulties alluded to above, there can in fact be benefits to the school community by having a greater degree of shared values and religious belief, that is, a greater degree of bonding social capital. This is something which I believe the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' deemphasizes.

6.3.2 Engagement, Passing and 'School Community'

The conceptualisation of the problematization of restricted educational environments, as discussed in Chapter 2, emphasizes the potential underside to strong communities, (see pp.38-39). This misses or deemphasizes firstly, how both bonding and bridging social capital can bestow benefits upon its members, and secondly, that the relationship between the two is

not zero-sum; both of which are points which Putnam himself makes. As a corrective to this problematizing and devaluing of a greater shared degree of belief and values, I wish in this final section to highlight a potential upside to a higher degree of bonding social capital drawn from staff and pupil comments; and further emphasise that this bonding need not be manifest or expressed in an exclusionary and closed way. A potential value of everyday interaction between more like-minded people expressed in a greater shared degree of belief and values can be a valuable form of community and communal attachments, which emphasise the quality of relationships and give (particularly when in a context of a school being as 'welcoming as possible', see p.109) people the confidence to 'bridge'. Simply put, by drawing upon both the primary data together with further review of, and insight gained from, additional literature and research, I wish to emphasize how a greater degree of shared faith identity and shared values within a school can give additional strength to the school's sense of community. This refers to what Toennies terms 'gemeinschaft' (2003), those ties and bonds of faith, common values and common traditions and customs which bind people together.

Community, as defined by Adrian Oldfield, is an idea less to do with formal organisation than it is '*with a sense of belonging and commitment. The commitment is to others who share interests, or positions, or purposes.... It is to seek the good of others at the same time as, and sometimes in neglect of, one's own good. It is to approach social relationships in an Aristotelian spirit of 'concord'. It is this that creates the sense of community*' (1990, p.173). Where faith-based oversubscription admissions criteria produce a greater shared degree of belief and values, I believe a benefit can be a greater degree of integrated community. Or, to put it another way, a greater sense of belonging and '*the communal dimensions that might unite people around a conception of what is good or worthwhile to pursue in life*' (Arthur 1999, p.8). The creation of a learning environment in which all pupils experience a sense of belonging, feel truly valued and are able to participate fully is important to any school, whether with or without a faith character. All three sampled schools however placed faith as a significant dimension of the life of their school community. The community of the three schools was therefore a worshiping faith community, where relationships were derived and inspired by the values and ideals of the school's religious tradition; and it was the faith base of the schools which distinguished being and belonging together in their school community, from being in a community school and schools of other faiths/denominations.

Prayer and worship were the most visible opportunities for both staff and pupils to become community-orientated. Similarly, themes chosen for assemblies and tutor/mentor time, and the ways in which the ethos and identity of the school permeated the taught curriculum (often in quite subtle ways) reinforced the distinctiveness of the schools' faith community. The engagement approach of All Saints, in keeping the majority of admissions open, and in particular in serving the educational needs of children from the 'lower aspirational end' of the schools surrounding area, provided a sense of community and cohesion within a faith context which many pupils would not have likely experienced elsewhere. This was a feeling expressed by several students in the student council focus group at All Saints;

'Yeah, there's definitely more community here, I mean my primary school that I went to wasn't a Christian school and here it feels a lot better cos there's more of a Christian aspect to it, umm, whereas my primary school didn't really show much of that, umm, but yeah, it feels really comforting here cos you can for people that come from different religions… who are non-Christians and might be Christians as well, umm, can come here and just share their feelings umm because it's not, its, I think we care for people here… more than say another school will, umm, yeah' (Peter, All Saints)

In the student focus group, students at All Saints also felt that the 40% of students from Christian families was key to the school community and the school being a 'Christian' school;

'I don't think it would work as well as a Christian school if there weren't as many Christians in the school, umm, yeah. Cos if you have a Christian school then, it's one thing saying you have a Christian school and then it's another one saying that, I have a Christian school but there are no Christians in the school, umm, so yeah, I think it does help to have a certain amount of umm people that believe the same thing, umm and that aspect of the school' (Michael, All Saints).

My hypothesis would be however, that ceteris paribus, these dynamics will more likely be stronger in a religious passing school like St Anthony's or Sacred Heart. The Roman Catholic DDE certainly felt that this, especially, was a feature of Roman Catholic schools, where the faith-base of the life of the school community was key to nurturing and sustaining quality and

excellence in personal relationships, where students felt cared about, and bonded to classmates, teachers, and the school. This is what Napapiet and Ghoshal term 'cognitive social capital' (1998, cited in Hepworth and Stitt, 2007; see also Goleman, 1996);

'...that sense of, of developing community, of friendship, and I think... I think when we look at the evidence of what it is Catholic schools do for the formation of children and young people, what the children tell us that they value afterwards, are... the friendships they've made... it's a particular feature of the schools... that they stay very strong friends into adult life and beyond for good times and bad times, and that friendships are the things that they remember, they remember teachers and other members of staff who cared about them, and they use that word care quite specifically, they talk about staff that cared, staff who cared about me, and who spent time with me and who were interested in me and who knew about me and took time to support me; and they say those sorts of things to us.'

The strength and importance of community was emphasised by interviews in both of the religious passing schools.

'...if we look, if we go back to our motto, community, I think we want them to value the concept, the idea of the community, to realise, you know, responsibility, you know. Obviously there's the individual, the individual matters greatly, but I think you know, coming back to this idea of that they are within a community, they have responsibility within that community and then they take that outside of the school when they go into the big bad world, that you know, they fit into a community, have an obligation to it... ultimately we're here to get good results but I think it's a lot more than that, it's about who they are, where they fit into a community, about fulfilling potential, you know, academic, non-academic, and I think being good Christians as well, you know, believing in the, you know, principles and the values of the Gospels really, and to act them out in their own lives and their interactions with others' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

In the focus groups the students were also positive about their school community and believed this was something which was fostered by the faith of the school and the greater degree of shared religious belief;

'*So you feel that there's more of a community here than perhaps in other schools?*' (BC).

Yeah I believe so, I think that's something, something that you <u>can</u> (her emphasis) *see throughout the school, you can see people working together, you can see teachers with students helping them... I think it is something that the Cath, the Catholic faith or the Christian faith has kind of brought our school more as a community and I think it, I'm not sure, but I think it would be different in another school, I don't think it would be so much of a community*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

'*…we're always reminded that we're like one community, so we all kind of try to get along, and we have like our whole school masses and assemblies so they try and like bring us together and make us a big community as often as possible…*' (Michael, Sacred Heart).

'*I wouldn't say it's* (faith) *really separating us it's more bringing us together because we know there are other faiths and other people that don't have a faith but we are the people that do, and then when we come together that makes our community, but that doesn't mean we're judgemental of other people's… it's just... so we can be together*' (Karen, St. Anthony's).

McGettrick's sixth characteristic of schools with a religious character (giving attention to the appointment of staff who are supportive of the particular faith of the school), may also be functional for the school community since the benefit to this, some may add, would be staff who are often already used to thinking in community terms and valuing the idea of community, and who carry through that communal emphasis and those values; rather than simply seeing the school as a set of bureaucratic structures (Portes and Landolt, 1996). Though it may be something of an open question as to how many of the staff in a religious passing school will be actively practising members of the school's faith tradition, it would seem intuitive to suppose that a core of staff, and in particular the leadership of the school will be; as was the case at both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart. In contrast, All Saints had a lesser expectation upon staff behaviour rather than belief (see p.107).

All this is to contrast the 'gemeinschaft' of the engaging and passing approach to educational environments (made possible by the school's greater degree of bonding capital)

with the challenge which community schools may face to create a similar form of community and communal attachments. In the early eighties, for instance, David Hargreaves described the challenge for comprehensive schools from the perspective of an inner-city school teacher; '*the school's not like it was. We used to be like a family, the old style working-class community. We didn't have to do anything special: we just drew on what was there in the home background. But it's not like that anymore. And there's not much we can do about it. How can you make a community in a school when there's no community out there?*' (1982, pp. 34-35). For Hargreaves phrases such as 'team spirit' and 'loyalty to the school' had declined in favour of a culture of individualism and moral relativism. Pupils who feel they belong in school and that their culture is being valued, as Parker-Jenkins et al comment however, '*are more likely to develop a sense of community and trust, and thereby to become active members*' (2005, p.142). My supposition would be therefore, that, ceteris paribus, a '*crucial communitarian element*' will more often be present in religious passing schools like St Anthony's and Sacred Heart than in community schools, or indeed perhaps in religious engagement schools too, like All Saints. That is, a sense of belonging, society and social cohesion due to '*the common experience of history, belief and purpose, experienced in the present*' (Donlevy 2008, p.167).

A wider relevant point is whether there is strength in faith communities which has better weathered the adverse consequences of a rising culture of individualism and waning in supports from community and extended family (Seligman, 1991; cited in Goleman, 1996). In <u>Bowling Alone</u> Putnam identified faith communities as having significant stocks of social capital, being both socially rooted and based on shared values (see also Furbey et al, 2006; Furbey, 2008). Research on the contribution and impact of faith-based groups and organisations on contemporary society has also found that there is a vast amount of faith-based voluntary and community action which '*may be reasonably seen as contributing implicitly to social and community cohesion*' (Furbey 2008, p.125; see also Cairns et al; Farnell et al. 2003; Gweini, 2008; London Churches Group, 2002; Lovatt et al, 2005; Smith, G, 2001; Smith, K. 2004; NWDA, 2003, 2005; see also Billings, 2009; Billings and Holden, 2008). We may therefore put forward the further supposition that this communitarian element will further draw strength from '*the social capital of being embedded in strong functional communities represented by church and parish agencies*' (Grace 2002, p.91). The religious passing approach may therefore gain in social capital due to their greater degree of shared networks of mutuality and extended community support networks outside of school. Put more

simply, parents, pupils and teachers may simply be '*better connected to each other outside of school and this sense of community*' may aide '*learning and good behaviour*' (West, E. 2010; see also Coleman and Hoffer, 1987; Bryk et al., 1993; Walsh, 2000). The functional benefit of the 40% of pupils drawn from Christian families was emphasised for instance by the School Chaplain at All Saints:

> '*…it's good to have the support of the parents in what you're trying to do, you know, they're very supportive… and it's an encouragement as well really to keep going, that you're doing the right thing and they want more of it if anything*'.

My supposition would again be however that a religious passing school, ceteris paribus, will gain still further from a larger amount of extensive and embedded networks, and it seems intuitive to conclude that they would. Interviewees in both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart felt their school benefited from strong functional links between homes, school and parish, particularly at Sacred Heart;

> '*We're part of a network of course, you know, because we've got our feeder schools, we've then got our parishes... it's what we feed of off really, we take kids from feeder schools where they've already been shown the same sort of values, the principles, you know, we abide to the same sorts of things so that makes our job of building a successful community much easier because we're getting people that are used to that, that share the same values as us and obviously a lot of the stuff we do and we talk about is reinforced if they go to mass on Sunday or if their priest visits them at their home or whatever. So it all kind of dovetails, bit of cliché, but it sort of dovetails and works alongside one another. So I would say being part of a community helps us act as a community within the context as a school really; it makes it easier rather than being sort of an island in a sort of unfriendly sea almost*' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

> '*we're probably best with kind of parish and diocesan community I think, we have loads and loads of links, activities that happen there...*' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

An important qualification however, will be the degree to which families actively practise their faith and the levels of parish affiliation and sacramental participation among students. For some or many of the students, the school may have replaced '*the local parish as the*

(only) *point of contact with the Church*' (Engebretson 2008, p.151). This was acknowledged by the head of PDC at Sacred Heart;

'*I think, you know, not every parent will be, as I say, will be a regular attender at mass or will have, you know, will have a big friendship group or, you know, or whatever within a faith community, but I think, I think where it does exist it only, it only serves to help because I think that we know that our parents are going to support what we want to achieve as a school, we know that they value that and that's obviously why they've chosen the school for their students or for the kids..., I think we know that most of our parents, you know, have a background, they have a, they have a life that supports what we want to achieve and it all kind of... fits in and rests well alongside one another.*'

In the student focus groups, though linking the school's religious character functionally to the school community, the students were still positive about the inclusivity of their school and did not show any signs of 'particularised trust' or the 'dark side' of communities. The students felt instead that being in a school of a religious character would make people from other faiths, and in particular minority faiths feel more welcome and comfortable;

'*I think like we would be more welcoming to other faiths cos we have a faith and we like understand what it's like, and also our school teaches us loads about other faiths, not just our own really*' (Zoe, St Anthony's).

'*Do you think being in a school of a religious character helps people from a minority faith feel perhaps more comfortable talking about their faith*' (BC)?

'*I think for anyone it would be wouldn't it*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

'*I think, I think they would yeah because... then they don't feel like they are a minority*' (Gareth, Sacred Heart).

The final comment is consistent with research from the Burnley Project and further research conducted in the UK as part of the Religion in Education (REDCo) project. Research from the Burnley Project found that young Asian people were generally tolerant and integrative; '*being religious themselves, they saw the value in the religion of others*', whereas in white

working-class enclaves, which were relatively untouched by religion, a substantial minority attitude of young people towards faith was hostile; '*they did not see any value in other cultures – a rejection, in other words, of multiculturalism*' (Billings 2009, p.29; see also Billings and Holden, 2008; Rizvi, 2007b). Research from the REDCo project also found that discussion of religious issues and personal belief was problematic for white students in more rural areas, where they faced a climate of youth apathy and negativity towards religion (McKenna et al, 2009; see also Yablon, 2010).

A bonding capital based on a shared faith identity and shared values in a religious passing approach to educational environments, rather than exacerbating exclusionary practices, can provide an important platform for fostering the confidence and a willingness to engage with diverse others; as shown in the student comments above from St Anthony's and Sacred Heart. Though further insight is needed in this area, some indications have already been provided in Chapter 5. Although not a 'neutral' space, the educational environment of the passing approach is still an inclusive and welcoming space, where the theology of the religious passing approach, and an emphasis upon being as welcoming as possible (whilst still maintaining a particular identity, see p.109), can be functional for both that 'crucial communitarian' element discussed above, and at the same time not exacerbate exclusionary practices (see also much related research into faith-based community activity, which has found that bridging social capital is often sustained by the bonding that derives from the collective life of faith communities. See for instance Furbey et al, 2006; Furbey, 2008).

6.4 Conclusions

Intergroup contact is understood to be an important ingredient for cohesion and harmony in a multicultural society characterised by diversity. There are oft heard and often intuitively persuasive arguments therefore why autonomous schools with a religious character are ill-suited to cultivating in future citizens those values which are essential to cohesion in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies. In these schools young children are often assumed to socialise with people who are like themselves, racially, religiously and culturally, and experience little or no context in which virtues of character like toleration and mutual respect are practiced and repeated. Common schools conversely, being understood to be more likely populated by students and teachers of different faiths and of no faith, are understood to be the institutions which can best provide that context for young children. Meaningful, positive

attitude promoting, intergroup interaction however, doesn't just happen, not even in the micro environment of a school; and the list of conditions which may need to be satisfied can be long and complicated (Vogt, 1997; see also pp.36-37, 44-45). This underlines the importance of the anthropology of everyday interaction in a given place at a given time (Amin, 2002). This may in fact make the engaging and especially the passing approach to educational environments interesting sites for future research. It is not so clear cut that common schools or the engaging approach of All Saints are necessarily more functional for cohesion than the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart. Being in principle a 'single-faith' school may not necessarily mean that young children experience and perceive their peers as being exclusively like themselves. Religious diversity is not so easily defined and it may be a mistake to assume that students in a religious passing school will necessarily be drawn into the same patterns of cultural or moral life, but may rather experience a variety of religious views, adherence and dialogical contexts.

Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart still drew their pupils from a variety of cultural, ethnic, socio-economic and linguistic backgrounds, and could be important social spaces where young children experience many of the other members of the school as 'different' in some important sense, and therefore find the task of bridging and a commitment to reciprocity as both important and challenging. Though the students at St Anthony's and Sacred Heart may experience this diversity within moderately narrow (religious) limits, this may provide them with not just experience of diversity and difference, but may further provide a lived experience of a context within which an internal diversity can be held together in some unity and an integrated community life. The passing approach therefore may in fact (potentially) be an ideal site for enabling togetherness and meaningful relationships with others irrespective of their backgrounds, and for coming to terms with difference and an open acceptance of diversity. A site therefore where '*barriers fall, friendships are formed and differences are seen as enriching and not as a threat*' (Bishop Lang, 2003, cited in Russell, 2007). Though further research will be needed regarding to what degree meaningful contact and respectful relationships across ethnic and cultural lines occurs in religious passing schools (and also religious engaging schools) vis-à-vis community school, my supposition would be that the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart may in practise potentially be a more fertile soil for successful intergroup contact and an open acceptance of diversity.

My further related supposition would be that 'gemeinschaft' will, ceteris paribus, be

more tangible in religious passing schools. It's worth noting that a politics of 'community' together with a concomitant political implication that there may therefore be a need to identify and cultivate valued forms of community and communal attachments was further motivated by the series of official reports which followed the disorders in 2001 (see p.22). Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart expressed this in the staff and student comments, so too All Saints; where in all three schools comments expressed a valued form of school community functionally linked to the school's faith tradition. I believe though that the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred heart in particular assumes a community of pupils who share, or at least support, the school's religious tradition, and provided a strong sense of a lived contra-individualistic communal emphasis, and also valued sense of community which emphasised the quality of relationships from being around like-minded people (expressed in a greater degree of shared belief and values). It is not so unproblematically clear that the gemeinschaft of the engaging approach, or a common school, and the values and attitudes encouraged, will be necessarily more functional for cohesion. These schools may have to work harder for successful intergroup contact.

Have I unequivocally demonstrated to a skeptic's satisfaction that a number of important assumptions underpinning the problematization of 'restricted educational environments' are either demonstrably untrue or of doubtable status? Doubtless no, nor could this research do as such for reasons already made clear (see p.50). This research though has indicated reasons why if successful intergroup contact is a key ingredient for cohesion and harmony in multicultural societies, it is not so obvious that autonomous schools with a religious character necessarily undermine cohesion in this regard. The passing approach to educational environments can mean an environment which is as ethnically diverse or more so than community schools, and be a site of successful intergroup contact (and be at least as good as, or as worse, as the broader education system). There are however further additional pedagogical reasons why St Anthony's and Sacred Heart may be more functional to cohesion than community schools, linked to the passing approach to educational aims. These will be explored in the next chapter.

Chapter 7

Engagement, Passing and the Problematization of 'Distinctive Non-Common Educational Aims'

7.1 Introduction

The problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' (as shown in Chapter 3), is firstly the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' and secondly the problematization of 'non-common values'. Both of these are intimately bound to 'indoctrination' and its consequences for children's moral instruction, personality and cognitive development. The engaging and passing approach to 'distinctive educational aims' are both inspired by the school's faith tradition. Insofar as these approaches have a values led curriculum, these values are inspired by the beliefs and moral values of the school's religious tradition; and may therefore be 'non-common'. More generally, both the engaging and passing approach seek further to present the faith of the school's sponsor positively and faith, more widely, as a positive and normal element in everyday life. The religious passing approach further has, more specifically, a distinctive non-common religious education curriculum, in that it is the primary conduit through which the religious beliefs of the school's faith tradition are 'passed'. This is a distinctive and non-common curriculum in that, though normally reflective of the majority of the students and their families attending the school, it would generally lack the endorsement of a majority of the wider society. The religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart may yet therefore be implicated in a form of indoctrination which is itself intimately bound to 'non-common values' and 'dominant group-based identities'.

At wider issue here therefore, is educational purpose and a foundation for character, or the purposeful development of human beings. What are the kinds of human beings which the schools may develop or are seeking to develop through their five years with the school, in addition to their being academically successful to whatever level? Therefore, this chapter is concerned with educational aims and 'person forming', the purposeful development of human

beings, and as with the preceding chapter is in two halves. The first half presents analysis and insight from the primary research to address the concerns inherent both in the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' and the problematization of 'non-common values'. The second half again presents a symbiosis of analysis and insight from the primary research, together with further insight gained from additional secondary philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research, to show how 'distinctive educational aims' can in fact contribute to education for cohesion by firstly developing its pupils' skills and capacity for critical thinking and reflection (Vogt, 1997; see also Everett, 2013); and secondly by providing values and fostering enduring effective motives for the conscious decision to accept the other (Schweitzer, 2007).

This chapter therefore draws upon the primary data to show how staff and students in each school perceived their school's educational aims, and how the students saw themselves and others; these extracts are anchored within further elucidation of the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims'. As in the preceding chapter, the empirical research only serves as a starting point for further discussion of and elaboration upon my evolving typology of different faith-based approaches to education, and the implications of their educational aims for cohesion. Results from the survey of final year students are also discussed to gain further insight into their personal and social identity development, and how they categorize themselves and others. The chapter concludes not just that the educational aims of both the engaging and passing approach wouldn't be any less functional for cohesion than the 'common' school, but goes further in indicating two key ways in which the passing approach to educational aims (particularly in the context of the passing approach to educational environments) can be advantageous for the development of pupils' social identities and tolerance; inherent in the school developing pupils' skills and capacity for critical thinking and reflection (and by extension, cohesion).

7.2 Identity

The problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' expresses the worry that a school's concern for (in particular) religious education taught primarily through and from the perspective of its religious tradition, will provide greater opportunity for the formation of narrow, separate identities - a separate 'them' and 'us' identity. This concern would however be difficult to level against the engaging approach of All Saints; not placing as it does any

special or extra emphasis upon passing on and/or nurturing the faith of the school's faith tradition. Although All Saints offers education within a faith setting, and also additional extra-curricular opportunities for further 'engagement' with the school's faith tradition, this occurs in a benignly tolerant environment which can and should be viewed as having no more of a string attached than a wish to simply make children aware of the beliefs and practices of the school's faith tradition. In this, the religious engaging approach shares much with commonly held perceptions of the Anglican tradition and Church of England schools more broadly (Barker and Anderson, 2005; see also Murray, 2013). The religious education curriculum in All Saints, as mentioned in Chapter 5, did not, for instance, place any special emphasis on exploring what the school's faith tradition comprised;

> '...yeah we don't, we wouldn't, we won't specifically sort of focus on Christian identity for individuals, we would teach, Christianity would be taught just as any other, any other religion' (Religious Education Teacher, All Saints).

In this, the religious engaging approach of All Saints to religious education in practice differs little from religious education in a community school. The religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart to religious education was however the most demonstrably visible way in which the school's religious tradition was formally 'passed' on. The curriculum primarily covered religious themes in the context of the theology, beliefs and practises of the school's faith tradition, and therefore, at a surface level at least, the spectre of 'dominant group-based identities' and also 'indoctrination' may be raised by many in this context. Of concern here is the degree to which the schools treat group boundaries as permeable or impermeable, and expresses religious understandings which require a strong boundary from 'the other'; and which '*can produce a passive retreat or a more active (and sometimes destructive) assertion of distinctiveness*' (Furbey et al. 2006, p.10). This would aid in encouraging 'chronically accessible' and 'dominant' group based identities.

Social identity, religious identities, and the suspicions of faith-based school naysayers deserve further and deeper, and more nuanced research and discussion than that which is within the ambitions of this research. Suspicions often seem to amount to a belief that '*somehow too much religious commitment threatens community cohesion*' so it should therefore be kept to the private, rather than the public realm (Cooling 2010, p.23; see also Chapter 2). As McKinney notes, in relation to Roman Catholic schools in Scotland, suspicions concerning the development of separate identities may be rooted in deeper

suspicions concerning the historical and contemporary position of particular faith communities (2008). For the present purposes however, it will be enough of a response to the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' to demonstrate that inherent in the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart to faith, is treating it as being both permeable and a choice, and also being committed to dialogical and plural understandings of identities. This is key to individuals socially interacting with others using their personal rather than their social identity, and not therefore encouraging the development of such 'dominant group-based identities', and by extension intergroup bias. Like the engaging approach of All Saints, though explicitly more denominationally distinct, the passing approach did not intend, nor wish to intend, cultivating obedience and ritualistic pursuit of religious duties, but rather emphasized attitudes and behaviour rather than belief (Parker-Jenkins, 2005).

7.2.1 Permeable and a Choice

The religious passing approach treated the possibility that children would question their faith as a natural and not undesirable part of their development into autonomous persons. Neither St Anthony's nor Sacred Heart shied away from different moral frameworks or beliefs, and both afforded pupils the right to reflect upon, and furthermore perhaps reject, what they were told:

> '...the first part of their (year ten) second paper in GCSE, it's the believing in God section... I don't say to the kids, you know, well Dawkins is wrong, he's an idiot and you must believe in Paley and St. Thomas Aquinas, you know, it's left entirely up to their own reflection... and sometimes the kids say, you know, after doing this topic, 'ooh, not so sure now, cos that's really made me think'... (Head of Religious Education, St Anthony's)

The religious education teacher at St. Anthony's in particular emphasised the value of personal expression for personal identity formation. Here, Bruner's concept of 'scaffolding' was key, generating activities through which children could continue to learn unaided (1966, cited in Stables, 2003). Children were encouraged and expected to articulate, express and exchange their own views and understandings, and relate their own personal opinions, and convictions to religious, ideological and value issues, to develop their own personal positions.

The religious passing approach therefore expressed the 'reflective transmission' of the school's religious tradition, and encouraged the pupils to 'author' the school's religious tradition in their own way, that is, appropriate and transform this tradition into personal meaning. The school's religious tradition was not presented in an authoritarian voice (see p.69);

'What extent to which are students helped to make their own choices, develop and explore their own views and beliefs' (BC)?

...it's not just giving them time to talk, sometimes it's giving, it's giving them the tools to talk, and the language to talk and to explore, but then at the same time the balance is not to hinder them by your own adult, teacher like, academically expected ways of communicating. It's always important you start with where, well any teacher should say this, that you start with where they're from in their own words and then allow those words to be legitimate... your adding value I suppose in a sense, by the, in the way which you've explained things and the language that you use and that, I guess it's that whole idea of scaffolding as well isn't it... good teaching should provide a good scaffold so that students can hook onto, hang their own ideas, and to kind of build it up to a point where they understand fairly, fairly tricky concepts...' (Head of Religious Education, St Anthony's)

Educational self-direction was also especially emphasised at St Anthony's;

'...there is much more debate in RE, the students always say that, than there is I think in anything else, including English. Umm, I think it's really important, and it's not just debate, it's discussion and talk for learning... So yeah, a lot of, a lot of student talk; you've always got to introduce things, you know, explain a particular idea but I think the more you draw from students and the more, it's like breathing, the more in and out goes on the better the conversation and the flow... and it they, if they come up with something interesting and there is space and time... if they're exploring and they want to, they're kind of hooked on to something, then you'd be, you'd be mad not to grab onto that and kind of run with it for a bit.' (Head of Religious Education, St Anthony's)

The religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart also respected the

student's conscience and emotional autonomy to take what they wished to from assemblies and worship, and participate to the degree to which they felt comfortable. Respectful understanding was shown to all children in the school, including those who were not from families of the school's faith tradition. To such pupils the invitation was there to experience the reality of the school's faith tradition and community within the school, but only to the degree to which they chose to enter that encounter; neither passing school sought to evangelise. In this, the religious passing approach was not significantly distinguishable from the religious engaging approach of All Saints. Staff interviewees at the two religious passing schools recognised that their students were at different stages in developing their own fully worked out distinctive beliefs and identity, and the school needed to meet them where they were; and wherever they were was ok;

'*I think we appreciative as a school that our students are at various places in terms of their own sense of faith. You've got those that have known, have only ever known, you know, go to church, you know, it's profound, it's there, they're cradle Catholics, other's, you know, are kind of lax, or kind of, you know, developing their own sense of faith, and I think as a school we, we acknowledge that. I don't feel we ram it down their throats… Some people tend to think faith schools do that but I think we realise, and I think we allow the students to take what they want to from an assembly, from a liturgy... You know, my step-daughter, she's you know, cradle catholic but, you know, she has challenges of faith and she questions it and that's very healthy, and I think for the most part we encourage that , you know, that curiosity, that curiosity of faith*' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).*

'*Everyone goes to mass without exception and they're welcome to take part in that to the degree in which they feel comfortable. I think there are universal aspects to that celebration that everyone can join with and where they're not, then they're still invited to take part in a particular way, come up for a blessing instead of communion for example... kids, you know, kids in their journey, wherever they're at in their, in their five years they're here, sometimes, you know, they're gonna have bad days and times where they are off faith, but I think , I think the way that we approach Catholicism, Christianity, is, is very much that idea of a journey… and they know they're not going to be condemned for anything, that people are here to listen, and that, they are kind of,*

they are walked with, they are met where, wherever they are, and wherever they are is ok' (Assistant Head St. Anthony's).

In the student focus groups, though the religious education curriculum focused upon Roman Catholicism, the students themselves also felt that they were in no way pressured or restricted in their beliefs. The students emphasised that they felt their school believed it was important for them to choose for themselves and make their own judgements, and come to their own individual conclusions;

' *...we're taught to have our own opinions...'* (Simon, St. Anthony's)

'*Your open to your own opinion'* (Paul, St Anthony's)

'*we have masses and you're encouraged to go to the Chapel if you want to, but it gives people, it's gives people room to breathe, it gives people room to go off and believe what they want to, it doesn't just constrict them'* (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

'*...they're very like down for us to choose, like, they kind of, kind of trust us'* (Richard, Sacred Heart).

'*...like during our work they let us, write what we think, they give us sought of facts, so they give the views of all the different religions and then they let us formulate our own opinion on what we think...'* (Hayley, Sacred Heart).

'*I think that's a good way to do it as well, like instead of just giving us what it is, if they let us choose then I think we've got more encouragement to actually think about it and decide for ourselves...'* (Sophie, Sacred Heart).

7.2.3 Dialogical and Plural

As discussed in Chapter 3 (see p.62), to develop a more complex representation of their own social identity and more chronic awareness of cross categorization in one's group memberships and those of others, students must be motivated to think about and be open to information about the social landscape and groups beyond their own personal experience.

This condition was met at both passing schools where the concepts of 'identity and diversity', and that difference is acceptable and to be respected, further permeated across the wider school curriculum. Pupils were encouraged to expend effort to achieve a rich and accurate understanding of the social world and awareness that persons, who are outgroupers along one category dimension, might be ingroupers when considered on another dimension. This approach undermined the cognitive basis of any ingroup bias and encouraged a more complex representation of pupils' social identity, and more chronic awareness of cross categorization in their group memberships and those of others. Far from the educational aims of the religious passing approach providing greater opportunity for the promotion of dominant religious identities, both schools, consistent with their embracement of an inclusive theology, were open to open minded and authentic dialogue with different faith interpretations and cultural positions. Both schools sincerely welcomed and built upon the common ground held by all the major world faiths, although simultaneously not overlooking nor denying differences between religions, and understanding and respecting their different origins, history and doctrines. The religious passing approach therefore did not see their pupils' spiritual, moral and social education narrowly and exclusively within the school's religious tradition. The importance and value of 'identity' being understood as dialogical and plural was emphasized in the religious passing schools;

'You don't, you don't live in isolation do you, or an island, and I guess that's a... it's a process which involves the two things (knowing others and knowing oneself) *bouncing off each other and involving a kind of symbiosis'* (Head of Religious Education, St Anthony's).

Do you find that exploring diversity helps the students to know themselves better' (BC)?

'I think it must do... it's giving them that kind of critical apparatus when they go out of school, and think well why, you know, why do people think in a particular way, why is it that they're doing this, where have those ideas come from... (Head of Religious Education Teacher St Anthony's)

Though rooted in the faith tradition of the school and primarily covering themes in a Christian context, ecumenical teaching about other religious views and values were

incorporated into the curriculum of both passing schools, and the schools looked for commonalities, common themes, issues and beliefs. The religious education classrooms in both passing schools also had displays and iconography representing and representative of all the five main celebrated religions in the *UK*;

'*We look for commonalities, we look for shared values and I think, you know, there's a tremendous amount of that, and I think you know, I think the kids do get that exposure*' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

'*Well because we're a Catholic school religion is really important so we've got a good percentage of the timetable focused on RE. Each year group does it right up to year thirteen and we don't just teach the Catholic religion, we teach all the big world faiths. We also take into account our students religious backgrounds and let those feed into the lessons as well... in our year ten we study Islam as a module as well as Christianity, so we do lots of comparisons, and every single year group has one focus on a different religion*' (Religious Education Teacher Sacred Heart).

This was echoed by the students in the focus groups:

'*Do you have lots of opportunities here to engage with different faiths and different beliefs and different cultures*?' (BC)

'*Definitely in RE, they're always saying kind of like, say your point of view on this, like make sure you include another religion other than like umm, Christian*' (Richard, Sacred Heart)

'*So we have to know both sides of it anyway, so doing it in an exam or; and the textbooks, the textbooks we use, they have the Christian opinion, the Muslim opinion, they have all the different opinions and we're taught pretty much thoroughly all of them*' (Hayley, Sacred Heart)

Both schools also had curriculum and extra curriculum cross cultural programmes and activities beyond their own community for their pupils to engage with. The schools also promoted the understanding of different cultures through drop down days/themed weeks on

identity and diversity, and provided 'education for cross-cultural understanding'; what Osler and Starkey term 'cosmopolitan citizenship', enabling pupils '*to make connections between their immediate contexts and the national and global contexts*' (2003, p.252; see also Halstead 1995);

'*...with my current year sevens we've just looked at 'what is national identity' and 'what makes Britain British', you know, 'what makes Britain'? And the students have just completed... a speech as to why people should come on holiday in the UK, and they focused on the multicultural aspect of Britain, the multi-ethnic, the multi-religious aspect of Britain as well... so then they look at their local community and being a good neighbour and how they can help out in their local community, and the different people that make up their community, so the elderly, the disabled, the ethnic minorities etc... We have also international week, we're an international school, we've got international school status, and we're linked with a school in India... and we do work with that. And we've also just started a project... called Comenius project, and there are schools in Germany, schools in Poland, our schools are all linked up and there are trips for students to go over and experience school in different countries and for teachers to maybe do swaps and things like that... In international week, it's a whole school thing where we'll have assemblies celebrating different nationalities and different identities, the canteen will have a different day... Peace One Day... it's on the 21st September, we often join up with our community school, which is next door, and we have some workshops on what Peace One day is, where all of the current conflicts, governments and people involved in current conflicts for one day cease their conflict and then it's a day of reflection, so we celebrate that and do some work on that*' (Religious Education Teacher Sacred Heart)

'*There's lots of things like, you know, from the welcome as you walk up the, walk up those stairs, there's 20 odd different languages up there, to opportunities to young interpreters, that's a really good scheme, to exploration in different subject areas about culture and identity, you know, African Mosques to... kind of British responses to the, to the Jubilee, and to the, to the Olympics. There's all sorts of different ways of thinking about where we, where we come from and where we're going, and the different, you know, the different religions that are represented within the school. I guess probably actually the choice of literature in the library as well, it strikes me that when I go in I*

see, I see a lot of, well, it's not 500 copies of <u>Swallows and Amazons</u>, it's very diverse range of... texts that are open to the children. I think probably actually in the English curriculum as well there is, about hearing different voices' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's)

At Sacred Heart in particular the school routinely arranged visits to different places of worship and visits to the school by representatives of other faiths, providing opportunities to meet peers from different faith groups as well as to increase interfaith awareness and understanding;

'*We have things like, umm, church week where we have other faiths come in to lead assemblies, so we have Anglican and Baptists and Methodists come in and they do assemblies so, you know, we, we have a strong commitment to the idea that, you know, we're part of a Christian, you know, we are Catholic, we're a Catholic school but, the Catholic church is part of a Christian, you know, Christian faith really... and we're getting more and more people from other faiths in as well, so in year nine our kids go down to a Mosque, they go to a Synagogue, I've had some sixth form, like, friends, friends from a Mosque up to talk to them....*' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart).

The students in the focus group at Sacred Heart also spoke about trips to different places of worship;

'*...in year nine, I think it was last year we went umm, to like a Muslim place of worship, a Sikh's place of worship*' (Richard).

'*Yeah, we went to a Sikh's place of worship, and they did a talk to us when we were there*' (Hayley).

'*Yeah, they showed us round, we tried some of like umm, it's kind of, it's like a bready...*' (Richard).

'*Their cultural food, yeah*' (Hayley).

'*Yeah like, doughy...*' (Langar, temple bread, Richard).

Both schools also encouraged their students to participate in the wide range of non-faith based academic and extra-curricular activities which the school offered, these were seen as an essential part of the holistic and maximum development (and self-development) of their pupils; giving them a fuller view of life, and the personal and social skills which are essential for living in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies;

'... when the kids troop up in half an hour, you'll see that a lot of them have huge, they look like kind of central American generals with the amount of badges and kind of tin wear that they've got; and they get them not just for sport as well, they get academic colours, sporting, the arts, which is kind of music and drama, and community. I think well over, easily half of a group that you ever get in, in front of you have got at least one of those badges on, and they're all, they're staff nominated... there's very few kids who don't do something and that most of those people have been, those children have been picked up and kind of encouraged to do something, to have a go. Cos that's the whole educating the whole child isn't it, that kind of holistic view, not just saying, you know, pass your exams doesn't really matter, we'll let your parents worry about what you do outside school' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

In the student focus groups the following quote from Jonathan Romain was also read to the students;

'*They* (schools with a religious character) *may be designed to inculcate religious values, but they result in religious ghettos, which can destabilise the social health of the country at large*'; separation '*leads to ignorance, which can breed suspicion, spiral into fear and deteriorate into prejudice*' (Rabbi Doctor Jonathan Romain).

The quote was then briefly elaborated upon in order to elucidate fully what Rabbi Romain's concerns were, and the students were then asked for their thoughts. They were not told who the quote was from until after the discussion had stopped. Consistent with their school's commitment to respecting pupil's conscience and emotional autonomy, and also dialogical and plural understandings of identity, students in both groups were highly dismissive of the Rabbi's concerns. The students showed no indication that they perceived themselves as being separate or separated in any kind of draconian way from non-Catholics or people without

faith; or that the school was encouraging religious understandings which required a strong boundary from 'the other';

'*I think it depends on your experience, if you haven't been to a school of faith you're not got gonna fully understand the experience. Obviously we've all been to Sacred Heart, I don't think any of us have come from other secondary schools so we've kind of come here, we're a good community but we're also very diverse, we've seen other religions, our friends might be from other religions, we go on trips to other religions places of worship, we're constantly learning about other religions, just kind of always telling us that it's not just about Catholics, like we're not just like the only important religion*' (Richard, Sacred Heart)

'*I think that whoever probably said that they must have not been in a faith school because if you have been you'll know that we're not brought up to look at any one in a certain way. We see everyone the same, like we don't see a certain person as different because they don't believe something, even though we all believe the same thing, we don't single anyone out, and that's kind of a main thing that the school tries to focus on is making everyone equal*' (Sophie, Sacred Heart)

'*...generally it's a foolish idea because not everyone's social life is restricted to in-school* and that generally youths aren't seen that way nowadays, we don't say, 'oh we go to this school and it's of this religion, therefore we don't like that religion'.*' (Karen, St. Anthony's) * This comment is also consistent with the children peer group analysis in the previous chapter, see p.150

7.2.4 Survey Analysis

The results from the student questionnaire were consistent with the staff and student comments from the interviews and focus groups, and did not show any evidence that the school was encouraging 'dominant group-based identities'. In the student questionnaire respondents were asked a series of self-identity questions, these questions were also asked on the 2010/2011 Citizenship Survey, and responses from the three sampled schools were compared to the responses from 16 year olds nationally. Respondents were asked which of the following were important to 'their sense of who they were';

- Religion

- Ethnic or racial background

- National Identity

- Where you live

- Your Interests

- Family

- Gender

- Age

Respondents were asked to indicate whether each of the above was either 'very important' 'quite important', 'not very important', 'not at all important', or 'don't know'. Chi-square tests were performed to see if there was any association between responses and which school/survey respondents were from (in the case of some answers post analysis required that some responses were collapsed together and/or the response 'don't know' was omitted due to low counts, see also p.93). The Chi-Square test found that there was an association for all of the above except interests. Generally, post analysis of the adjusted residuals showed a pattern where significantly less than expected respondents from the two passing schools indicated that a category was 'very important' to their sense of who they were. Importantly, the results did not show any indication of respondents evaluating themselves in terms of a single 'dominant' identity, or that they were contracting the boundaries of their social identity to subordinate all other group identities to a single identity (such as one based on their religious identity). Rather the results were consistent with the school's commitment to and understanding of identity as permeable, dialogical and plural, and showed that the identities of the respondents were differentiated along different meaningful social dimensions.

Significantly less than expected respondents from Sacred Heart and St Anthony's in fact indicated that religion, ethnic or racial background, national identity, age and also family was 'very important' to their sense of who they are; and significantly more than expected respondents from Sacred Heart and St Anthony's indicated that religion was 'not very

important'. For national identity 'quite important' had the highest number of responses across all three schools, though 'not very important' had the highest number of responses for ethnic or racial background. This would be consistent with more complex social identities, where respondents were aware of the differences within their own ingroups and could tolerate a degree of ambiguity in defining their ingroup-outgroup boundaries. A valuing of their national identity but being aware too of the ethnic and racial diversity within their national identity ingroup, so that their ethnic or racial background was not so important to their sense of who they were (for full tables and charts see Appendix K).

Part of the survey of final year students also included a measure for respondent's social identity complexity, though it was felt this should be simplified somewhat given the young age of the respondents, and also made shorter than would otherwise be preferable given the limited time respondents would have to complete the whole survey. Respondents were asked first of all to consider all the people who shared the same ethnic or racial background as they themselves did, and decide how many of these people they felt would also share the same religion as they did. For instance, if a respondent chose white-British and 'no religion', they would need to consider how many white-British people were not religious. They were then asked to consider this relationship in the other direction, i.e. when thinking about people who are not religious, how many of them did they think were also white-British. Finally respondents were asked to consider the people who they felt shared the same interests as they did, and decide how many of these people they felt would also share a) their ethnic or racial background and b) their religion. The mean of all these scores was calculated to give a complexity score for each individual, a high number meaning a low complexity and a low number meaning a high complexity. The results from the three sampled schools with a religious character were then compared to each other.

A one-way ANOVA test did not on this occasion find any association between the mean complexity scores and the three different schools (for the full charts, tables and statistics see Appendix L), and showed no indication that the religious passing schools were encouraging less complex social identities. This was consistent with further survey results which did not show any evidence that attendance at their school encouraged children's dependence upon a religious identity for meeting their psychological needs for inclusion. In the student questionnaire students were asked to what extent they agreed, or disagreed, that religion affected who their friends were. Only just under 6% in both passing schools strongly agreed; over 75% of students at Sacred Heart and just fewer than 70% of students at St.

Anthony's either tended to or strongly disagreed. A chi-square test comparing the responses from the three schools to the responses from 16 year olds from the 2010/2011 was also performed (though low counts in the 'strongly agree' or 'tend to agree' categories necessitated that these were collapsed together, see also p.93). The chi-square test found that there was an association between the responses and which school/survey respondents were from. Further analysis showed however that the only significantly more/less than expected results were seen at Sacred Heart, where significantly less than expected respondents either tended to, or strongly agreed, though significantly less than expected respondents from All Saints tended to disagree.

All of the above has been to demonstrate that the concerns over 'dominant group-based identities' would be baseless in the case of the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart to educational aims, as they equally would be in the case of the religious engaging approach of All Saints. Rather, the religious passing schools' treatment of identity and diversity, and their motivation of students to think about and be open to information about their social landscape and groups beyond their own personal experience, meant that both schools met both the requirements of children having a complex social identity. Firstly, by encouraging students' awareness of their membership of more than one ingroup categorization, and secondly, by encouraging recognition that their multiple ingroup categories did not fully overlap (Roccas and Brewer, 2002). The religious passing approach can in practice be as successful (or unsuccessful) therefore as any other school in ensuring that children do not 'chronically' depend upon any single ingroup for meeting psychological needs for inclusion and self-esteem. In the next section I wish to address the concerns inherent in the problematization of 'distinctive non-common values' by simply demonstrating that the values which drove all three school's educational aims for their children's moral instruction and personality development were simply not uncommon.

7.3 Values

Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, and also All Saints, were schools permeated by an ethos based on values which guided their behaviour as institutions and organisations, and each school used worship, the physical environment and the curriculum, both formally and informally, as vehicles to transmit and engage with those values. The values which were considered desirable to promote and articulated in the school were guided by the beliefs,

teachings and practices of the school's faith tradition. The education which was provided by the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, or the engaging approach of All Saints, had a fundamental, and certainly some would say more profound than other (non-faith) schools, interest therefore in the place of values in all the structures of the school (Keast, 2005). This brings us to the problematization of 'distinctive non-common values'. The point I wish to demonstrate here however, as indicated above, is though the faith tradition of the school could in practise offer some challenge to some contemporary attitudes and relations, the values which the religious engaging and passing approach to educational aims wised to inculcate into their students were simply not uncommon.

7.3.1 Staff and Student Comments

This section demonstrates how both the staff and students saw their school (and should be seen by others as such) as inculcating a basic and an uncontroversial set of accepting personal and social values which pupils were expected to live out in their behaviour, and their behaviour towards others; values such as forgiveness, humility and compassion, a commitment to the service of others, valuing and celebrating diversity and showing respect and consideration to others. Though distinctly and strongly inspired by the school's faith tradition, such values were not exclusive to that faith, and therefore not uncommon, though the ways in which the schools articulated and justified them were (this important qualification has implications for pupils personal and social identity development which will be further discussed below). All three schools saw themselves as having a values led curriculum and transmitting values and a morality which, though determined by the beliefs and moral values of the school's sponsor, any person of any various religious or secular persuasion would/should wish to subscribe to. The below quote is broadly typical of the responses from interviewees from the three schools;

I think even if you're not a Catholic or a Christian, I think there are core values that, you know, all of humanity would almost, most people would buy into, would recognise as being important... Even if you're, even if you're agnostic you know, or an atheist, I just think the values that we, you know, the Gospel, the teachings of the gospel, the values there, even if you don't want to engage with the idea of a God, I just think that actually they're very common and very important values and I don't think that any parent would be aghast with it...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart)

Though St Anthony's felt that the moral tradition on offer in the school could in some ways be counter-cultural and often offer challenge to contemporary influential individualistic and materialistic attitudes and relations, offering alternative values and attitudes inspired by the school's religious tradition;

'I think the values that we would hope to espouse would be counter-cultural. I was talking to my year elevens this morning about, about marriage, so I showed them this kind of Ken and Barbie ideal of, you know, what society or the world says is kind of, is good, and then that provoked a very good discussion about actually what's really important in marriage and the values that you would wish for yourself and for your children; and then because they were talking , we were talking about particular clothes that these little dolls were wearing, it then jumped to briefly the idea of clothing itself and how, how very often that's just superficial, but, you know, as a teenager your clothes are very important…. I guess we take opportunities here to make them think and to, to question values that society very often says are good. So the clothing thing, well that's fine, but ultimately, actually it's kind of unimportant really…' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's)

Interviewees in all three schools were asked what values were the most important to the school, the values which the school considered the most desirable to try and instil into its pupils. Interviewees showed no ambivalence or reticence in talking about the source of these values;

'It's the Gospel, you know, the values of the Gospel really, of love thy neighbour, you know, much, much along those lines really, about love and respecting one another, realising the importance of the individual, also the idea of community, you know, all of these things really. So I think the bulk of what we do is very much based on those, on those Gospel traditions and values...' (Head of PDC, Sacred Heart)

'...there's an emphasis on forgiveness, more so perhaps, and a really inclusive nature which might not always be as articulated in the way that we do in a state school. So you might find similar kind of values (in a community school)*, and I accept that argument completely, but the difference is we articulate it more clearly and more obviously and*

do tie it down to a belief system which is the Christian faith and here in the Anglican tradition.' (Principal, All Saints)

All three schools also similarly found however, that they needed on occasion to challenge views brought into the school from home, though in a sensitive manner and whilst still respecting pupil's conscience and emotional autonomy;

'*...you also have to challenge the students' views they bring in from home, a lot of students will bring their parental views, that you'll hear them, especially in citizenship lessons, for example on the issue of immigration, and they spout these things out in discussion and you can just imagine it's their parents talking, or it's what they've heard on the TV, or they've heard a friend saying something kinda that way. So you have to challenge those types of views back in the classroom by trying to offer, I suppose its offering them all the information and then letting them make their own decision, because you don't want to push views on anybody...*' (Religious Education teacher, Sacred Heart)

'*... we're all influenced by our parents whether we like it or not, you know, that's our major, major influence and it, it still rings true today, despite the fact we've got the internet and twenty-four hour TV and games and all the rest of it... So you do, you know, particularly if you're talking about cultures other than our, our immediate culture, then, you know, prejudice comes into play... So it's just trying to break it down really and just, challenging, challenging preconceived ideas and beliefs and prejudice.*' (Religious Education teacher, All Saints)

When the students in the focus groups were asked what were the values they felt were important to their school all three groups gave a similarly uncontroversial list of common moral values which chimed with the responses of the staff interviewees. Respect was a value listed in all three focus groups and the conversation below from St. Anthony's was broadly quite typical;

'*What values would you say your school tries to teach you?* (BC)

'*Trust*' (Nathan, St Anthony's).

'*Respect*' (Paul, St Anthony's).

'*Treat everyone equally*' (Karen, St Antony's).

Interestingly, and not insignificantly, several of the students at the two passing schools also extolled the virtues of schools with a religious character, feeling that interfaith respect and moral values were more integral to a school with a religious character than a community school (one student made specific reference to religious education lessons which has particular relevance for the supposition that in religious education lessons in a religious passing school, the school's foundational faith can become operative as a resource for tolerance, this is a supposition given further space below);

'*If I was building my own school, how do you think I should go about teaching people respect for others*' (BC)?

'(it) *depends if it's a faith school or not. If it was a faith school then that would come across through RE lessons, things like that, but if it wasn't a faith school you'd have to physically teach it with just yourself and your own knowledge, and maybe past experiences*' (Hollie, St Antony's).

'*I think having a religious school improves your moral values, cos you're, you're sought of, it improves your moral values because it sort of teaches you to sort of understand each other and just improves your opinion, and to listen to everyone else's opinion*' (Paul, St. Anthony's).

'*I think because we're a school with a faith we get taught a lot of respect, and in community schools I don't think they get taught in the same way so when you go there they wouldn't be giving you the respect that we were taught here, and that we treat each other with*' (Zoe, St Anthony's).

As discussed in Chapter 3, an often heard assumption amongst educational researchers is that values are best 'caught' rather than 'taught', and that the normative school climate and the examples modelled by teachers in their attitudes and relationships are more effective than direct teaching (see p.64-65). In all three schools there was a minimal requirement that staff

were supportive of the school ethos and values base. The religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart also meant (when possible) taking advantage of the school's freedom to apply religious criteria in selecting staff to establish a core of personnel who were active practising members of the school's faith tradition, and therefore had further personal reasons to commit to the schools' values, purpose and mission (and would also more likely have already internalised and be used to thinking and behaving in these terms, see also pp.105-106). For the present purposes though it will be enough to note that all three schools echoed the advice of Jackson et al, that the '*unintentional outcomes of schooling... are of greater moral significance*' (1993, p.44), and that the importance of moral practice, acting out values, and setting the normative classroom climate was emphasised by interviewees in all schools;

> '*It's got to be in the classroom hasn't it* (encouraging respect for different beliefs and cultures)*... I think respect for, respect in general is probably gonna come before respect for any one particular thing at, at any particular time, and if there is that general insistence on respect and decency and listening and valuing, but doing those as you mature in a more, in a critical fashion, then that's, that's kind of your starting point*' (Assistant Head, St Anthony's).

> '*...it's* (encouraging respect for different beliefs and cultures) *through the lesson plans, it's through modelling, it's through the examples that the teachers set in their own attitudes and beliefs...* (Religious Education teacher, Sacred Heart).

In the student focus groups with the student councils, students also displayed awareness of both the normative climate of the school and the more direct aspects such as moral messages on posters around the school;

> '*I wouldn't, I don't think they like just kind of tell us* (which values are important to the school)*, like directly, like you have to kind of do this, but they, throughout our whole time, they're kind of instilling it...*' (Richard, Sacred Heart)

> '*We all have a planner and all of the sort of things are in there, like code of conduct and stuff are all around the school. Like, I was only reading one a minute ago outside umm... yeah, the well-being room.*' (Peter, All Saints)

All the above is to demonstrate that, rather than being consistent with the problematization of 'distinctive non-common aims', the religious engaging and passing approach was instead consistent with a values based curriculum consistent with the more benignly pragmatic and functionalist view of schools with a religious character, as being institutional forms which can support the community values of duty and responsibility, and propagate values essential to cohesion in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies.

7.3.2 Survey Analysis

This section presents some of the further results from the survey of final year students and also shows something of the limitations of the influence of the school vis-à-vis other potential influences such as home and parents, and underscores the importance of not exaggerating the role which education can play in preparing pupils for a life in an ethnically and religiously diverse society. In the student questionnaire respondents were asked a series of value questions. These questions were asked on the 2007/2008 Citizenship Survey and the answers from school respondents were compared to the answers given from 16 years olds nationally. Respondents were asked which of the following values they either 'strongly agreed with', 'tended to agree with', 'tended to disagree with', 'strongly disagreed with', or 'didn't know':

1. People should be free to say what they believe even if it offends others.

2. Different ethnic and religious groups should adapt and blend into the larger society.

3. People should respect the culture and religious beliefs of others even when these oppose their own values.

4. Different ethnic and religious groups should maintain their customs and traditions.

5. Individuals should take responsibility for helping other people in their local community.

Across all three schools and the 2007/2008 citizenship survey a majority of respondents either tended to agree or strongly agreed with all of the above (except question 1, see below),

particularly question 3 where the lowest count for the two agree categories was seen at All Saints where 82% either agreed or strongly agreed. Somewhat paradoxically, a majority of respondents agreed with both question 2 and 3 in all cases. Although larger majorities agreed with question 3 rather than 2, these two questions would seem at face value to be mutually exclusive (though we cannot be exactly sure how these questions were being interpreted by respondents, see also p.97). Chi-square tests were carried out for all of the above (in the case of some answers, post analysis again required that the two disagree categories were collapsed together and/or the category 'don't know' was omitted due to low counts, see also p.93). The chi-square test found that there was an association for question 1, with an analysis of the adjusted residuals showing that school respondents generally tended to agree or strongly agreed more than respondents from the 2007/2008 Citizenship survey. This shows some tentative evidence of greater (passive) tolerance from the school students. For all three schools a majority of respondents either tended to agree or strongly agreed; the opposite however was true of the 2007/2008 citizenship survey where a majority of respondents either tended to disagree or strongly disagreed. The adjusted residuals showed that significantly less than expected respondents from the 2007/2008 survey tended to agree and significantly more than expected tended to disagree or strongly disagreed.

Some further tentative evidence for support for multiculturalism and appreciation of the importance of cultural diversity could be seen in responses to questions 2 and 4. For question 2 the chi-square test showed there was an association between responses and which school or survey respondents were from. School respondents tended to agree or strongly agreed slightly less than expected than 16 year olds from the 2007/2008 citizenship survey. An association was also found for question 4. Across all four response groups large majorities either tended to or strongly agreed, though the adjusted residuals did show some variation in the strength of respondents' agreement. Significantly more than expected respondents from the 2007/2008 citizenship survey strongly agreed, with significantly less than expected respondents tending to agree. No association between responses and which school/survey respondents were from was found for questions 3 or 5 (for the full tables, charts and statistics see Appendix M).

Respondents were also asked to choose up to five of their most important values from the following list:

A. Tolerance and politeness towards others

B. Respect for the law

C. Everyone should speak English

D. Everyone should vote

E. Respect for all faiths

F. Respect for people from different ethnic groups

G. Freedom to criticise the views and beliefs of others

H. Everyone has a voice in politics through democracy

I. Freedom of speech/expression

J. Freedom to follow a religion of choice

K. That national policy is not made on the basis of religious beliefs

L. Equality of opportunity

M. Freedom from discrimination

N. Pride in country/patriotism

O. Justice and fair play

P. Responsibility towards other people in the community

Chi-square tests were again performed for each. For most of the values no association was found to exist between whether it was chosen or not, and which school/survey a respondent was found. An association was found however for 7 of the 16 values. The responses for these questions presented a mixed and also somewhat paradoxical picture. For value C, significantly more than expected respondents from Sacred Heart chose this value (everyone should speak English), and significantly less than expected respondents from the 2007/2008 citizenship survey chose this. Although Sacred Heart had a lower percentage of students whose first language was not English, Sacred Heart was also a much larger school than either St Anthony's or All Saints, and therefore had a larger absolute number of pupils for whom English was not their first language. One may speculate that the high numbers of respondents who chose value C was reflective of this. The results may also reflect wider shifting national

attitudes towards speaking English; results from the 2014 British Social Attitudes for instance showed that 95% of respondents felt that an ability to speak English was the most important factor in whether somebody could be judged to be 'truly British'.

The situation above was reversed for value E (respect for all faiths), with significantly more than expected respondents from the 2007/2008 citizenship survey choosing this value, and significantly less than expected respondents from Sacred Heart. Though the school would list this value as one of the most important they try to inculcate in their students, the results from the survey may show something of the limitations of the influence of the school vis-à-vis other influences such as home and parents. That said, this is not to say that those respondents who did not choose 'respect for all faiths' necessarily disagreed with the sentiment, or even considered it an unimportant value, only that they did not consider it one of their five most important. Likewise, Value F (respect for people from different ethnic groups), where significantly less than expected respondents from St Anthony's chose this, despite the school being ethnically diverse with over 20% of students identifying themselves as other than 'white British' (for the full tables, charts and statistics see Appendix N).

7.4 Religious Passing

Having addressed the concerns inherent both in the problematization of 'dominant group-based identities' and the problematization of 'distinctive non-common values', in the next two sections I wish to now move beyond simply allaying these concerns. By drawing upon the primary data and additional secondary philosophical, educational, and sociological literature and research, I wish to show how a concern for religious education taught primarily through a single faith can in fact contribute to education for cohesion by firstly developing its pupils' skills and capacity for critical thinking and reflection; and secondly by providing values and fostering enduring effective motives for the conscious decision to accept the other (Schweitzer, 2007). These are also, it's worth reminding, the final two pathways which Vogt identifies through which education can promote tolerance, whether understood as passive or active. To maintain that the nurturing of faith should not therefore be an educational task, and that cultivating children's capacity and inclination for critical thinking however should be, is to miss that these two goals are not necessarily mutually exclusive, in fact quite the opposite. Such nurturing can in fact be a professional and pedagogical aid to such cultivation when 'nurturing' is understood as being of a particular kind, what I have termed 'passing' (see

p100). In this section then I wish to flip any concerns around indoctrination on their head and show how the religious passing approach to educational aims can in fact have pedagogical advantages over community schools (and also the engaging approach) in developing their students' capacity and inclination for critical thinking. More than this however, I wish to also demonstrate a further way in which the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' misses how a concern for religious education taught primarily through a single faith can also have professional and pedagogical benefits for developing in their pupils lasting motivational value frameworks, or 'thick identities' (Schweitzer, 2007)

7.4.1 Critical Thinking

Developing pupil's capacity for critical thinking and reasoning is, according to Vogt, the most likely mediating link between the association of education and tolerance, being an indirect way in which education affects more tolerant attitudes and outlooks (see p.68). Religious education is also the only formal curriculum area in which the state has chosen to opt out of its responsibility for those school types which have a religious affiliation in law (Gardner and Cairns, 2005), and in St Anthony's and Sacred Heart the religious education curriculum was the key vehicle through which the religious beliefs of the schools' tradition were 'passed' on. Both St Anthony's and Sacred Heart were Roman Catholic schools, and Roman Catholic schools, in particular, are often the unfortunate targets of misconceptions bound to pervasive and often resilient historical images and prejudices (Grace, 2002, 2006). Many an external observer will believe that religious education in a Roman Catholic school is a strong process of 'indoctrination', of imprinting upon the mind of its pupils a strong and unquestioning emotional commitment to dogma and catechism (Grace, 2002). Misconceptions around religious education in a Roman Catholic school were also touched upon by interviewees in both of the religious passing schools;

'*I think the assumption is of people when they talk of Catholic schools is that we only think about Catholicism and that's simply not the case. You know, we're not kind of, kind of papist, sort of doctrinal dogma you know, it's well beyond that*' (PDC and Citizenship Teacher, Sacred Heart).

The religious education teacher at St Anthony's had recently attended an inset day on teaching world faiths and similarly remarked upon the often held misconceptions about religious education in a Roman Catholic school;

'...*we had a guy called Dr Bob Bowie who's from Canterbury, and because we haven't had any inset days for quite a while on teaching other world faiths, I thought it was really important that we did. So he came and talked about Islam in particular but not particularly 'here are some resources for teaching Islam' but that idea of an encounter with people from other faiths and the kind of attitudes towards other faiths, and other faiths and other school's attitudes towards what they think Catholic schools are up to; which by and large was 'do you do any world faiths, we're amazed that you do. We think you spend most of your time indoctrinating children'. So there was a lot of kind of myth busting around that...*'

Importantly and fundamentally, a concern for 'religious socialisation as the transmission of faith' does not preclude the possibility of critical RE as opposed to formative RE only, or teaching only 'about' rather than 'how' (for more detail on the former distinction see Astley 1994, see also p.68). It does not preclude the possibility of a religious education which critically scrutinizes and examines the beliefs and values of the religious tradition of the school's sponsor, and one which develops pupils' skills and capacity for critical reflection. Nor does it preclude the possibility of a religious education which gives pupils the intellectual tools to scrutinise and reflect upon appropriate evidence in order to come to their own personal position on different kinds of truth claims. The importance of encouraging critical thinking and autonomy was emphasised by the passing school's DDE, that, although rooted in the teachings of the Catholic Church, religious education should be governed by the same educational principles which apply to other areas of the curriculum; even though this might mean pupils not just questioning their faith but rejecting faith altogether as a result of children's development as autonomous individuals;

'(critical thinking is) *absolutely essential, and we absolutely, and again, probably more at secondary, that, what we want is that our students question what we're doing. I never wanted my students to be conforming and quiet and wouldn't question. We expected it... and we particularly expected our RE teachers to be making that challenge, intellectual enquiry, and many of our children went completely away from*

faith, they didn't believe it, didn't want to be there; fine, we'll deal with that, we'll cope with it and we'll respect it and understand it... students must make up their own minds, you can't indoctrinate people into... into what their faith is to be...'

The religious passing approach to single faith schooling as described in Chapter 5 (see p.102, pp.103-104) can be captured as 'critical enquiry with roots', or an educational climate which expected critical discussion, reflection and inquiry, of both the faith tradition of the school's sponsor, as well as aspects of contemporary society such as materialism and individualism. At St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, reason, argument and doubt played an essential role, and they were schools where any charge of indoctrination would be baseless. The essential integral feature therefore of the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart was the sustained critical intellectual inquiry and reflection which was encouraged and expected of students.

Developing their student's capacity to critically reflect upon beliefs and values, and to challenge what they were being told was especially emphasised in staff interviews at St Anthony's. Although firmly rooted in the school's faith tradition the educational aim was just as firmly to develop in their pupils the intellectual tools to engage and reflect critically, and in the light of such engagement and reflection to come to their own personal position on different beliefs and values; to decide for themselves what is to count as the good life for them;

'I would be wasting my time if I didn't make the kids think; and if they didn't come out more religiously literate than when they came in, if they just accepted things at face value, that's not education at all, that's just indoctrination... and even if it's not for Catholicism, but for themselves, for their fully worked out in conscious... having been exposed to, taught, you know, the tradition of the church and how, how Catholics do things and how we try to respond to God and other people and the world. If they can't, if they come out and they can't say much about their faith then I think I've kind of failed, we've collectively failed as a school' (Head RE, St. Anthony's)

In this, the religious passing approach to religious education shared a core aim with the religious engaging approach, and so too community schools it should also be added;

...one of the key tasks of RS is to encourage critical thinking and analytical thinking really. You know, I think this but why do I think it, and that's the kind of progression I'd like to, I like to see from year seven right through... my first kind of speaky bit, my first speech is 'I'm not here to tell you what to believe', you know, my job is to make you, is to try and engage your thinking' (Religious Education Teacher, All Saints).

As outlined in Chapter 5, though the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart had a concern for religious education taught primarily through the school's religious tradition, it did not desire nor seek any such simple or didactic sounding transmission of the beliefs of its sponsor as 'presenting a religion as if it is true' (see quote from Halstead and McLaughlin on p.53). To simply present a particular religion as being prima facie 'true' or certain (together with the concomitant assertion that others are false), with no further engagement, scrutiny or debate (and when the truth of which cannot be ascertained), would be to undermine the integrity and autonomy of the individual pupil and for many would count as a strong form of indoctrination (Pring, 2005; see also pp.66-68). Rather the school's religious passing approach to religious education was a 'super' critical examination of the school's tradition (see p.104). This super critical approach may also be an important way in which the religious passing approach can affect their pupil's purposeful (religious) identity development. Much curricula which promotes the development of critical thinking and reasoning, and therefore tolerance indirectly, such as '*open discussion, cooperative work and educational self-direction*' (Vogt 1997, p.22), will be common to different school types and certainly not unique to St Anthony's or Sacred Heart. However, though the religious engaging approach of All Saints offered extra-curricular opportunities for further 'engagement' with the stories and narratives of the school's faith tradition, it is an open question to what extent these opportunities for engagement were taken up by pupils within the school; particularly amongst those children for whom there was little or no congruence between the cultural and Christian values of the school, and those of the home. More fundamentally still, these extracurricular opportunities will unlikely be the authoritative, cognitively demanding engagement of the religious passing approach to religious education.

Beyond a religious passing school, implementation of a similarly 'super critical' and authoritative religious education approach in a community school, as well as a religious engagement school, would pose significant educational as well as practical challenges which would require great skill as well as sensitivity. In a multi religious and cultural context in

particular, community schools must adopt a form of (religious) '*neutrality with respect to significantly controversial matters, either by attempting to illuminate different perspectives for discussion or remaining silent about, or underplaying, points of controversy*' (Halstead and McLaughlin 2005, p.70). Satisfying neutrality therefore, would require that community schools examine the nature and limits of at least several of the five main celebrated religions in the UK to a similar degree. To examine each however in a 'super critical' fashion would place significant practical and professional demands upon staff to not just schedule sufficient time and space in the curriculum, but also have the sufficient depth of knowledge, skill and confidence to critically examine the UK's major religious traditions. In the religious passing school however, it will only be necessary to critically engage to such an extent with the school's own faith tradition. The religious passing approach will also likely entail a requirement, as was the case in St Anthony's and Sacred Heart, that the religious education teacher is a practising member of the school's faith tradition; and therefore also more likely to be confident and competent in 'super critically' passing this on, and 'super critically' reflecting upon the nature and limits of the school's tradition (see also Everett 2013).

A further point is whether the religious passing approach to religious education (taught primarily through the school's tradition) also helped to avoid encouraging a strong form of relativism or tendency to reduce all religious expressions to their lowest common denominator. This may be in contrast to a more 'neutral-ised' religious education which emphasizes objectivity and neutrality, or a more dispassionate phenomenological or 'learning about' approach to religious education (Cooling, 2010; see also Mason, 1997, Vermeer, 2009). The religious passing schools themselves felt that their concern for religious education taught primarily through the faith tradition of the school was advantageous, both for affording added opportunities for the development of critical thinking and reasoning skills, and also for helping to avoid children becoming relativistic towards different faiths;

... I think it must be terribly hard teaching RE... not in a church school, it's gonna be a completely different experience... kinda of say, yeah, well we're alright aren't we, we've all got an opinion, and kids do not like that, they don't like the uncertainty of 'there's seven billion people on the planet, there's seven billion answers', well that's no good is it, that's not, that's not what they're looking for. There might be a variety of views and they're quite happy to kind of accept that you're coming from a different one, but they want, they want there to be certain viewpoints as just opposed to a myriad, cos

otherwise your just wasting your time really, you could talk about anything, what's your favourite colour, doesn't mean anything does it... I suppose community schools, the RE there kind of teaches you to be a jack of all trades and the master of none and you end up just with a, a confused mishmash of ideas as opposed to a fairly certain idea about a particular religion, but which then gives you the apparatus, whatever you wanna call it… to think about the others, that's not to say that we don't look at the others, but we certainly don't look in… as great a depth as we do Christianity or Catholicism (Head RE St Anthony's).

Learning that all religions are as equally valuable as each other and that there is no absolute truth, only truth which is relative to different languages, cultures and perceptions, could reinforce a number of values integral to community cohesion (particularly tolerance, at least in the public domain, where privileging one particular faith or worldview at the expense of another should be avoided; see also Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005). However, it may also relativize student's religious identities and undermine the distinctiveness and integrity of individual faith, leaving children questioning and relativistic about many moral issues (Grace, 2002). Such an approach may encourage a form of religious indifference and 'indifferent unbelief', where children are left feeling that there is no point taking any faith or worldview seriously in such a market place with competing offers, with no objective resource to judge between them. The issue was also touched upon in conversation with the religious education teacher at All Saints;

'*When you're trying to present all these different faiths and all these different ideas, is it hard not to slip into relativism*?' (BC)

'*I suppose it is yeah, I suppose it is quite, quite hard, I mean I find it quite, a little umm, what's the word I'm looking for, yeah... I see it as just giving them a broad base to think about and look at it from, and hopefully change their mind about some preconceived ideas liked we talked about before, particularly around, around Islam and around Christianity as well*' (Religious Education Teacher, All Saints).

This is not to denigrate in any way the religious education taught in other schools, only to suggest that they may in fact face the harder educational and critical task of trying to avoid

any slide from neutrality into a strong form of indifference, which would undermine the significance of faith and the development of 'thick' religious identities in individual children.

Importantly the 'super' critical reflection of the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart does not preclude the possibility of full identification as its outcome however, and '*as a result of critical reflection upon a group and its fundamental values a person may come to treat these values as hers...*' (Mason 2000, p.58). The point at which pupils begin to question their familial culture of upbringing, that is to say 'ooh' (see p.170), is what Hardimon calls the 'the moment of alienation internal to reflection', reaching this moment is key to being autonomous agents and making an informed choice on the important question of whether one should endorse, modify, or reject their family's values and beliefs (1994, cited in Mason 2000). Endorsement is therefore not precluded by critical reflection and children may exercise their autonomy, skills and capacity for critical thinking, to overcome the moment and fully identify with a group and endorse its substantive values and beliefs; thereby overcoming '*the moment of alienation internal to reflection without abandoning reflection*' (ibid. p.58). Inherent in this understanding is that it in fact helps to clarify and strengthen one's views by questioning them and reflecting critically upon just who one thinks one is. In this way the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart can make a further significant and positive contribution to the task of identity formation; that is, 'thick identities' for 'thick tolerance'. This is a further way in which the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' misses how a concern for religious education taught primarily through and from the perspective of the school's religious tradition can in fact benefit cohesion.

7.4.2 'Thick Identities' and the 'Need for Roots'

'*To function effectively*', Gardner argues, '*people require a set of ideas which occupy a position of some permanence*' (1988, p.97). This set of ideas is part of a person's 'roots', and to be 'rooted', as Simone Weil reminds us, '*is perhaps the most important and least recognised need of the human soul*'; and 'uprootedness' is '*by far the most dangerous malady to which human societies are exposed... Whoever is uprooted himself uproots others. Whoever is rooted himself doesn't uproot others*' (2005, p.40 & pp.44-45). 'Roots' may well be the only road that leads to 'the other', that being confident in and of one's self-identity is necessary for tolerance and respect, and the ability to live alongside different groups. As

Engebretson argues, '*to claim one's identity truthfully and passionately is never a barrier to empathetic listening to, dialogue with and entering into relationships with the other. Indeed, it can be argued that it is a first necessary step*' (2008, p.152). Conversely, in modern liberal societies where life has perhaps lost many of its old moorings and where there has been a decline in both *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* (Tonnies, 2003; see also previous chapter), the greatest threat to children, as Galston comments, '*is not that they will believe in something too deeply, but they will believe in nothing very deeply at all*' (1989, p.101). Research in the UK by McKenna et al shows the value of the affirmation and development of student's own beliefs and identities, '*indicating that those more secure in their own positions are more able to appreciate better the views and commitments of others*' (2009, p.68). A survey of 421 students from sixteen secondary schools across England found that those who identified with a religion or worldview were significantly more likely to agree that 'respecting the religion of others helps to cope with differences' (21% strongly agreed, 44% agreed) and to disagree with 'I don't like people from other religions and do not want to live together with them' (51% strongly disagreed, 26% disagreed).

The enhancement of 'identity construction processes' and formation of an authentic personal identity, though not easily measured in any hard and fast way, may therefore nonetheless be considered a major pedagogical task (Yablon, 2010). Fostering the formation of a personal identity entails the transmission of cultural elements and both a religious engagement and passing school can provide an important symbolic, cultural and communal architecture for the exploration and reaffirmation of their student's faith identities at a time when wider modern society is oft said to be afflicted with a 'permanent identity crisis' (Levin, 2005; see also Flint 2007; Vermeer, 2009). The religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Hart can especially help those children brought up in the same religious tradition as the school to explore their own faith and identity in greater depth;

'*For the Roman catholic students, what are the ways the schools tries to help their identity or their attachment to Catholicism and the Catholic community*' (BC).

'*I guess it's in the worshiping traditions, it's in the actions of the particular areas of social concern that we would be interested in and, you know, working for CAFOD as opposed to Oxfam… I think by sharing the richness of the tradition is important, by hopefully being role models, by offering them times of prayer, by taking them away on*

retreat; by their first visit out when they're in year seven, going down to the Cathedral in Portsmouth' (Assistant Head Teacher St. Anthony's)*.*

Parents may often specifically wish to send their children to a school with a religious character precisely because they desire their children to share their own identity. Parents may feel that such schools are an environment in which their children's beliefs and identities will be more firmly cemented into their inherited framework; and where therefore they will develop a more confident sense of self-identity. Conversely, it could be that without a secure and stable environment where the cultural values of the school are broadly congruent with the cultural values which informed their upbringing at home, young people could become more confused about their own (religious) identity, which may undermine young people's self-esteem and fragile sense of self (MacMullen, 2007). This was a theme picked up upon by a student in the focus group at St. Anthony's;

'*In like another school you might get bullied if you said you were a Christian... when you do it's like it lowers your self-esteem and stuff, so it's not good.'* (Hollie, St Anthony's)

Being 'tolerant' is understood to be important in societies marked by cultural and religious diversity, and tolerance can be understood as either being something which is 'passive' or 'active' (see p.37). My point here would be however, that whatever the theoretical grounds upon which the differing meanings of tolerance are debated, whether one is an 'indifferent passive' tolerator or 'energetically active' tolerator, before one can be either one or the other one firsts needs to be a person who possesses a framework of motivational values which provides the basis for either passive resignation/indifference or active appreciation/engagement. If community cohesion therefore is about '*building a more tolerant, more understanding and a fair and transparent society...*'(DCSF 2009, p.6), however tolerance is understood, there is a sense in which being a tolerant person implies being someone who is in fact confident in their own beliefs and values. This is what Schweitzer terms 'thick' identities, and the development of thick identities is important for inculcating 'thick' tolerance, tolerance that '*will stand the test of conflicting convictions*' (2007, p.98). Both the religious engaging approach and religious passing approach in fact share a relevant key qualitative distinction from community schools in this regard. This is what Grace terms the '*legitimation context*' (2002), wherein the ultimate source of authority

and justification for the personal and social values articulated by the schools could in effect be summed up (as the principal of All Saints expressed to me) by '*because God says so*'. In this way, all three schools could '*invest their community and social aims not only with a secular legitimation (arising from national and local policies) but also with a religious and sacred legitimation*' (Grace 2002, p.133). In this regard therefore, it can be argued that these schools have additional, doctrinal resources to draw upon from within their religious tradition, which are unavailable to community schools which must instead rely upon '*those reason that are acceptable to us all*' (MacMullen p.35, 2007; see also Strike, 1996). This was most succinctly expressed by All Saints' school Chaplain;

> '*I think there's probably more, there's a path, if you've got a religious tradition, there's a pathway of doing that isn't there* (fostering tolerant attitudes)*, where I think if you don't have that it becomes more citizenship, your responsibilities, as you say a civic minded individual; but motivation for a Christian would be their, not only to other people, but service to God as well, you know, it's part of your loving god and loving your neighbour isn't it. I think the motives are different, yeah.*'

These additional 'sacred' resources may not just buttress the schools value base, sense of purpose and mission, but where these values are not 'distinctive and non-common' (as shown above), rather than disserving cohesion they can instead help promote and support unifying attitudes and values essential to preparing children for citizenship and life in a diverse and multicultural society; and help build, maintain and safeguard community cohesion (Billings and Holden, 2008). Specifically, a distinctive contribution which the engaging approach of All Saints and the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart are able to make to citizenship and life in a multicultural and multi-faith society, lies in their being (potentially) more effective at fostering tolerant attitudes in their pupils by being able to go beyond the limited and 'thin' impersonal rule that everybody should be tolerant, by using the foundational faith of the school as a resource for 'thick' tolerance (Schweitzer, 2007). The development of 'thick' identities for 'thick tolerance' maybe as important as being educated alongside children from different faiths and worldviews, and this, as MacMullen reminds us '*is something that faith schools are well placed to provide*' (2005, p.70). St Anthony's and Sacred Heart's concern for religious education taught primarily through the school's faith tradition could especially support the development of thick identities by appropriating the faith of the school's tradition in such a way that it can become

a resource for thick tolerance, that is, a stable and enduring underlying basis upon which a person acts (Schweitzer, 2007; see also Vogt, 1997).

At St Antony's the school's faith tradition's roots of respect and valuing diversity were used in this way, the parable of the Good Samaritan for instance being used as a model for equality of individuals and respect, and welcoming difference, treating strangers as one would hope they would treat you in similar circumstances;

'*I guess the story that they hear a lot here is about, is about respect because I think children themselves are very, they want to know that they're respected and are quite keen for that value to be espoused even when they don't respect other people, even when they get it wrong, so you know, it's your kind of good Samaritan, it's those parables, its literally those parables... as stories that we come back to time and again which are about respect and valuing and being different, but all made in God's image and it not mattering ultimately...*'* (Head of RE St Antony's; see also p184).

In this way, for the classroom educator in St Anthony's, the school's faith tradition could become operative as a resource for thick identities and thick tolerance, rather than the relativizing of religious identities, which a more neutral and detached approach to religious education might encourage. The strength of this approach, as Schweitzer argues, is that by clarifying and strengthening the motives for tolerance inherent in the tradition of the school's faith tradition, by deepening children's (religious) identities, and encouraging them to consider these motives for tolerance when considering their relationships with others, the school is not trying to add something to, or supersede, the school's faith tradition (2007; see also Schwöbel, 2002, cited in Schweitzer, 2007). Rather than trying to make people tolerant by trying to force them into tolerant attitudes, the schools make '*use of existing convictions and is not dependent on the difficult task of creating a completely new set of convictions or beliefs*' (ibid, p.96). Related research by Yablon has similarly argued how religious values and thinking can serve as a more committed basis for intergroup dialogue and peace, and that religious reasoning can serve as an effective strategy for enhancing positive intergroup relations (2010; see also Silberman, Higgins, and Dweck, 2005; cited in Yablon, 2010).

My supposition would be, as indicated above, that all of this would be demonstrably more the case in the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart than the engaging approach of All Saints, as their distinctive purpose and ethos was more explicitly informed by

the school's faith tradition. Sacred Heart and St Anthony's also displayed a greater congruence with the cultural values which informed pupils' upbringing at home. The religious engaging approach of All Saints, in common with community schools, may therefore more often face the harder task in developing thick identities and tolerance due to being a broader church, and the difficulty inherent in trying to create a new set of convictions or beliefs rather than building upon existing convictions. It would seem intuitive to conclude that a religious passing approach to educational environments and aims will more often be able to build upon and deepen existing convictions, not least because of this greater congruence between home and school. This greater congruence was alluded to by one of the students in the focus group at Sacred Heart;

'*I do feel like the lesson, not the actual lessons are different* (to a community school) *but kind of more the respect and attitude, like this being a catholic school most people in here are either Christian or Catholic so we have like quite a lot of respect, like we've grown up to be respectful and like loving… we're more respectful to our teachers, where is you might, might find in a community school they're a bit more kind of loud and less respectful*' (Richard)

Interviewees in the three schools also showed how religious education teachers in St Anthony's and Sacred Heart viewed their personal beliefs having a more positive utility than the religious education teacher at All Saints, seeing this as a professional resource rather than something to be suppressed (Cooling, 2010). Consistent with the difference in the respective schools mission or 'strength of fibres', the religious education teacher at All Saints felt, though it was easier to discuss his faith openly, that he would not, nor should he, bring this into the classroom. This is consistent with research which found that Christian student teachers felt more, in contrast to atheist student teachers, that they should be neutral and not reveal their own beliefs (Revell and Walters, 2010, cited in Cooling, 2010);

'*I think one* (difference between working in a community school and working in All Saints)... *I'm a lot more relaxed about speaking about faith, it makes it a lot easier, obviously I don't talk about it in the, in the classroom cos, you know, abuse of power and all the rest of it, but certainly outside, and you know all the kids would know that*' (RE teacher, All Saints).

The religious education teacher at St. Anthony's however felt comfortable being open about his own beliefs and sharing these with the children, though in a cooperative manner which respected children's emotional autonomy and integrity, and felt the children valued the authenticity of this:

 '...we can as talk as teachers, as Catholic RE teachers about our own experiences and that we can say, you know, this happened to me, this happened to a person I knew, this is how I dealt with it you know, it might not have been the best way to deal it with it but it was the answer, and I think we are completely at liberty and always do share where it's appropriate, share those experiences, and I think the children, I don't wanna claim too much from it, but I think that they can see that is an authentic response to a human question as opposed to a 'well this is what it says in the text book or, I don't know'. I think it's that personal connection that you have with children and, and to be able to speak of, of your faith and your experience... (Religious Education Teacher, St. Anthony's).

The difficult (but also admirable) task of trying to create a new set of convictions or beliefs, rather than building upon existing convictions, was also touched upon in discussion with the Citizenship and PSHE teacher at All Saints;

'*...it's about giving them a good set of moral values to live their life's by, but that is just as difficult because their moral, their value set will come from home if there's no tolerance at home either for different races or different genders or different sexualities or whatever, that's really hard cos you're actually undermining their parents…*

…there's no point preaching to the converted... if you're just simply reinforcing what they already know, then what are you gaining for the children that haven't got it, the children that haven't got any idea of identity or self-worth. Because I think that's the key thing, it's not, it's not just about tolerating other people but it's knowing that you've got an identity and you've got self-worth and who you are is valued cos we are very good at saying other people are just as, you know, are valued, and other people, other religions are valued, but actually you're valued as a person. It's you that's special, and I think that's one thing that we've got to maybe focus on a little bit more with some of our young people cos they get the thing about they've got to be, they can't

be racist, and they can't be because they don't get the importance of who they are…
they know what's right and wrong but they've not got the self-worth there to use it I
think'.

The benefit in 'preaching to the converted' I have tried to show, lies in the faith tradition of the school becoming operative as a resource for thick identities and thick tolerance, something which would in practice not be feasible in a school where there wasn't a significant degree of congruence between home and school. In this the passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart supports a pre-existing development for many of its pupils and has a not insignificant advantage therefore in the development of 'thick identities'. Adopting the educational approach of the religious passing school in a religious engagement or secular community school would I suspect face significant professional and practical difficulties, with both these schools' approaches to education more often facing the harder job of balancing a desire for a more neutral and balanced approach to religious education on the one hand, and avoiding relativizing identities on the other. Trying to create a new set of convictions or beliefs for pupils is the more difficult educational task than building upon existing convictions, particularly when pupils' external social and cultural milieu is inimical to many of the schools' generated ideals (Grace, 2002). Although in this endeavour the engagement school sets itself not just the harder, but many would say also the more admirable and beneficent task.

A final short and not unrelated point is to emphasise the value of religious education lessons per se, particularly for identity and character development. The research in Holland by Bertram-Troost and colleagues further found that the degree to which pupils appreciated religious education lessons the more they indicated that they learnt at school to talk about their own world view (2009, see also p.61-62). Similarly, the research by McKenna et al. also found that a majority of students felt that religious education lessons '*helped them to understand themselves better, develop their own views and make moral choices better*' (2009, p.62). The importance of religious education lessons was emphasised by all three schools, particularly the religious education teacher at St Anthony's where religious education played a major role in the school's mission and purpose;

'*That just, that beggars belief, that whole idea that, you know, that it's* (RE) *not in the EBACC*; if you look at the skills comparing, and I wouldn't want to do down any other subject, you compare RE and geography, there's, there's kind of a no brainer as to*

which one is gonna make you think harder, evaluate all sorts of different points of view, has a definite body of knowledge, is gonna make you more aware of the culture that you live in, and, and so on. It's just absolutely, it is unbelievable, that it's not, it isn't in there... RE is much more important, it's much more important for them as human beings, in, 21st century, you know, Britain.' (Assistant Head St Anthony) * Then education secretary Michael Gove's proposal to scrap GCSEs in favour of an English Baccalaureate Certificate was subsequently scrapped in February 2013

7.5 Conclusions

Above I have endeavoured to demonstrate that the problematization of 'distinctive educational aims' would be inappropriate in the context of a religious engaging approach and also religious passing approach. Due in the latter case to its pedagogy, learning frameworks and normative school climate, which understands and values the dialogical and plural nature of identity and respects children's conscience and emotional autonomy. Above I have also demonstrated that the passing and engaging approach foster a basic and uncommon set of accepting personal and social values which pupils were expected to live out in their behaviour and their behaviour towards others. More than this however, I have also given indications how a concern for religious education taught primarily through a particular faith tradition can in fact (potentially) be an aid to cohesion by developing pupils' skills and capacity for critical thinking and reflection, and also 'thick identities' for 'thick tolerance'.

Though deeper and more nuanced research on how the different school types, and in particular their religious education, influences the religious commitments and also social identities more broadly of their pupils is needed; the conclusion of this chapter is that (whatever small influence relative to the influence of home and parents which schools have) the religious passing approach to educational aims can provide pupils with 'thick resources' of a contra-relativist kind to support the development of more secure and also more tolerant identities, and help students find personally satisfying and committed answers to questions such as 'who am I', and 'who will I be in the future' (Vermeer, 2009). By not just presenting to students the distinctive moral perspective of the school's religious tradition, but going beyond this, not just with an invitation to '*dialogue and encounter*' (Maritain, 1962, p.54), but an expectation, indeed requirement, of critical enquiry and reflection, the religious passing school can perform the dual role of supporting the development of 'thick' identities

and at the same time give people positive attitudes towards those who have different identities. That is, a 'thick' framework of motivational values which provides the basis for not just passive resignation or indifference, but my supposition would be for an active appreciation of and engagement with the fact of society's differing ethnicities, cultural beliefs, sexual orientations, genders, and religions; that is, active tolerance as reflected in the student comments above and in the previous chapter.

Far from being 'indoctrinatory' and inimical to '*tolerance and respect and the ability to live alongside groups with different cultural values*' (Halstead, 1995, p.269), the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart to educational aims, the school's concern for religious education (super) critically taught through the school's faith tradition, and its dialogical and plural understanding of identity, can in fact help provide one of the '*necessary bases of autonomy by making possible the kinds of secure identity which are required for effective agency*' (Mason 2000, p.162; see also McLaughlin, 1996, Thiessen, 1993). Moreover, this approach can strengthen identity in a way that fosters the kind of self-confidence which allows pupils to be more open to the other. In this way the religious passing approach of St Anthony's and Sacred Heart to both educational environments and educational aims can be understood and utilised as a pedagogical method, a resource for thick identities and thick tolerance. The religious engaging approach of All Saints conversely, lacking the high degree of congruence between home and school that St Anthony's and Sacred Heart had, and generally faced with a need to adopt a more neutral approach to religion and worldview, also consequently faced the harder educational task (though many would also say the more admirable one too), of trying to create a new set of convictions or beliefs for pupils rather than being able to build upon existing convictions.

Chapter 8

Final Conclusions and Summary

'*If Britain is to become a tolerant and cohesive society, it will be necessary to recognise that the debate surrounding faith schools is a distraction. There is no reason to believe that they are inevitably divisive – in a socially destructive sense – as the long history of Anglican, Catholic and Jewish schools in England clearly demonstrates*' (Short, 2002, p. 570).

8.1 Introduction

This research has asked the question, and entered into the debate, what is, and can be, the contribution of schools with a religious character to the cohesion agenda, and the above quote seems an appropriate place to begin this final chapter. The research has explored this debate through two different issues, 'restricted non-common educational environments' and 'distinctive non-common educational aims'. These straddle concerns that schools with a religious character encourage the development of 'parallel lives' and divisive attitudes and identities based on narrow religious commitments. This research therefore can be seen as having provided some much-needed and also timely empirical research with closely interwoven theoretical analysis and elaboration, of two different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims; and their potential benefits for students' personal and social identity development, and wider consequences for cohesion. In this way the research has generated a theoretical framework, grounded in empirical research, which advances understanding and enables further research to be taken further.

In the remainder of this final chapter I will summarise the main research findings and theoretical claims that I have made, and their wider implications for cohesion. The chapter will then reflect upon the contribution of this research before finally highlighting important areas for future research.

8.2 Main Research Summary

The purpose of this research was to define institutionally important and policy relevant models of faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims. The research has emphasised the fact of the differences and distinguishing features of the different schools which have formal links to religious organizations and which are currently publicly funded; and that writing or speaking about schools with a religious character as being a uniform approach to education or homogenous group of schools is necessarily disingenuous. Two different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims have been outlined, 'religious engaging' and 'religious passing', which have been drawn and developed from, and grounded in, the collection and analysis of the primary research. These approaches defined the interviewees, and by extension the school's itself, self-understanding of its approach, and the mission and culture of the school more broadly. Although emphasising that the distinction drawn between the different approaches should not be interpreted as an impermeable separation, the research has highlighted the different strength of different 'threads' in the two approaches which demonstrably show the validity of the distinction drawn between the different faith-based approaches. The research has also emphasised the importance and value of 'thick' identities, critical thinking, a sense of community within schools, and strong, functional, community links with the local area. These were educational advantages which the research has suggested the religious passing approach would, ceteris paribus, possess more frequently than other faith-based approaches and community schools.

Both of the faith-based approaches outlined in this research are demonstrably distinctive alternatives to community schools and schools without any formal links to religious organisation. The engaging approach, though still unambiguous about its identity and ethos, does not however place any special or extra emphasis or importance upon passing on and/or nurturing the faith of the school's religious tradition; but does offer education within a faith setting and also additional extra-curricular opportunities for further 'engagement' with faith. This occurs in a benignly tolerant environment which can and should be viewed as having no more of a string attached than a wish to simply make children aware of the beliefs and practices of the school's religious tradition. The 'religious passing' approach meanwhile will often mean also that the selection of staff and pupils is also different from community schools, where recruitment and admissions may often be based on religious criteria. A 'religious passing' approach however need not be equated with an education that is segregated or monocultural, as religious passing schools, not being limited

to catchment-area criterion, may still draw their pupils from a variety of cultural, ethnic, socio-economic and linguistic backgrounds, and can be important social spaces where young children experience many of the other members of the school as 'different' in some important sense and find the task of bridging, and a commitment reciprocity, as both important and challenging.

The research has also highlighted that religious homogeneity is difficult in practise to qualify. Religion is inherently diverse and debate and differences of opinion and understandings on many theological and doctrinal points characterise the major religions of the world. Each has within it different ways of relating to and living its traditions and identity, and can provide a context for the practice of the social skills required for deliberation, mediation and conflict resolution in a wider world full of differences. Though students at religious passing schools may experience this diversity within moderately narrow (religious) limits, this may provide them with not just experience of diversity and difference, but may further provide a lived experience of a context within which an internal diversity can be held together in some unity and an integrated contra-individualistic community life.

This research has further argued that the educational and cultural experiences offered to students by the 'passing' approach may in fact (potentially) be an ideal site for coming to terms with difference and an open acceptance of diversity. Though the use of faith-based selection criteria in oversubscribed religious passing schools can potentially indirectly privilege pupils from higher socio-economic backgrounds, the research has emphasized that any degree of socio-economic filtering would not be intrinsic to the concept of either the religious passing school, or indeed engagement school, and would be incidental and likely caused by complex and multiple causal factors (Allen and West, 2013; Oldfield et al, 2013). This therefore, would not justify abolishing a whole category of schools with a religious character. As stated at various points during the research, in the absence of school level information about applications to schools and offers received by parents and their characteristics, no conclusive link can be established between admissions criteria and school composition.

The research has further shown how the religious passing approach understands and values the dialogical and plural nature of identity, and respects children's conscience and emotional autonomy to take what they wish to from assemblies and worship, and also participate to the degree to which they personally feel comfortable with . The passing approach entails showing respectful understanding to all children in the school, including

those who are not from families of the school's religious tradition. The 'passing' approach does not seek to evangelise but rather advocates individuality and individual choice, and the knowledge, understanding and skills for individuals to recognise that they have the capacity through critical reflection to come to their own conclusions about whether a religious outlook on life has meaning or purpose for them. The passing approach therefore would not encourage the development of 'dominant group-based identities' and would not intend, nor desire, to impose a religious identity on their students, or obedience and ritualistic pursuit of religious duties.

This research has also emphasised how a concern for religious education taught primarily through a particular religious tradition can in fact (potentially) be an aid to cohesion by firstly developing pupils' skills and capacity for critical thinking and reflection, and secondly by operationalising the faith of the school's sponsor as a resource for 'thick identities' for 'thick tolerance'. The research has shown how the passing approach advocates cultivating the habit and skills of reason, argument and critical openness, and a critical relationship with the faith of the school's sponsor (as well as with the wider contemporary culture and values of society). The passing approach encourages children to question their faith, and considers this a not undesirable result of their developing as autonomous persons. Faith is presented as a choice, as permeable, and students are expected to reflect critically upon their beliefs, and the nature and limits of what the school was 'passing' on. By emphasizing religious values inherent in the school's religious tradition which support cohesion, the passing approach can also go beyond the more limited and impersonal rule that everybody should be tolerant for reasons which are acceptable to all.

Though the 'engaging approach will more often face the more difficult, but also perhaps more admirable, task of trying to create a new set of convictions or beliefs; for children from families of the school's sponsor, the passing approach can support a pre-existing development and have a not insignificant advantage therefore in the development of 'thick identities' and providing values and enduring effective motives for appreciating differences between people, and the need to accept these. The supposition of this research has been that this 'thick' framework of motivational values would provide the basis for not just passive tolerance, but for an active appreciation of and engagement with the fact of the religious, cultural, ethnic and social plurality of the world around them. This was reflected in the student comments from the focus groups. Analysis of the student survey and focus groups were also consistent with the school's commitment to and understanding of identity as

permeable, dialogical and plural, and showed that the identities of the respondents were differentiated along different meaningful social dimensions. Finally however, results from the survey of final year students in each of the three schools showed something of the limitations of the influence of the school vis-à-vis other potential influences such as home and parents. A final and enduring point this research would wish to make therefore is that it is important to at once neither underestimate nor overestimate the actual influence exerted by the school and education upon the personal and social moral formation of its pupils.

8.3 Research Contribution

An assumption of this thesis has been that for the foreseeable future schools with a religious character will continue to contribute to a more diverse school system and greater opportunities for parental choice. It would be churlish to conclude however, that given this assumption there is no further need to engage in debate and research about different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims. Schools with a religious character are an easy target for those with fears about cohesion and wider concerns about the place of faith in the purposes of education and educational experience. The British Humanist Association and the National Secular society continually question the legitimacy of schools with a religious character and their place in the overall provision of education nationally. As has been stated at various points in this research, despite being a widely and hotly debated topic it is rare for any discussion to go much beyond claim and counter-claim. Limited knowledge grounded at best in theory, or at worst upon an intellectual prejudice and bias, are recurrent themes in critical arguments surrounding schools with a religious character. Examples of mainstream educational study and research which attempt to define and categorise different faith-based approaches to education, and their potential wider consequences for cohesion are also rare; particularly research which has both a strong theoretical basis and empirical underpinning.

This research has demonstrated the validity of two different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims which are very likely to be generalizable and relevant to the wider population of autonomous schools with a religious character (Mason, 1996). The research has therefore begun to narrow the research focus and agenda by highlighting and increasing understanding of those structural aspects of school's educational environment and aims which may promote or retard cohesion. Though the research does not provide

categorical truths about these school types, the research nonetheless has a wider resonance beyond its particular empirical parameters and is therefore generalizable, not in a statistical sense, but rather, the research is generalizable as descriptions of what any autonomous school with a religious character could do. Although as a contribution to the 'faith schools debate' this research cannot claim to have produced an exhaustive analysis of the issues, the thrust of this whole research project was to define institutionally important and policy relevant models of faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims; the research has therefore achieved its desired objective.

I see this research as providing a mechanism for enabling greater understanding and a new kind of evidence-based discussion of the nature of the school's educational environments and aims to be taken further. This opens the way for faith school providers to define the purpose of the education they provide, and how this impacts upon admissions procedures, curriculum content, and the ethos of the school more widely; and how this can at once both contribute to cohesion and promote educational environments and aims that are relevant to their faith communities more clearly. This research would not support those who maintain that the educational environments or aims of schools with a religious character necessarily have a detrimental effect upon cohesion. In a reversal therefore of the main criticisms of schools with a religious character, this research has argued that in practise there are faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims which can be the foundation of institutional forms which support values and social identities essential to cohesion in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies. Concerns around 'restricted non-common educational environments' and in particular, 'distinctive non-common aims', would be rendered baseless by either a 'passing' or 'engaging' approach. The accusation that schools with a religious character disserve cohesion is unjustifiable therefore when stated in a general way. In conclusion, single faith schools can challenge the argument that they disserve cohesion by adopting a more 'engaging' or 'passing' approach, and the insights gained from this research can be developed by educators and voluntary providers to consider the differences between their educational environments and aims, and look for common ground and purpose (Barker and Anderson, 2005).

Dichotomous categorisations of schools into faith and non-faith, and any simplistic determinism, such as community schools can promote cohesion and schools with a religious character cannot, are unhelpful and disingenuous; so too hegemonic perceptions of schools with a religious character. As the purposes of education and how these are to be seen in the

light of faith become increasingly more questioned and debated therefore, this research can be seen as having provided some much-needed and also timely empirical research with closely interwoven theoretical analysis and elaboration, of two different faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims. In this way I believe the research can be seen as having generated a theoretical framework, grounded in empirical research, which categorises faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims, and which can refocus debate and discussion around what faith-based approaches have to offer in terms of promoting values, critical thinking, and social identities essential to cohesion in diverse multicultural and multi-faith societies. Schools with a religious character face mounting pressures as they seek to maintain a legitimate future within the state education sector. Whilst there are many arguments which are put forward in support of continuing to fund schools with a religious character with public money, this research has outlined two forms of faith-based approaches which are defensible in terms of; 1) an exploration of the meaning and aims of education; 2) the importance of certain traditions in our understanding of what it means to be human, and 3) a defensible idea of autonomy compatible with participation in those traditions. These are where Pring advocates a justification for 'faith-based' schools should lie (2005).

As to the first of Pring's demands, both the engaging and passing approach offer an exploration of the meaning and aims of education, because one of the most important aims of both approaches is to offer a more holistic philosophy of education and development of their pupils. Both offer an approach where academic achievement is not the ultimate measure of a person, or necessarily the most important aim of education, particularly the passing approach. Both approaches emphasise the education of the whole person, and developing every aspect of the individual to their maximum potential; the social, moral, emotional and, importantly, spiritual development of people, in addition to intellectual and physical development. In regard to the second demand, both the engaging and particularly the passing approach can, as living representatives, offer students an alternative and meaningful (faith) perspective and lifestyle to (and also critique of) that of secularism, about what it means to flourish as a human being. The schools could offer a perspective more open to the sphere of ultimate meaning and purpose as a valuable and meaningful way of making sense of what it means to be a human being and to be so more fully (see also Cox, 1984, cited in Grace, 2002). The purposes of education and the schools' educational aims were rooted and could be understood within this perspective; and so too their pupil's educational and personal development. Both

approaches offer an opportunity to pupils to immerse themselves, to whatever degree they feel comfortable, in a set of values and ideals in the (faith) community of school, and find personally satisfying committed answers to questions of deep human interest, such as 'who am I', and 'who will I be in the future' (Vermeer, 2009).

This would doubtlessly not satisfy those secularists of a more 'fundamentalist' outlook (see p.24), and who believe inclusivity within a purely secular education system should be the overriding characteristic of publicly funded education. Only minimal indications of the direction a further response should take can be given here, but my counsel to such outlooks would be reflect upon and recognise that what people believe is an essential influence in human life and what it means to flourish as a human being. What people believe can be profoundly important to those whose beliefs shape their lives, and is too important to be ignored in education. If human beings are to be taken seriously their beliefs also have to be taken seriously (Keast, 2005).This was emphasised by the Roman Catholic DDE;

'…education is an important responsibility for a society, to make sure that its children and young people are educated in a wider sense… that is education about values, about things that really matter; and for people who have a religious practise that's really important that life is lived in the full context of what they believe. As adults we would expect as Christians to live our lives in accordance with our values and we want our children and young people to do the same'.

No education or educational experience can be entirely objective-neutral and ideologically free (Grace, 2002). All education has its own tacit, contestable assumptions about what values and virtues are important in life, about the human person and character development, and which provide a framework within which subjects taught are interpreted and applied (Smith and Carvill, 2000, cited in Cooling, 2010). Secular institutions can in practise be no different in their potential to indoctrinate and assimilate in favour of a particular understanding of knowledge and the human person, cast as some 'general' and incontestable 'good'. Indoctrination therefore can arrive as much from secular assumptions and dispassionate, tokenistic portrayals of religions traditions, customs and practices, as it can from tacit assumptions made by teachers about the truth of religiously based teachings (Pring, 2005). It is also certainly worth nothing here that the secular education system in France has not resolved ethnic and religious tensions (Flint, 2007). What matters most in the opinion of

the author is developing children's capacity and inclination for critical thinking and reflection, and their independence of thought. This brings us to Pring's third requirement.

Both the engaging and passing approach advocate a defensible ideal of autonomy which is compatible with participation in the religious tradition of the school's sponsor. The engaging approach does not in fact place any special or extra emphasis or importance upon passing on and/or nurturing the faith of the school's religious tradition. In comparison, in its pedagogy, learning frameworks and normative school climate, the passing approach advocates individual autonomy through the faith tradition of the school, by respecting children's conscience and emotional autonomy and advocating a 'super' critical examination of the school's tradition. This approach enables children to think for themselves and provides them with the apparatus to critically explore further systematic bodies of thought and worldviews, and find and lead their own concepts of the 'good life'. This is an approach which would pose significant, if not insurmountable, educational and practical challenges in a community school.

Though I believe this research is an important contribution to moving the faith-schools debate towards evidence-based argument and discussion, this final section will now consider important areas where further empirically grounded investigation and insight is needed.

8.4 Further Research

Based on the faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims identified in this research, future research could continue this line of investigation with deeper and more searching research to provide further empirical evidence for generalisations regarding how different approaches to educational environments and aims, both faith-based and non-faith-based, influences the religious commitments, world views, capacity for critical thinking and reasoning of their pupils; and how these by extension shape pupils' personal and also social identities, their character development, behaviors and attitudes. More research and insight too is needed into the potentially distinctive ways in which different approaches to educational environments and aims model values, and the means by which they seek to educate for values development more widely; in particular, longitudinal studies investigating whether schools (and what specific aspects) are successful in influencing the intellectual and character development of their pupils. The often subtle ways in which the ethos, as a foundation for character formation for the now and the future, permeates the curriculum will be of particular

interest. Of special interest too may be the role of, and examples set, by teachers. Key to this will be mechanisms to know and understand pupils' values, how they perceive themselves and their religious and world views. Without such mechanisms it will be difficult to assess the contribution of distinctive approaches to educational environments and aims to students' current and later attitudes and values.

Of interest too is how pupils in different schools perceive one another, and how this is related to their perceptions of their respective schools. Interviewees in all three of the secondary schools included in the primary research still felt that community schools were difficult places to be for people of faith, so too did several of the students in the focus groups. It is just as important therefore that nonreligious pupils in schools without any formal links to religious organisations respect and tolerate their religious peers as it is for cohesive attitudes to be exercised the other way round. Further research is needed into what opportunities there are in non-faith-based approaches to educational environments and aims for pupils to understand and appreciate the identities and attitudes of members of faith communities, or in what ways the normative school climate might directly or indirectly reinforce the otherness of the religious person, or devalue religious identities and beliefs.

One possible new direction for future research, though one which would go hand in hand with researching the impact of ethos upon academic attainment, is to ask what benefit there might be to children's emotional intelligence having an encounter or emersion (to whatever degree) in the history, tradition and worship of a religious tradition. Pedagogical climates, learning frameworks and whole school environments which operationalise the moral framework, symbolic life and ritual practises inherent in a religious tradition, and its possible influence upon young people's emotional intelligence, may prove a rich area for future research. This may be particularly relevant for those children who are not from religious families, who would not otherwise have any encounter with religious tradition, and for children whose family life does not provide 'a sure footing in life' (and for whom therefore, school can provide an important corrective for 'deficiencies in emotional and social competence' [Goleman, 1996]). Emotional intelligence, as Goleman explains, concerns a key set of abilities such as self-motivation, self-control, and empathy, and the arts of listening, resolving conflicts, and cooperation, which go '*hand in hand with education for character, for moral development, and for citizenship*' (p.286, 1996). The emotional lessons learnt during childhood shape our emotional circuits, and make one either more adept, or inept, at the basics of emotional intelligence (ibid.). This has clear relevance for the cohesion

agenda as cognitive control of emotion and empathy is inherent in emotional intelligence and being able to consider other's perspectives and thinking before acting upon negative thoughts and emotions is inherent in more tolerant attitudes (Vogt, 1997; see also Davies, 2008).

Goleman also stresses that emotional literacy requires an expanded mandate for schools which requires teachers going beyond their traditional missions, and people in the community becoming more involved in school (1996); these are something the 'gemeinschaft' of the passing and engaging approach are well placed to provide. As this research did not itself include any measure of emotional intelligence this serves only as a suggestion for where future research might be directed. At a time however when emotional ineptitude, '*selfishness, violence, and a meanness of spirit seem to be rotting the goodness of our communal lives*' (Goleman 1996, p.XI), a conjecture might be that a 'faith school effect' might just be highlighted from a focus upon the emotional fabric of a child's life and its outcomes; tied to the distinctive contribution which a school with a religious character can make to this fabric vis-à-vis a strictly secular schooling model and environment.

Further insight is needed too into the effects of religious diversity and its absence in schools and how meaningful interfaith contact in schools interacts with the religious diversity present there. The supposition of this research has also been that the religious engaging and the religious passing approach to educational environments may make for interesting sites for future research. Particularly so the religious passing approach, since it would seem intuitive to assume that ethnic, linguistic, and social diversity is more likely to be often experienced within a primary (religious) ingroup. It would also seem intuitive to assume that levels of intergroup anxiety will also be lower in such a context. This therefore may provide not just experience of diversity and difference but further provide experience of a context within which an internal diversity and difference can be held together in some unity; helping to shape peoples sense of inclusion and awareness of sharing ingroup membership with individuals who differ from themselves in respect of some other salient group identity (Miller et al, 2009). A supposition maybe that pupils' personal experience with such salient cross-cutting diversity within a primary ingroup would play a significant role in encouraging more complex representations of their own multiple ingroup memberships more widely (bid.). This may potentially make the religious passing school model an ideal site for learning about groups; changing behavior; generating affective ties; and finally ingroup reappraisal; these are the four interrelated mediating processes, identified by Pettigrew, that operate through a greater frequency of contact between groups to reduce prejudice (1998).

Further insight and research here could also focus upon the concept of extended contact and the secondary transfer effect (STE). Extended contact is a concept introduced by Wright et al (1997), and is the straightforward idea that simply knowing that ingroup members have outgroup friends, can be enough on its own to improve attitudes towards that outgroup for people who do not themselves have any direct contact with that outgroup (see also Turner, Hewstone, and Voci, 2007; Turner, Hewstone, Voci, and Vonofakou, 2007). The religious engaging and passing approach in particular may prove rich sites for further research and insight into the STE, where positive attitudes which result from contact situations with one group bias the formation of attitudes towards other outgroups (for further see Eller and Abrams, 2004; Hewstone, Hughes and Kenworthy, 2006; Pettigrew, 1997, 2009; see also Brown and Hewstone, 2005; Verkuyten et al, 2010; Tausch et al, 2010). Future studies could also focus on the quality of contact, and in particular cross-group friendships, understood to potentially be a more effective form of contact than less intimate forms (Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007), and which may also prove to be higher in a context where pupils experience salient cross-cutting diversity within their religious ingroup.

In particular, further insight is needed into how 'religious diversity' should be defined in order to measure it, as it can have different meanings in different contexts. Future research will need to take into account in particular to what degree and how young people themselves experience religious diversity at their school (Troost, 2011). Being in principle a 'single-faith' school, at least at an institutional level of conception, may not necessarily mean that young children experience and perceive their peers as being exclusively like themselves, but may rather experience a variety of religious views, adherence and dialogical contexts. Faith-based oversubscriptions criteria may also still draw pupils from a variety of cultural backgrounds and further research is needed into to what degree meaningful inter-group contact and respectful relationships across ethnic, cultural and religious lines, occurs in different educational approaches to environments and aims, and how this continues to influence social networks into adulthood. A supposition raised by this research has been that in a more religious heterogeneous school, or particularly in a school where two or three faith groups predominate in near equal numbers, that children (active intervention notwithstanding) will more likely segregate themselves into subgroups within the school. The results from the student survey showed that respondents from All Saints felt less 'warm' towards Protestants than all other respondents. This might tentatively be consistent with

students in the main self-segregating and generally keeping to within their religious/nonreligious ingroup, though further research and insight is needed. Though a 'passing' approach will often more likely entail one religious group predominating, it may in practise potentially be a more fertile soil for successful intergroup contact and an open acceptance of diversity.

There remains a poverty of research into the complex causal relationships between choices made by parents, a schools admissions criterion and the offers it makes. There has also yet to be any analysis of socio-economic composition of schools following successive changes to the School Admissions Code in 2007, 2009 and 2012 which contain provisions which are mandatory, and failure to comply with these means that the body concerned is in breach of its statutory duty to act in accordance with the provisions in the Code, and could result in an objection being made to the Schools Adjudicator. These mandatory provisions are intended to prevent admission decisions that discriminate, either directly or indirectly, on the basis of socio-economic or ethnic criteria. Interviews of parents or children have also been prohibited following the Education and Inspections Act 2006 (DfES 2007), and a mandatory provision since the third admissions code has been that '*admission authorities must not use either face-to-face interviews or interviews by telephone or other means*' (DfES, 2009, 1.52). Such research may then energise and inform further sensitive thought and debate as to how, whether needed, further changes to the School Admissions Code may help produce a more socially and (also ethnically) cohesive generation of children. The case for national monitoring of the characteristics of applicants to particular schools and of those offered places is also compellingly clear (Allen and West, 2009).

Finally, more research and insight is needed into the faith-based approaches to education of the 'newer' schools with a religious character, where race, ethnicity and religion have typically overlapped to an extent not demonstrated in the development of the 'old' schools within the Roman Catholic and Anglican tradition. Concerns that an associated risk of increased choice within the education system could be deepening patterns of religious and ethnic segregation will be especially relevant here. Future research should be focused upon whether, if numbers of these schools grow, this will lead to greater numbers of schools which have more or less in common with either an engaging or passing approach. There is, as yet, insufficient research or evidence base to generalise about these 'newer' schools with a religious character, but approaches which were more consistent with the problematization of faith-based approaches to education might tentatively be labelled a 'religious resistant

identity' approach (see Castell, 1997). Only brief indications of such an approach can be given here. Such an approach would be more theologically and communally conservative, and embrace a more exclusivist theology. The approach would be resistant to recognising and supporting the religious backgrounds of pupils (and staff) which were different to the faith of the school's sponsor. All of McGettrick's list of characteristics of schools with a religious character (see p.106), will be stronger fibres, and such an approach would generally reflect a form of 'resistance of passive retreat into certainty'; and which defined itself to a greater or lesser extent theologically and normatively in opposition to secular values and a perceived secularisation in education, and also too towards other religions. This would be an expression of what Ruthven terms '*a 'religious way of being' that manifests itself in a strategy by which beleaguered believers attempt to preserve their distinctive identity as a people or group in the face of modernity and secularization*' (Ruthven, 2003, p 8).

A resistance identity approach would raise tensions between the way in which it nurtured pupils' understanding of and attachment to the faith and community of the school's sponsor on the one hand, and raising pupils' awareness of the religious and cultural diversity of society on other. Similarly to 'active' and 'passive' tolerance, a morally relevant distinction may be made here between the promotion of diversity and relations with different faiths and cultures on the one hand, and a more limited 'dealing with difference' on the other (Short and Lenga, 2002; see also Erricker, 2006). In particular, there may be tensions between the schools educational aims on the one hand, and critical enquiry and autonomy of thought on the other. More research and insight would be needed though into what extent such an approach 'taught about' rather than 'taught how'(Atkinson, 1965; see also p.68), and devalued individual study and reflection; instead perhaps placing a higher value and emphasis upon handing on and understanding already 'given and received' knowledge (Halstead, 2004).

Even where such an approach meant a more narrowly culturally defined congruence between home and school, and also failed to sufficiently develop pupils' capacity for critical enquiry, it may still be desirable to allow such approaches to exist however, and even receive public funding for reasons of psychological security, rootedness, and a platform from which to relate to the wider society (see for instance Jordan and John's, 2007). A willingness of the wider society to fund such schools may be desirable for minorities which are culturally uncomfortable with many mainstream and dominant values shared in the wider, largely secular, society, and feel marginalised or threatened (see for instance, Akhtar, 1992, cited in

Ameen and Hasan, 2013; Merry, 2007). For both their own psychological security and the interests of wider society, it may be desirable that any further discomfort is experienced after they have received consistent support and competent instruction in the faith tradition of their community than before, or it never having been received at all. This may help avoid a more acute crisis of identity and tension being felt (see for instance Alwin et al, 2006). Though this would not obviate the need for government responsibility and difficult forms of regulation to ensure that cultural interpretations of theological principles in these schools did not force identities upon children, suppress knowledge, or fail to show tolerance and respect to adherents of other faiths and non-religious beliefs, as well as groups such as women and homosexuals.

Such approaches to future research could mark a timely refocus to the public and political debate over the continuation and expansion of faith-based education in England's mosaic of school provision, to make it more about the purposes of education. Such a direction raises further questions however, which this research did not have space to address and only the briefest of indications can be given here. First and foremost, how we measure the effectiveness of an education and of our schools is an area in need of a great deal more sensitive thought and research. Likewise, what kind of people do we want our schools to help shape? This would include what conception of tolerance we should wish people to have, and schools to advocate, as a minimum. Should tolerance be minimally consistent with a more 'passive' and limiting definition of tolerance; or should a more active and energetic ethical underpinning of appreciation of difference and 'the other' be preferred. Similarly, what conception of personal autonomy should schools develop? The value of personal autonomy, as Wood and Tuoch, explain, has different meanings in different cultures (2000, cited in Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005). In some communities there is a lower recognition of personal autonomy and respect, and deference towards authority is more highly valued and regarded (Haneef 1979, cited in Parker-Jenkins et al, 2005; see also Merry, 2007).

An insistence upon an adequate capacity for critical independence of thought would be closer to what Halstead terms 'strong autonomy', that assumptions and beliefs should be challenged and open to rigorous criticism based on rationality (1986). Such an insistence, as a minimum, may however lead as Mason argues to children from devotedly religious families becoming estranged from their families, or the disintegration of cultural communities and inter-communal ties; and may therefore limit the options for the exercise of that autonomy (2000; see also Mason 1993, cited in ibid). Weak autonomy alternatively, according to

Halstead, entails '*coming to see the point of moral or social rules for oneself... and giving one's consent to them*' (1986, p.36). Alternatively therefore, autonomy as a minimum could require only children's consent to practises which carry a significant risk of serious injury or depriving the child of the possibility of pursuing what he or she might reasonably come to regard as an important good (Mason, 2000). A school which inculcates love and knowledge about its religious tradition may not carry such a risk. Weaker interpretations of personal autonomy therefore may not entail that pupils need necessarily to have an adequate capacity for critical independence of thought cultivated in them and that all assumptions and beliefs are challenged and open to rigorous criticism. Stronger conceptions of tolerance and autonomy on the other hand could in practise exert a strong homogenising influence and threaten or devalue minority identities. These are issues which need a great deal more sensitive thought and research.

Appendices

Appendix A

Information Sheet

The empirical study springs from my interest in the concept of Community Cohesion which has been developing as the dominant principle for the Governments approach to managing Britain's multi-ethnic, multi-faith and multicultural society since its conception following disturbances in the North of England in 2001. In tandem with this new approach to issues of racial tension and ethnic integration has been the commitment from successive governments to a more diverse school system and greater opportunities for parental choice; the contribution that schools with a religious character make to the mosaic of school provision has been particularly favourably perceived by policy makers

As Community Cohesion has become a central plank in government policy a vociferous public and political debate has grown over the role which schools with a religious character play in breaking down cultural barriers and promoting cross cultural contact. It has been a debate however, that has generated far more heat than light, being conducted overwhelmingly at the level of prejudice and generalisation. Schools with a religious character therefore have both enjoyed as well as at times had to endure its emergence into the spotlight in education debate in England and Wales. Schools with a religious character have enjoyed a growing popularity for such schools among parents as well as government policy which has provided for the expansion of the number of schools with a religious character within the maintained sector. At the same however, schools with a religious character have had to endure well-rehearsed arguments and the often sweeping generalisations of critics against such schools, the most oft-repeated being that such schools are socially and racially divisive and pose a threat to social cohesion.

As part of the growing tradition of research and scholarship in relation to schools with a religious character my thesis critically scrutinises and challenges both theoretically and empirically the link which is infrequently made in some people's minds and in the media between 'faith-based' schooling and a deleterious effect upon on social cohesion. My thesis questions whether schools with a religious character necessarily pose a threat to social cohesion, or at least more so than their non-denominational counterparts. I believe the key determinant in this will be the content of children's learning, and fundamentally, how what is taught is taught.

Appendix B

School Information

	LA Average, 2012 School census	St Anthony's	Sacred Heart
All Usual Residents/Pupils	69441	699	1339
% White British	90.21	76.4	83.4
% Irish	0.18	1.4	1
% Irish Traveller	0.02	0	0.1
% Any other white	1.93	5.6	3.5
% Roma/Gypsy	0.12	0	0
% Mixed	2.27	6.72	4.85
% Indian	0.58	3.4	1.9
% Pakistani	0.15	0	0
Bangladeshi	0.23	0	0
Any other Asian	1.44	3	2.5
Caribbean	0.11	0.1	0.1
% African	0.4	1.3	1
Any other Black	0.11	0.1	0.1
Chinese	0.29	0.9	0.5
% first Language English	95.99	92.3	93.9
% first language not English	3.96	7.7	6

	LA Average, 2012 School census	**All Saints**
All Usual Residents/Pupils	9527	715
% White British	82.86	83.36
% Irish	0.36	0.00
% Irish Traveller	0.00	0.00
% Any other white	6.08	7.41
% Roma/Gypsy	0.18	0.00
% Mixed	4.74	4.20
% Indian	0.61	0.56
% Pakistani	0.07	0.00
Bangladeshi	0.40	0.14
Any other Asian	1.23	0.14
Caribbean	0.05	0.14
% African	0.50	1.26
Any other Black	0.09	0.14
Chinese	0.68	0.56
% first Language English	91.30	88.95
% first language not English	8.60	10.90

	Super Output Area Lower Area	Super Output Area Middle Layer	St Anthony's
All Usual Residents/Pupils	1613	7679	699
% White British	87.97	87.12	76.4
% Irish	1.49	1.34	1.4
% Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.19	0.17	0
% Any other white	4.15	4.36	5.6
% Mixed	1.3	2.08	6.72
% Indian	0.19	0.64	3.4
% Pakistani	0	0.2	0
Bangladeshi	0.25	0.26	0
Any other Asian	2.48	1.55	3
Caribbean	0.62	0.49	0.1
% African	0.87	0.83	1.3
Any other Black	0	0.4	0.1
Chinese	0.31	0.66	0.9
% first Language English	96.76	93.97	92.3
% first language not English	3.24	6.03	7.7

	Super Output Area Lower Layer	Super Output Area Middle Layer	Sacred Heart
All Usual Residents/Pupils	1421	5591	1339
% White British	91.06	93.02	83.4
% Irish	0.21	0.48	1
% Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0.02	0.1
% Any other white	1.13	1.43	3.5
% Mixed	0.03	1.91	4.85
% Indian	1.27	1	1.9
% Pakistani	0	0.05	0
Bangladeshi	0	0	0
Any other Asian	1.41	0.59	2.5
Caribbean	0.14	0.45	0.1
% African	1.13	0.05	1
Any other Black	0.14	0.07	0.1
Chinese	0.7	0.77	0.5
% first Language English	96.76	98.01	93.9
% first language not English	3.24	1.99	6

	Super Output Area Lower Area	**Super Output Area Middle Layer**	**All Saints**
All Usual Residents/Pupils	1587	6469	715
% White British	85.95	87.36	83.40
% Irish	0.50	0.51	0.00
% Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.19	0.11	0.00
% Any other white	4.54	3.32	7.40
% Mixed	3.53	2.40	4.20
% Indian	1.20	1.22	0.60
% Pakistani	0.00	0.09	0.00
Bangladeshi	0.06	0.28	0.10
Any other Asian	1.45	2.20	0.10
Caribbean	0.19	0.15	0.10
% African	0.25	0.56	1.30
Any other Black	0.13	0.09	0.10
Chinese	0.82	0.57	0.60
% first Language English	94.61	94.56	89.00
% first language not English	5.39	5.44	10.90

Appendix C

Primary Research Schedule

School	Interviewee	Date Interview 1	Date Interview 2
Sacred Heart	Assistant Head	16 July 2012	
St Anthony's	Assistant Head	04 December 2012	03 July 2013
Sacred Heart	Head of PDC	15 October 2012	14 October 2013
All Saints	PSHE Teacher	01 October 2012	
All Saints	Religious Education Teacher	29 February 2012	09 July 2013
Sacred Heart	Religious Education Teacher	24 November 2012	
St Anthony's	Religious Education Teacher	04 December 2012	03 July 2013
All Saints	School Chaplain	29 February 2012	09 July 2013
All Saints	School Principal	29 February 2012	

School	Focus Group	Date
All Saints	Christian Union	29 February 2012
All Saints	Student Council	29 February 2012
Sacred Heart	Student Council	14 May 2012
St Anthony's	Student Council	04 December 2012

School	Date of Student Survey
All Saints	Mar-12
Sacred Heard	Jan-Feb-12
St Anthony's	May-12

Appendix D

Suggested Topics for Semi-Structured School Interviews

I.   The ethos/theological basis of the school, the values that the school promotes;

II.   The points in school life and culture where faith and education meet;

III.   Exploring and affirming pupils identities;

IV.   Exploring diverse national, regional, ethnic and religious cultures, groups and communities.

V.   Encouraging/teaching respect for different national, religious and ethnic identities;

VI.   Challenges the school faces and the strengths which the school has in the delivery of an identity and diversity learning agenda.

Appendix E

Suggested Topics for Semi-Structured Interviews with Diocesan Directors of Education

I.   Why there is a need for Church of England schools/what would be lost without them;

II.   The differences which characterise Church of England schools from community schools;

III. Why Parent choose a Church of England school for their child/children;

IV.   Admissions;

V.   The kinds of human beings Church of England schools seek to develop through their education (in addition to academically/vocationally successful)

Appendix F

Student Survey Questions

Q1. What is your gender?

Male
Female

Q2. Which of these best describes your ethnic group?

White - British
White - Irish
Any other White background
Mixed White and Black Caribbean
Mixed White and Black African
Mixed White and Asian
Any other mixed background
Asian or Asian British - Indian
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi
Any other Asian/Asian British background
Black or Black British - Caribbean
Black or Black British - African
Any other Black/Black British background
Chinese

Q3. What do you consider your national identity to be? Please choose as many or as few as apply.

English
Scottish
Welsh
Irish
British

Q4. What is your religion even if you are not currently practising?

Christian
Buddhist
Hindu
Jewish
Muslim
Sikh
Any other religion

No religion at all

Q5. Do you consider that you are actively practising your religion?

Yes
No
Not Applicable

Q6. What proportion of your friends are of the same ethnic group as you? Would you say…

All the same
More than a half
About a half
Or, less than a half?

Q7. What proportion of your friends are of the same religious group as you? Would you say…

All the same
More than a half
About a half
Or less than a half?
Not part of any faith group

Q8. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your religion affects who your friends are?

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know
Not Applicable

Q9. Now thinking about people in your local area (15/20 minutes walking distance), what proportion of all the people are of the same ethnic group as you? Would you say…

All the same,
More than a half,
About a half,
Or less than a half?

Q10. To what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area, (within 15/20 minutes walking distance), is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?

Definitely agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Definitely disagree
Don't Know

Q11. To what extent would you agree or disagree that this local area (15/20 minutes walking distance) is a place where residents respect ethnic differences between people?

Definitely agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Definitely disagree
Don't Know

Q12. How important is your ethnic or racial background to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q13. How important is your religion to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q14. How important is your national identity to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q15. How important is where you live to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q16. How important are your interests to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q17. How important is your family to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q18. How important is your gender to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q19. How important is your age to your sense of who you are?

Very important
Quite important
Not very important
Not at all important
Don't know

Q12. Thinking about how people from different ethnic and religious groups mix together in the local area (15-20 minutes walking distance), do you think that different ethnic and religious groups…

(1) …mix enough
(2) …should mix more
(3) …should mix less
(4) Not Applicable
(5) Don't Know

Q20. When you think carefully about the kinds of people who have the same ethnic or racial background as you, how many of them do you think have the same religion as you? For instance if you chose white - British, and no religion at all; how many white British people do you think have no religion at all? Give an answer from 0-10; 10 if you think everyone, 0 if you think no one, and between 0 and 10 if you think some but not all.

Q21. When you think carefully about the kinds of people who have the same religion as you, how many of them do you think have the same ethnic or racial background as you? For instance if you chose Christian, and Black or Black British - Caribbean; how many Christians do you think are Black/Black British - Caribbean? Give an answer from 0-10, 10 if you think everyone, 0 if you think no one, and between 0 and 10 if you think some but not all.

Q22. When you think carefully about the kinds of people who have the same interests as you, how many of them do you think have the same religion as you? And how many of them do you think have the ethnic or racial background as you? For instance if you chose white -

British, and no religion at all; many people who have the same interests as you do you think are white - British people? And how many people who have the same interests as you do you think also have no religion at all? Give an answer from 0-10 to each of the questions below, 10 if you think everyone, 0 if you think no one, and between 0 and 10 if you think some but not all.

Q23. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? People should be free to say what they believe even if it offends others.

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q24. People should respect the culture and religious beliefs of others even when these oppose their own values

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q25. Different ethnic and religious groups should adapt and blend into the larger society.

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q26. Different ethnic and religious groups should maintain their customs and traditions.

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q27. Individuals should take responsibility for helping other people in their local community

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q28. Thinking about how people from different ethnic and religious groups mix together in Britain as a whole today, do you think that different ethnic and religious groups…

Mix enough
Should mix more
Should mix less
Don't Know

Q29 How much do you agree or disagree that it is possible to fully belong to Britain and maintain a separate cultural or religious identity?

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't Know

Q30. Which of these things, if any, would you say are the most important values for living in Britain? Please choose up to five.

Tolerance and politeness towards others
Respect for the law
Everyone should speak English
Everyone should vote
Respect for all faiths
Respect for people from different ethnic groups
Freedom to criticise the views and beliefs of others
Everyone has a voice in politics through democracy
Freedom of speech/expression
Freedom to follow a religion of choice
That national policy is not made on the basis of religious beliefs
Equality of opportunity
Freedom from discrimination
Pride in country/patriotism
Justice and fair play
Responsibility towards other people in the community
Something else (SPECIFY)

Q31. I'd like to get your feeling towards different religious groups from 0 ('Very cold') to 100 ('Very warm'). Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favourable and warm toward the group. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favourable toward the group and that you don't care too much for that group. You would rate the group at the 50 degree mark if you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the group.

Buddhist People
Catholic People
Jewish People
Muslim People
Protestant People (including Church of England, Church of Scotland, Anglican, Methodist, and others)
People who are deeply religious

People who are not religious

Appendix G

2011 School Census Analysis

State Funded Primary and Secondary Schools

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. Of Schools			No. Of Pupils		
Academy Converters	43	112	996	32,143	66,617	901,877
Academy Free Schools	0	0	14	0	0	957
Academy Sponsor Led	3	29	242	2,279	22,521	217,312
Community School	0	0	10,946	0	0	3,161,651
Foundation School	1	44	932	1,231	11,535	575,582
Voluntary Aided School	1,937	1,999	36	602,890	360,765	23,920
Voluntary Controlled School	0	2,409	72	0	360,112	48,134
Totals	1,984	4,593	13,238	638,543	821,550	4,929,433

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. Mixed Background			% Mixed Background			No. Indian			% Indian		
Academy Converters	1,572	2,748	33,338	4.89	4.13	3.70	1,293	1,891	25,404	4.02	2.84	2.82
Academy Free Schools	0	0	59	0.00	0.00	6.17	0	0	55	0.00	0.00	5.75
Academy Sponsor Led	191	1,006	9,647	8.38	4.47	4.44	23	137	4,268	1.01	0.61	1.96
Community School	0	0	136,825	0.00	0.00	4.33	0	0	88,189	0.00	0.00	2.79
Foundation School	37	284	22,390	3.01	2.46	3.89	1	39	16,107	0.08	0.34	2.80
Voluntary Aided School	31,347	16,374	1,455	5.20	4.54	6.08	12,679	5,944	1,017	2.10	1.65	4.25
Voluntary Controlled School	0	10,961	1,379	0.00	3.04	2.86	0	4,655	397	0.00	1.29	0.82
Totals	33,147	31,373	205,093	5.19	3.82	4.16	13,996	12,666	135,437	2.19	1.54	2.75

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. Pakistani			% Pakistani			No. Bangladeshi			% Bangladeshi		
	RC	CoE	None	RC	CoE	None	RC	CoE	None	RC	CoE	None
Academy Converters	386	2,158	18,457	1.20	3.24	2.05	165	226	7,299	0.51	0.34	0.81
Academy Free Schools	0	0	203	0.00	0.00	21.21	0	0	16	0.00	0.00	1.67
Academy Sponsor Led	9	497	9,958	0.39	2.21	4.58	1	434	3,658	0.04	1.93	1.68
Community School	0	0	161,019	0.00	0.00	5.09	0	0	69,438	0.00	0.00	2.20
Foundation School	1	47	22,807	0.08	0.41	3.96	0	19	7,041	0.00	0.16	1.22
Voluntary Aided School	8,248	9,329	1,011	1.37	2.59	4.23	1,777	5,135	1,719	0.29	1.42	7.19
Voluntary Controlled School	0	7,804	409	0.00	2.17	0.85	0	1,626	723	0.00	0.45	1.50
Totals	8,644	19,835	213,864	1.35	2.41	4.34	1,943	7,440	89,894	0.30	0.91	1.82

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. Any Other Asian			% Any other Asian			No. Caribbean			% Caribbean		
Academy Converters	722	1,015	13,430	2.25	1.52	1.49	380	983	8,543	1.18	1.48	0.95
Academy Free Schools	0	0	22	0.00	0.00	2.30	0	0	2	0.00	0.00	0.21
Academy Sponsor Led	37	314	3,145	1.62	1.39	1.45	89	761	5,130	3.91	3.38	2.36
Community School	0	0	50,646	0.00	0.00	1.60	0	0	40,092	0.00	0.00	1.27
Foundation School	3	40	8,286	0.24	0.35	1.44	3	18	7,059	0.24	0.16	1.23
Voluntary Aided School	12,369	3,512	685	2.05	0.97	2.86	10,970	7,523	574	1.82	2.09	2.40
Voluntary Controlled School	0	2,414	506	0.00	0.67	1.05	0	1,577	415	0.00	0.44	0.86
Totals	13,131	7,295	76,720	2.06	0.89	1.56	11,442	10,862	61,815	1.79	1.32	1.25

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. African			% African			No. Any other Black			% Any other Black		
Academy Converters	1,553	2,123	16,865	4.83	3.19	1.87	235	415	3,289	0.73	0.62	0.36
Academy Free Schools	0	0	72	0.00	0.00	7.52	0	0	14	0.00	0.00	1.46
Academy Sponsor Led	421	1,317	9,573	18.47	5.85	4.41	43	228	1,980	1.89	1.01	0.91
Community School	0	0	95,435	0.00	0.00	3.02	0	0	17,954	0.00	0.00	0.57
Foundation School	4	55	14,282	0.32	0.48	2.48	6	14	2,760	0.49	0.12	0.48
Voluntary Aided School	36,471	14,180	953	6.05	3.93	3.98	6,356	2,809	167	1.05	0.78	0.70
Voluntary Controlled School	0	3,573	619	0.00	0.99	1.29	0	833	143	0.00	0.23	0.30
Totals	38,449	21,248	137,799	6.02	2.59	2.80	6,640	4,299	26,307	1.04	0.52	0.53

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. Chinese			% Chinese		
Academy Converters	121	371	4,754	0.38	0.56	0.53
Academy Free Schools	0	0	10	0.00	0.00	1.04
Academy Sponsor Led	4	50	716	0.18	0.22	0.33
Community School	0	0	10,232	0.00	0.00	0.32
Foundation School	3	33	1,874	0.24	0.29	0.33
Voluntary Aided School	1,646	1,522	396	0.27	0.42	1.66
Voluntary Controlled School	0	825	251	0.00	0.23	0.52
Totals	1,774	2,801	18,233	0.28	0.34	0.37

Denomination Code
Roman Catholic
Church of England
None/Does not apply

Type of establishment	No. First Language English			% First Language English			No. First Language not English			% First Language not English		
Academy Converters	27,046	59,752	813,242	84.14	89.69	90.17	5,029	6,784	86,257	15.65	10.18	9.56
Academy Free Schools	0	0	753	0.00	0.00	78.68	0	0	136	0.00	0.00	14.21
Academy Sponsor Led	1,793	18,639	179,099	78.67	82.76	82.42	484	3,819	36,373	21.24	16.96	16.74
Community School	0	0	2,586,928	0.00	0.00	81.82	0	0	568,270	0.00	0.00	17.97
Foundation School	1,222	11,123	493,781	99.27	96.43	85.79	9	395	79,883	0.73	3.42	13.88
Voluntary Aided School	501,275	312,967	18,755	83.15	86.75	78.41	100,318	46,960	5,046	16.64	13.02	21.10
Voluntary Controlled School	0	333,488	43,950	0.00	92.61	91.31	0	26,205	4,005	0.00	7.28	8.32
Totals	531,336	735,969	4,136,508	83.21	89.58	83.91	105,840	84,163	779,970	16.58	10.24	15.82

Appendix H

Student Survey Statistical Data Analysis: Chi-Square Results(1)

What proportion of your friends are of the same religious group as you?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
all the same,	Count	38	27	2	5	72
	Expected Count	29.3	24.5	8.2	10	72
	% within Survey/School	23.60%	20.00%	4.40%	9.10%	18.20%
	Adjusted Residual	2.3	0.7	-2.5	-1.9	
more than a half,	Count	48	48	12	28	136
	Expected Count	55.3	46.4	15.5	18.9	136
	% within Survey/School	29.80%	35.60%	26.70%	50.90%	34.30%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	0.4	-1.2	2.8	
about a half,	Count	32	33	11	13	89
	Expected Count	36.2	30.3	10.1	12.4	89
	% within Survey/School	19.90%	24.40%	24.40%	23.60%	22.50%
	Adjusted Residual	-1	0.7	0.3	0.2	
or less than a half?	Count	28	19	10	7	64
	Expected Count	26	21.8	7.3	8.9	64
	% within Survey/School	17.40%	14.10%	22.20%	12.70%	16.20%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.8	1.2	-0.7	
Not part of any faith group	Count	15	8	10	2	35
	Expected Count	14.2	11.9	4	4.9	35
	% within Survey/School	9.30%	5.90%	22.20%	3.60%	8.80%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-1.5	3.4	-1.5	
Total	Count	161	135	45	55	396
	Expected Count	161	135	45	55	396
	% within Survey/School	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Pearson Chi Square Test = .002						
= Significant Residual						

What proportion of your friends are of the same religious group as you?		School/Survey			Total
		16 Year olds/South East/Citizenship Surveys 2007-2011	Sacred Heart	St Anthony's	
all the same,	Count	5	27	5	37
	Expected Count	5.9	22.1	9	37
	% within School/Survey	13.90%	20.00%	9.10%	16.40%
	Adjusted Residual	-0.4	1.8	-1.7	
more than a half,	Count	9	48	28	85
	Expected Count	13.5	50.8	20.7	85
	% within School/Survey	25.00%	35.60%	50.90%	37.60%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	-0.8	2.3	
about a half,	Count	9	33	13	55
	Expected Count	8.8	32.9	13.4	55
	% within School/Survey	25.00%	24.40%	23.60%	24.30%
	Adjusted Residual	0.1	0	-0.1	
or less than a half?	Count	8	19	7	34
	Expected Count	5.4	20.3	8.3	34
	% within School/Survey	22.20%	14.10%	12.70%	15.00%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	-0.5	-0.6	
Not part of any faith group	Count	5	8	2	15
	Expected Count	2.4	9	3.7	15
	% within School/Survey	13.90%	5.90%	3.60%	6.60%
	Adjusted Residual	1.9	-0.5	-1	
Total	Count	36	135	55	226
	Expected Count	36	135	55	226
	% within School/Survey	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .130					
= Significant Residual					

What proportion of your friends are of the same religious group as you?			School/Survey		Total
			16 Year olds/South West/Citizenship Surveys 2007-2011	All Saints	
all the same,		Count	13	2	15
		Expected Count	4.6	10.4	15
		% within School/Survey	65.00%	4.40%	23.10%
		Adjusted Residual	5.3	-5.3	
more than a half,		Count	3	12	15
		Expected Count	4.6	10.4	15
		% within Survey School 2	15.00%	26.70%	23.10%
		Adjusted Residual	-1	1	
about a half,		Count	2	11	13
		Expected Count	4	9	13
		% within School/Survey	10.00%	24.40%	20.00%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.3	1.3	
or less than a half?		Count	0	10	10
		Expected Count	3.1	6.9	10
		% within School/Survey	0.00%	22.20%	15.40%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	
Not part of any faith group		Count	2	10	12
		Expected Count	3.7	8.3	12
		% within School/Survey	10.00%	22.20%	18.50%
		Adjusted Residual	-1.2	1.2	
Total		Count	20	45	65
		Expected Count	20	45	65
		% within School/Survey	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Pearson Chi-Square = .000					
= Significant Residual					

Appendix I

Student Survey Statistical Data Analysis: Chi-Square Results(2)

What proportion of your friends are of the same ethnic group as you?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year olds/ Citizenship Survey 10/11	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
all the same,	Count	27	12	10	2	51
	Expected Count	20.9	17.3	5.8	7	51
	% within Friends the same ethnic group	52.90%	23.50%	19.60%	3.90%	100.00%
	Adjusted Residual	1.9	-1.7	2	-2.2	
more than a half,	Count	66	93	16	31	206
	Expected Count	84.4	69.9	23.3	28.5	206
	% within Friends the same ethnic group	32.00%	45.10%	7.80%	15.00%	100.00%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.7	4.9	-2.3	0.7	
about a half,	Count	28	20	11	7	66
	Expected Count	27	22.4	7.5	9.1	66
	% within Friends the same ethnic group	42.40%	30.30%	16.70%	10.60%	100.00%
	Adjusted Residual	0.3	-0.7	1.5	-0.8	
or less than a half?	Count	42	10	8	15	75
	Expected Count	30.7	25.4	8.5	10.4	75
	% within Friends the same ethnic group	56.00%	13.30%	10.70%	20.00%	100.00%
	Adjusted Residual	2.9	-4.2	-0.2	1.7	
Total	Count	163	135	45	55	398
	Expected Count	163	135	45	55	398
	% within Friends the same ethnic group	41.00%	33.90%	11.30%	13.80%	100.00%
Pearson Chi-Square = .000						
= Significant Residual						

What proportion of your friends are of the same ethnic group as you?		School/Survey			Total
		16 Year olds/South East/Citizenship Surveys 2007-2011	Sacred Heart	St Anthony's	
all the same,	Count	9	12	2	23
	Expected Count	5.3	12.6	5.1	23
	% within School/Survey	15.80%	8.90%	3.60%	9.30%
	Adjusted Residual	1.9	-0.3	-1.6	
more than a half,	Count	24	93	31	148
	Expected Count	34.2	80.9	33	148
	% within School/Survey	42.10%	68.90%	56.40%	59.90%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.1	3.2	-0.6	
about a half,	Count	11	20	7	38
	Expected Count	8.8	20.8	8.5	38
	% within School/Survey	19.30%	14.80%	12.70%	15.40%
	Adjusted Residual	0.9	-0.3	-0.6	
or less than a half?	Count	13	10	15	38
	Expected Count	8.8	20.8	8.5	38
	% within School/Survey	22.80%	7.40%	27.30%	15.40%
	Adjusted Residual	1.8	-3.8	2.8	
Total	Count	57	135	55	247
	Expected Count	57	135	55	247
	% within School/Survey	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Pearson Chi-Square = .001					
= Significant Residual					

What proportion of your friends are of the same ethnic group as you?		School/Survey		Total
		16 Year olds/South West/Citizenship Surveys 2007-2011	All Saints	
all the same,	Count	21	10	31
	Expected Count	15.5	15.5	31
	% within School/Survey	46.70%	22.20%	34.40%
	Adjusted Residual	2.4	-2.4	
more than a half,	Count	19	16	35
	Expected Count	17.5	17.5	35
	% within School/Survey	42.20%	35.60%	38.90%
	Adjusted Residual	0.6	-0.6	
about a half,	Count	3	11	14
	Expected Count	7	7	14
	% within School/Survey	6.70%	24.40%	15.60%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	2.3	
or less than a half?	Count	2	8	10
	Expected Count	5	5	10
	% within School/Survey	4.40%	17.80%	11.10%
	Adjusted Residual	-2	2	
Total	Count	45	45	90
	Expected Count	45	45	90
	% within School/Survey	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Pearson Chi-Square = .006				
= Significant Residual				

Appendix J

Statistical Data Analysis: ANOVA Results(1)

Feeling Thermometer Results					
		N	Mean	95% Confident Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Standard Deviation Measure	BSA 2008	86	14.15	11.63	16.67
	Sacred Heart	122	14.52	12.09	16.96
	All Saints	41	17.50	12.64	22.36
	St Anthony's	49	10.52	7.19	13.85
	Total	298	14.17	12.67	15.66
Interquartile Range Measure	BSA 2008	86	14.12	10.22	18.01
	Sacred Heart	122	15.62	11.90	19.34
	All Saints	41	19.65	12.66	26.63
	St Anthony's	49	11.61	6.99	16.24
	Total	298	15.08	12.85	17.31

Feeling Thermometer Results Post Hoc Tests							
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Standard Deviation Measure	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	-0.37	1.84	0.84	-3.98	3.25
		All Saints	-3.35	2.48	0.18	-8.22	1.52
		St Anthony's	3.63	2.33	0.12	-0.96	8.23
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	0.37	1.84	0.84	-3.25	3.98
		All Saints	-2.98	2.35	0.21	-7.61	1.65
		St Anthony's	4	2.21	0.07	-0.34	8.34
	All Saints	BSA 2008	3.35	2.48	0.18	-1.52	8.22
		Sacred Heart	2.98	2.35	0.21	-1.65	7.61
		St Anthony's	6.98	2.76	0.01	1.55	12.41
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	-3.63	2.33	0.12	-8.23	0.96
		Sacred Heart	-4	2.21	0.07	-8.34	0.34
		All Saints	-6.98	2.76	0.01	-12.41	-1.55
= Significant Difference at 5% Level							

Feeling Thermometer 'Bias' Scores						
		N	Mean/Bias Scores	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cath Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	86	5.79	16.59	1.79	2.23	9.34
	Sacred Heart	122	12.87	22.11	2.00	8.91	16.84
	All Saints	41	0.57	24.82	3.88	-7.27	8.40
	St Anthony's	49	11.57	19.75	2.82	5.90	17.24
	Total	298	8.92	21.07	1.22	6.52	11.32
Protestant Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	86	6.54	19.54	2.11	2.35	10.72
	Sacred Heart	122	9.38	16.90	1.53	6.35	12.41
	All Saints	41	-0.51	18.13	2.83	-6.23	5.21
	St Anthony's	49	3.33	13.69	1.96	-0.60	7.26
	Total	298	6.20	17.66	1.02	4.19	8.22
Muslim Vrs Mean Other Group	BSA 2008	86	-10.04	21.53	2.32	-14.66	-5.43
	Sacred Heart	122	-11.87	21.45	1.94	-15.71	-8.02
	All Saints	41	-10.56	22.81	3.56	-17.76	-3.36
	St Anthony's	49	-8.96	17.37	2.48	-13.94	-3.97
	Total	298	-10.68	20.98	1.22	-13.07	-8.29
People Who are Deep Religious Vrs Mean other groups	BSA 2008	86	-0.97	19.95	2.15	-5.24	3.31
	Sacred Heart	122	-12.26	20.47	1.85	-15.93	-8.59
	All Saints	41	-4.55	26.01	4.06	-12.76	3.66
	St Anthony's	49	-2.05	17.99	2.57	-7.22	3.12
	Total	298	-6.26	21.31	1.23	-8.69	-3.83
Buddhist Vrs Mean other groups	BSA 2008	86	-1.39	17.89	1.93	-5.22	2.45
	Sacred Heart	122	-3.56	18.77	1.70	-6.92	-0.19
	All Saints	41	2.50	21.55	3.37	-4.30	9.31
	St Anthony's	49	-2.15	14.96	2.14	-6.44	2.15
	Total	298	-1.86	18.38	1.06	-3.96	0.23
Jewish Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	86	-5.85	16.61	1.79	-9.41	-2.29
	Sacred Heart	122	-2.37	12.90	1.17	-4.68	-0.06
	All Saints	41	-2.87	22.21	3.47	-9.88	4.14
	St Anthony's	49	-1.62	13.28	1.90	-5.44	2.19
	Total	298	-3.32	15.63	0.91	-5.10	-1.54
Not Religious Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	86	5.92	20.44	2.20	1.54	10.31
	Sacred Heart	122	7.80	21.02	1.90	4.03	11.56
	All Saints	41	15.42	31.70	4.95	5.42	25.43
	St Anthony's	49	-0.12	13.33	1.90	-3.95	3.71
	Total	298	7.00	21.96	1.27	4.50	9.51

Bias Scores Multiple Comparisons			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Catholic Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	-7.08	2.91	.016	-12.82	-1.35
		All Saints	5.22	3.93	.185	-2.51	12.95
		St Anthony's	-5.78	3.70	.120	-13.07	1.51
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	7.08	2.91	.016	1.35	12.82
		All Saints	12.30	3.74	.001	4.95	19.66
		St Anthony's	1.30	3.50	.710	-5.58	8.19
	All Saints	BSA 2008	-5.22	3.93	.185	-12.95	2.51
		Sacred Heart	-12.30	3.74	.001	-19.66	-4.95
		St Anthony's	-11.00	4.38	.013	-19.62	-2.38
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	5.78	3.70	.120	-1.51	13.07
		Sacred Heart	-1.30	3.50	.710	-8.19	5.58
		All Saints	11.00	4.38	.013	2.38	19.62
Protestant Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	-2.85	2.45	.246	-7.67	1.98
		All Saints	7.05	3.31	.034	0.54	13.55
		St Anthony's	3.20	3.12	.305	-2.93	9.34
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	2.85	2.45	.246	-1.98	7.67
		All Saints	9.89	3.14	.002	3.71	16.08
		St Anthony's	6.05	2.95	.041	0.26	11.85
	All Saints	BSA 2008	-7.05	3.31	.034	-13.55	-0.54
		Sacred Heart	-9.89	3.14	.002	-16.08	-3.71
		St Anthony's	-3.84	3.69	.298	-11.10	3.41
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	-3.20	3.12	.305	-9.34	2.93
		Sacred Heart	-6.05	2.95	.041	-11.85	-0.26
		All Saints	3.84	3.69	.298	-3.41	11.10
= Significant Difference at 5% Level							

Bias Scores Multiple Comparisons Cont.						
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Muslim Vrs Mean Other Group	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	1.82	2.96	.539	-4.01	7.66
		All Saints	0.51	4.00	.898	-7.35	8.38
		St Anthony's	-1.09	3.77	.773	-8.50	6.33
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	-1.82	2.96	.539	-7.66	4.01
		All Saints	-1.31	3.80	.731	-8.79	6.17
		St Anthony's	-2.91	3.56	.414	-9.92	4.10
	All Saints	BSA 2008	-0.51	4.00	.898	-8.38	7.35
		Sacred Heart	1.31	3.80	.731	-6.17	8.79
		St Anthony's	-1.60	4.46	.720	-10.37	7.17
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	1.09	3.77	.773	-6.33	8.50
		Sacred Heart	2.91	3.56	.414	-4.10	9.92
		All Saints	1.60	4.46	.720	-7.17	10.37
People Who are Deep Religious Vrs Mean other groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	11.29	2.93	.000	5.53	17.05
		All Saints	3.59	3.95	.364	-4.18	11.35
		St Anthony's	1.08	3.72	.771	-6.24	8.41
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	-11.29	2.93	.000	-17.05	-5.53
		All Saints	-7.71	3.75	.041	-15.09	-0.32
		St Anthony's	-10.21	3.52	.004	-17.13	-3.29
	All Saints	BSA 2008	-3.59	3.95	.364	-11.35	4.18
		Sacred Heart	7.71	3.75	.041	0.32	15.09
		St Anthony's	-2.50	4.40	.570	-11.16	6.16
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	-1.08	3.72	.771	-8.41	6.24
		Sacred Heart	10.21	3.52	.004	3.29	17.13
		All Saints	2.50	4.40	.570	-6.16	11.16
= Significant Difference at 5% Level							

			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
Bias Scores Multiple Comparisons Cont.							
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Buddhist vrs Mean other groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	2.17	2.59	.402	-2.92	7.26
		All Saints	-3.89	3.49	.265	-10.75	2.97
		St Anthony's	0.76	3.29	.818	-5.71	7.23
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	-2.17	2.59	.402	-7.26	2.92
		All Saints	-6.06	3.31	.069	-12.58	0.46
		St Anthony's	-1.41	3.11	.650	-7.52	4.70
	All Saints	BSA 2008	3.89	3.49	.265	-2.97	10.75
		Sacred Heart	6.06	3.31	.069	-0.46	12.58
		St Anthony's	4.65	3.89	.233	-3.00	12.30
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	-0.76	3.29	.818	-7.23	5.71
		Sacred Heart	1.41	3.11	.650	-4.70	7.52
		All Saints	-4.65	3.89	.233	-12.30	3.00
Jewish Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	-3.48	2.20	.115	-7.81	0.85
		All Saints	-2.98	2.97	.316	-8.81	2.86
		St Anthony's	-4.23	2.80	.132	-9.73	1.28
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	3.48	2.20	.115	-0.85	7.81
		All Saints	0.50	2.82	.858	-5.05	6.06
		St Anthony's	-0.75	2.64	.777	-5.95	4.45
	All Saints	BSA 2008	2.98	2.97	.316	-2.86	8.81
		Sacred Heart	-0.50	2.82	.858	-6.06	5.05
		St Anthony's	-1.25	3.31	.705	-7.76	5.26
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	4.23	2.80	.132	-1.28	9.73
		Sacred Heart	0.75	2.64	.777	-4.45	5.95
		All Saints	1.25	3.31	.705	-5.26	7.76
Not Religious Vrs Mean Other Groups	BSA 2008	Sacred Heart	-1.87	3.05	.540	-7.87	4.13
		All Saints	-9.50	4.11	.021	-17.58	-1.42
		St Anthony's	6.05	3.87	.120	-1.58	13.67
	Sacred Heart	BSA 2008	1.87	3.05	.540	-4.13	7.87
		All Saints	-7.63	3.91	.052	-15.32	0.06
		St Anthony's	7.92	3.66	.031	0.71	15.12
	All Saints	BSA 2008	9.50	4.11	.021	1.42	17.58
		Sacred Heart	7.63	3.91	.052	-0.06	15.32
		St Anthony's	15.55	4.58	.001	6.53	24.56
	St Anthony's	BSA 2008	-6.05	3.87	.120	-13.67	1.58
		Sacred Heart	-7.92	3.66	.031	-15.12	-0.71
		All Saints	-15.55	4.58	.001	-24.56	-6.53
= Significant Difference at 5% Level							

Appendix K

Statistical Data Analysis: Chi-Square Results(3)

How important is your religion to sense of who you are?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	63	12	9	5	89
	Expected Count	37.4	29.8	9.4	12.4	89.0
	%	38.7%	9.2%	22.0%	9.3%	22.9%
	Adjusted Residual	6.3	-4.6	-.2	-2.6	
Quite important	Count	30	38	3	25	96
	Expected Count	40.3	32.2	10.1	13.4	96.0
	%	18.4%	29.2%	7.3%	46.3%	24.7%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.5	1.5	-2.7	4.0	
Not very important	Count	22	44	8	19	93
	Expected Count	39.1	31.2	9.8	12.9	93.0
	%	13.5%	33.8%	19.5%	35.2%	24.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-4.1	3.2	-.7	2.1	
Not at all important	Count	46	30	17	3	96
	Expected Count	40.3	32.2	10.1	13.4	96.0
	%	28.2%	23.1%	41.5%	5.6%	24.7%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-.5	2.6	-3.5	
Don t know	Count	2	6	4	2	14
	Expected Count	5.9	4.7	1.5	1.9	14.0
	%	1.2%	4.6%	9.8%	3.7%	3.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	.8	2.2	.0	
Total	Count	163	130	41	54	388
	Expected Count	163.0	130.0	41.0	54.0	388.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

How important is your ethnic or racial background to sense of who you are?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	66	13	10	3	92
	Expected Count	38.6	30.8	9.7	12.8	92.0
	%	40.5%	10.0%	24.4%	5.6%	23.7%
	Adjusted Residual	6.6	-4.5	.1	-3.4	
Quite important	Count	59	42	6	22	129
	Expected Count	54.2	43.2	13.6	18.0	129.0
	%	36.2%	32.3%	14.6%	40.7%	33.2%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-.3	-2.7	1.3	
Not very important	Count	24	46	13	25	108
	Expected Count	45.4	36.2	11.4	15.0	108.0
	%	14.7%	35.4%	31.7%	46.3%	27.8%
	Adjusted Residual	-4.9	2.4	.6	3.3	
Not at all important	Count	11	19	9	4	43
	Expected Count	18.1	14.4	4.5	6.0	43.0
	%	6.7%	14.6%	22.0%	7.4%	11.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.3	1.6	2.3	-.9	
Don t know	Count	3	10	3	0	16
	Expected Count	6.7	5.4	1.7	2.2	16.0
	%	1.8%	7.7%	7.3%	0.0%	4.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.9	2.5	1.1	-1.6	
Total	Count	163	130	41	54	388
	Expected Count	163.0	130.0	41.0	54.0	388.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

How important is your national identity to your sense of who you are?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	73	27	9	8	117
	Expected Count	49.3	39.3	12.4	16.0	117.0
	%	44.8%	20.8%	22.0%	15.1%	30.2%
	Adjusted Residual	5.3	-2.9	-1.2	-2.6	
Quite important	Count	59	55	11	28	153
	Expected Count	64.4	51.4	16.2	21.0	153.0
	%	36.2%	42.3%	26.8%	52.8%	39.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.1	.8	-1.8	2.1	
Not very important	Count	25	31	10	14	80
	Expected Count	33.7	26.9	8.5	11.0	80.0
	%	15.3%	23.8%	24.4%	26.4%	20.7%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.2	1.1	.6	1.1	
Not at all important	Count	5	7	8	2	22
	Expected Count	9.3	7.4	2.3	3.0	22.0
	%	3.1%	5.4%	19.5%	3.8%	5.7%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.9	-.2	4.0	-.6	
Don t know	Count	1	10	3	1	15
	Expected Count	6.3	5.0	1.6	2.1	15.0
	%	.6%	7.7%	7.3%	1.9%	3.9%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.8	2.8	1.2	-.8	
Total	Count	163	130	41	53	387
	Expected Count	163.0	130.0	41.0	53.0	387.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

How important is where you live to your sense of where you live?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	40	7	1	5	53
	Expected Count	22.8	17.4	5.3	7.5	53.0
	%	24.7%	5.6%	2.6%	9.4%	14.1%
	Adjusted Residual	5.2	-3.3	-2.1	-1.0	
Quite important	Count	73	50	9	20	152
	Expected Count	65.3	50.0	15.3	21.4	152.0
	%	45.1%	40.3%	23.7%	37.7%	40.3%
	Adjusted Residual	1.6	.0	-2.2	-.4	
Not very important	Count	40	53	18	23	134
	Expected Count	57.6	44.1	13.5	18.8	134.0
	%	24.7%	42.7%	47.4%	43.4%	35.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.8	2.0	1.6	1.3	
Not at all important	Count	9	14	10	5	38
	Expected Count	16.3	12.5	3.8	5.3	38.0
	%	5.6%	11.3%	26.3%	9.4%	10.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.5	.5	3.5	-.2	
Total	Count	162	124	38	53	377
	Expected Count	162.0	124.0	38.0	53.0	377.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

How important is your gender to you sense of who you are?		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	Total
			Survey/School			
Very important	Count	75	52	13	12	152
	Expected Count	64.4	50.3	15.4	21.9	152.0
	%	47.2%	41.9%	34.2%	22.2%	40.5%
	Adjusted Residual	2.2	.4	-.8	-3.0	
Quite important	Count	56	43	9	24	132
	Expected Count	56.0	43.6	13.4	19.0	132.0
	%	35.2%	34.7%	23.7%	44.4%	35.2%
	Adjusted Residual	.0	-.1	-1.6	1.5	
Not very important	Count	18	22	9	16	65
	Expected Count	27.6	21.5	6.6	9.4	65.0
	%	11.3%	17.7%	23.7%	29.6%	17.3%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.6	.1	1.1	2.6	
Not at all important	Count	10	7	7	2	26
	Expected Count	11.0	8.6	2.6	3.7	26.0
	%	6.3%	5.6%	18.4%	3.7%	6.9%
	Adjusted Residual	-.4	-.7	2.9	-1.0	
Total	Count	159	124	38	54	375
	Expected Count	159.0	124.0	38.0	54.0	375.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .002						
= Significant Residual						

How important is your age to your sense of who you are?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	65	25	11	6	107
	Expected Count	45.4	36.3	10.5	14.8	107.0
	%	40.6%	19.5%	29.7%	11.5%	28.4%
	Adjusted Residual	4.5	-2.7	.2	-2.9	
Quite important	Count	73	64	13	33	183
	Expected Count	77.7	62.1	18.0	25.2	183.0
	%	45.6%	50.0%	35.1%	63.5%	48.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.0	.4	-1.7	2.3	
Not very important	Count	19	31	9	11	70
	Expected Count	29.7	23.8	6.9	9.7	70.0
	%	11.9%	24.2%	24.3%	21.2%	18.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.9	2.0	.9	.5	
Not at all important	Count	3	8	4	2	17
	Expected Count	7.2	5.8	1.7	2.3	17.0
	%	1.9%	6.3%	10.8%	3.8%	4.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	1.2	1.9	-.2	
Total	Count	160	128	37	52	377
	Expected Count	160.0	128.0	37.0	52.0	377.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

How important are your interests to your sense of who you are?		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	Total
		Survey/School				
Very important	Count	78	59	18	14	169
	Expected Count	71.6	56.0	17.3	24.0	169.0
	%	48.4%	46.8%	46.2%	25.9%	44.5%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	.6	.2	-3.0	
Quite important	Count	65	58	15	34	172
	Expected Count	72.9	57.0	17.7	24.4	172.0
	%	40.4%	46.0%	38.5%	63.0%	45.3%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.6	.2	-.9	2.8	
Not very/not at all important	Count	18	9	6	6	39
	Expected Count	16.5	12.9	4.0	5.5	39.0
	%	11.2%	7.1%	15.4%	11.1%	10.3%
	Adjusted Residual	.5	-1.4	1.1	.2	
Total	Count	161	126	39	54	380
	Expected Count	161.0	126.0	39.0	54.0	380.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .056						
= Significant Residual						

How important is your family to your sense of who you are?		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2010/2011	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St Anthony's	
Very important	Count	135	65	20	26	246
	Expected Count	105.5	82.2	24.6	33.7	246.0
	%	82.8%	51.2%	52.6%	50.0%	64.7%
	Adjusted Residual	6.4	-3.9	-1.6	-2.4	
Quite important	Count	24	50	9	22	105
	Expected Count	45.0	35.1	10.5	14.4	105.0
	%	14.7%	39.4%	23.7%	42.3%	27.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-4.9	3.6	-.6	2.5	
Not very/not at all important	Count	4	12	9	4	29
	Expected Count	12.4	9.7	2.9	4.0	29.0
	%	2.5%	9.4%	23.7%	7.7%	7.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.3	.9	3.9	.0	
Total	Count	163	127	38	52	380
	Expected Count	163.0	127.0	38.0	52.0	380.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square Test = .000						
= Significant Residual						

Appendix L

Statistical Data Analysis: ANOVA Results(2)

Social Identity Complexity Mean								
School	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Sacred Heart	130	5.7654	1.57953	0.13853	5.4913	6.0395	2	10
All Saints	41	5.2866	2.01832	0.31521	4.6495	5.9236	1.5	10
St. Anthony's	55	5.8182	1.75426	0.23654	5.3439	6.2924	0	10
Total	226	5.6914	1.71177	0.11387	5.467	5.9158	0	10
ANOVA = .243								

Appendix M

Statistical Data Analysis: Chi-Square Results(4)

People should be free to say what they believe even if it offends others.		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Strongly agree	Count	24	24	12	6	66
	Expected Count	27.0	22.7	7.6	8.6	66.0
	%	16.6%	19.7%	29.3%	13.0%	18.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-.8	.4	1.9	-1.0	
Tend to agree	Count	43	46	21	23	133
	Expected Count	54.5	45.8	15.4	17.3	133.0
	%	29.7%	37.7%	51.2%	50.0%	37.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.6	.0	1.9	1.9	
Tend to disagree	Count	59	33	6	14	112
	Expected Count	45.9	38.6	13.0	14.6	112.0
	%	40.7%	27.0%	14.6%	30.4%	31.6%
	Adjusted Residual	3.1	-1.3	-2.5	-.2	
Strongly disagree	Count	17	6	1	3	27
	Expected Count	11.1	9.3	3.1	3.5	27.0
	%	11.7%	4.9%	2.4%	6.5%	7.6%
	Adjusted Residual	2.4	-1.4	-1.3	-.3	
Don t know	Count	2	13	1	0	16
	Expected Count	6.6	5.5	1.9	2.1	16.0
	%	1.4%	10.7%	2.4%	0.0%	4.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	4.0	-.7	-1.6	
Total	Count	145	122	41	46	354
	Expected Count	145.0	122.0	41.0	46.0	354.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .000						
= Significant Residual						

Different ethnic and religious groups should adapt and blend into the larger society.		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Strongly agree	Count	25	25	8	7	65
	Expected Count	19.5	26.8	8.1	10.6	65.0
	%	31.6%	22.9%	24.2%	16.3%	24.6%
	Adjusted Residual	1.7	-.5	-.1	-1.4	
Tend to agree	Count	42	49	16	21	128
	Expected Count	38.3	52.8	16.0	20.8	128.0
	%	53.2%	45.0%	48.5%	48.8%	48.5%
	Adjusted Residual	1.0	-1.0	0.0	.1	
Tend to disagree	Count	12	21	7	14	54
	Expected Count	16.2	22.3	6.8	8.8	54.0
	%	15.2%	19.3%	21.2%	32.6%	20.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	-.4	.1	2.2	
Strongly disagree	Count	0	14	2	1	17
	Expected Count	5.1	7.0	2.1	2.8	17.0
	%	0.0%	12.8%	6.1%	2.3%	6.4%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.8	3.6	-.1	-1.2	
Total	Count	79	109	33	43	264
	Expected Count	79.0	109.0	33.0	43.0	264.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .013						
= Significant Residual						

People should respect the culture and religious beliefs of others even when these oppose their own values.		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Strongly agree	Count	60	53	19	14	146
	Expected Count	60.3	49.8	16.5	19.4	146.0
	%	42.0%	44.9%	48.7%	30.4%	42.2%
	Adjusted Residual	-.1	.7	.9	-1.7	
Tend to agree	Count	75	54	13	27	169
	Expected Count	69.8	57.6	19.0	22.5	169.0
	%	52.4%	45.8%	33.3%	58.7%	48.8%
	Adjusted Residual	1.1	-.8	-2.1	1.4	
Tend to/strongly disagree	Count	8	11	7	5	31
	Expected Count	12.8	10.6	3.5	4.1	31.0
	%	5.6%	9.3%	17.9%	10.9%	9.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.8	.2	2.1	.5	
Total	Count	143	118	39	46	346
	Expected Count	143.0	118.0	39.0	46.0	346.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .086						
= Significant Residual						

Different ethnic and religious groups should maintain their customs and traditions		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Strongly agree	Count	23	27	4	4	58
	Expected Count	14.4	25.8	7.6	10.2	58.0
	%	37.7%	24.8%	12.5%	9.3%	23.7%
	Adjusted Residual	3.0	.4	-1.6	-2.4	
Tend to agree	Count	28	66	20	30	144
	Expected Count	35.9	64.1	18.8	25.3	144.0
	%	45.9%	60.6%	62.5%	69.8%	58.8%
	Adjusted Residual	-2.4	.5	.5	1.6	
Tend to/strongly disagree	Count	10	16	8	9	43
	Expected Count	10.7	19.1	5.6	7.5	43.0
	%	16.4%	14.7%	25.0%	20.9%	17.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-.3	-1.1	1.2	.6	
Total	Count	61	109	32	43	245
	Expected Count	61.0	109.0	32.0	43.0	245.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Pearson Chi-Square = .019

= Significant Residual

Individuals should take responsibility for helping other people in their local community		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Strongly agree	Count	42	39	7	12	100
	Expected Count	42.3	33.3	11.4	12.9	100.0
	%	29.8%	35.1%	18.4%	27.9%	30.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-.1	1.4	-1.7	-.3	
Tend to agree	Count	88	63	24	27	202
	Expected Count	85.5	67.3	23.1	26.1	202.0
	%	62.4%	56.8%	63.2%	62.8%	60.7%
	Adjusted Residual	.6	-1.0	.3	.3	
Tend to/strongly disagree	Count	11	9	7	4	31
	Expected Count	13.1	10.3	3.5	4.0	31.0
	%	7.8%	8.1%	18.4%	9.3%	9.3%
	Adjusted Residual	-.8	-.5	2.1	.0	
Total	Count	141	111	38	43	333
	Expected Count	141.0	111.0	38.0	43.0	333.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Pearson Chi-Square = .315

= Significant Residual

Appendix N

Statistical Data Analysis: Chi-Square Results(5)

Tolerance and politeness towards others		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	74	74	24	31	203
	Expected Count	77.7	73.9	24.6	26.8	203.0
	%	52.1%	54.8%	53.3%	63.3%	54.7%
	Adjusted Residual	-.8	.0	-.2	1.3	
Mentioned	Count	68	61	21	18	168
	Expected Count	64.3	61.1	20.4	22.2	168.0
	%	47.9%	45.2%	46.7%	36.7%	45.3%
	Adjusted Residual	.8	.0	.2	-1.3	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .600						

Respect for the law		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	72	65	24	21	182
	Expected Count	69.7	66.2	22.1	24.0	182.0
	%	50.7%	48.1%	53.3%	42.9%	49.1%
	Adjusted Residual	.5	-.3	.6	-.9	
Mentioned	Count	70	70	21	28	189
	Expected Count	72.3	68.8	22.9	25.0	189.0
	%	49.3%	51.9%	46.7%	57.1%	50.9%
	Adjusted Residual	-.5	.3	-.6	.9	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .733						

Everyone should speak English		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	119	85	30	34	268
	Expected Count	102.6	97.5	32.5	35.4	268.0
	%	83.8%	63.0%	66.7%	69.4%	72.2%
	Adjusted Residual	3.9	-3.0	-.9	-.5	
Mentioned	Count	23	50	15	15	103
	Expected Count	39.4	37.5	12.5	13.6	103.0
	%	16.2%	37.0%	33.3%	30.6%	27.8%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.9	3.0	.9	.5	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .001						
= Significant Residual						

Everyone should vote		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	121	124	41	41	327
	Expected Count	125.2	119.0	39.7	43.2	327.0
	%	85.2%	91.9%	91.1%	83.7%	88.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.4	1.7	.7	-1.0	
Mentioned	Count	21	11	4	8	44
	Expected Count	16.8	16.0	5.3	5.8	44.0
	%	14.8%	8.1%	8.9%	16.3%	11.9%
	Adjusted Residual	1.4	-1.7	-.7	1.0	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .235						

Respect for all faiths		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	65	90	30	27	212
	Expected Count	81.1	77.1	25.7	28.0	212.0
	%	45.8%	66.7%	66.7%	55.1%	57.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.5	2.8	1.4	-.3	
Mentioned	Count	77	45	15	22	159
	Expected Count	60.9	57.9	19.3	21.0	159.0
	%	54.2%	33.3%	33.3%	44.9%	42.9%
	Adjusted Residual	3.5	-2.8	-1.4	.3	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .003						
= Significant Residual						

Respect for people from different ethnic groups		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	69	90	31	37	227
	Expected Count	86.9	82.6	27.5	30.0	227.0
	%	48.6%	66.7%	68.9%	75.5%	61.2%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.9	1.6	1.1	2.2	
Mentioned	Count	73	45	14	12	144
	Expected Count	55.1	52.4	17.5	19.0	144.0
	%	51.4%	33.3%	31.1%	24.5%	38.8%
	Adjusted Residual	3.9	-1.6	-1.1	-2.2	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .001						
= Significant Residual						

Freedom to criticise the views and beliefs of others		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	124	121	33	45	323
	Expected Count	123.6	117.5	39.2	42.7	323.0
	%	87.3%	89.6%	73.3%	91.8%	87.1%
	Adjusted Residual	.1	1.1	-2.9	1.1	
Mentioned	Count	18	14	12	4	48
	Expected Count	18.4	17.5	5.8	6.3	48.0
	%	12.7%	10.4%	26.7%	8.2%	12.9%
	Adjusted Residual	-.1	-1.1	2.9	-1.1	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .025						
= Significant Residual						

Everyone has a voice in politics through democracy		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	125	112	39	44	320
	Expected Count	122.5	116.4	38.8	42.3	320.0
	%	88.0%	83.0%	86.7%	89.8%	86.3%
	Adjusted Residual	.8	-1.4	.1	.8	
Mentioned	Count	17	23	6	5	51
	Expected Count	19.5	18.6	6.2	6.7	51.0
	%	12.0%	17.0%	13.3%	10.2%	13.7%
	Adjusted Residual	-.8	1.4	-.1	-.8	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .545						

Freedom of speech/expression		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	77	78	29	33	217
	Expected Count	83.1	79.0	26.3	28.7	217.0
	%	54.2%	57.8%	64.4%	67.3%	58.5%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.3	-.2	.9	1.4	
Mentioned	Count	65	57	16	16	154
	Expected Count	58.9	56.0	18.7	20.3	154.0
	%	45.8%	42.2%	35.6%	32.7%	41.5%
	Adjusted Residual	1.3	.2	-.9	-1.4	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .343						

Freedom to follow a religion of choice		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	91	111	38	33	273
	Expected Count	104.5	99.3	33.1	36.1	273.0
	%	64.1%	82.2%	84.4%	67.3%	73.6%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.3	2.9	1.8	-1.1	
Mentioned	Count	51	24	7	16	98
	Expected Count	37.5	35.7	11.9	12.9	98.0
	%	35.9%	17.8%	15.6%	32.7%	26.4%
	Adjusted Residual	3.3	-2.9	-1.8	1.1	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .001						
= Significant Residual						

That national policy is not made on the basis of religious beliefs		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	134	126	40	45	345
	Expected Count	132.0	125.5	41.8	45.6	345.0
	%	94.4%	93.3%	88.9%	91.8%	93.0%
	Adjusted Residual	.8	.2	-1.2	-.3	
Mentioned	Count	8	9	5	4	26
	Expected Count	10.0	9.5	3.2	3.4	26.0
	%	5.6%	6.7%	11.1%	8.2%	7.0%
	Adjusted Residual	-.8	-.2	1.2	.3	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .637						

Equality of opportunity		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	78	86	36	24	224
	Expected Count	85.7	81.5	27.2	29.6	224.0
	%	54.9%	63.7%	80.0%	49.0%	60.4%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.7	1.0	2.9	-1.8	
Mentioned	Count	64	49	9	25	147
	Expected Count	56.3	53.5	17.8	19.4	147.0
	%	45.1%	36.3%	20.0%	51.0%	39.6%
	Adjusted Residual	1.7	-1.0	-2.9	1.8	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .006						
= Significant Residual						

Freedom from discrimination		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	103	98	34	33	268
	Expected Count	102.6	97.5	32.5	35.4	268.0
	%	72.5%	72.6%	75.6%	67.3%	72.2%
	Adjusted Residual	.1	.1	.5	-.8	
Mentioned	Count	39	37	11	16	103
	Expected Count	39.4	37.5	12.5	13.6	103.0
	%	27.5%	27.4%	24.4%	32.7%	27.8%
	Adjusted Residual	-.1	-.1	-.5	.8	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .838						

Pride in country/patriotism		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	130	105	38	39	312
	Expected Count	119.4	113.5	37.8	41.2	312.0
	%	91.5%	77.8%	84.4%	79.6%	84.1%
	Adjusted Residual	3.1	-2.5	.1	-.9	
Mentioned	Count	12	30	7	10	59
	Expected Count	22.6	21.5	7.2	7.8	59.0
	%	8.5%	22.2%	15.6%	20.4%	15.9%
	Adjusted Residual	-3.1	2.5	-.1	.9	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .014						
= Significant Residual						

Justice and fair play		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	98	109	35	33	275
	Expected Count	105.3	100.1	33.4	36.3	275.0
	%	69.0%	80.7%	77.8%	67.3%	74.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-1.8	2.2	.6	-1.2	
Mentioned	Count	44	26	10	16	96
	Expected Count	36.7	34.9	11.6	12.7	96.0
	%	31.0%	19.3%	22.2%	32.7%	25.9%
	Adjusted Residual	1.8	-2.2	-.6	1.2	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .090						
= Significant Residual						

Responsibility towards other people in the community		Survey/School				Total
		16 Year Olds/Citizenship Survey 2007/2008	Sacred Heart	All Saints	St. Anthony's	
Not mentioned	Count	122	119	34	40	315
	Expected Count	120.6	114.6	38.2	41.6	315.0
	%	85.9%	88.1%	75.6%	81.6%	84.9%
	Adjusted Residual	.4	1.3	-1.9	-.7	
Mentioned	Count	20	16	11	9	56
	Expected Count	21.4	20.4	6.8	7.4	56.0
	%	14.1%	11.9%	24.4%	18.4%	15.1%
	Adjusted Residual	-.4	-1.3	1.9	.7	
Total	Count	142	135	45	49	371
	Expected Count	142.0	135.0	45.0	49.0	371.0
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi-Square = .195						

Bibliography

Abbas, T. (2005) British South Asian Muslims: before and after September 11. In Abbas, T. (ed.), Muslim Britain: communities under pressure, (pp. 3-17). London: Zed Books.

Accord Coalition (2014) Databank of Independent Evidence on Faith schools. Accord Coalition. Available from http://accordcoalition.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Databank-of-Independent-Evidence-on-Faith-Schools-April-2014.pdf (downloaded 21/12/2014).

ACUPA (Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas) (1985) Faith in the city. London: Church House Publishing. Available from http://www.churchofengland.org/media/55076/faithinthecity.pdf (downloaded 25/06/2010).

Ackerman, B. (1980) Social Justice in the Liberal State. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Adamson, J. (2000) Education. In: Ward, A. and Waller, A. (eds.) The Cambridge History of English Literature. New York: Bartleby. Available at: www.bartleby.com/cambridge/ (accessed 10/12/2008).

Ahern, K. J. (1999) Ten Tips for Reflexive Bracketing. Qualitative Health Research 9(3), pp 407-11.

Alasuutari, P (1995) Researching Culture: Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies. London: Sage.

Alwin, D., Felson, J., Walker, E. and Tufis, P. A. (2006) Measuring Religious Identities in Surveys. Public Opinion Quartely, 70(4), pp.530-564.

Ajegbo, K. (2007) Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship. (DfES, 2007). Available from: publications.teachernet.gov.uk/.../DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf (downloaded 12/12/2007).

Alexander, H. and McLaughlin, T. (2003) Education in Religion and Spirituality. In Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., and Standish P. (eds.) The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ameen, R. & Hassan, N. (2013) Are faith schools educationally defensible? Research in Teacher Education. 3(1), pp.11-17.

Anon (1988) Education in a Multicultural Society. Labour Party Consultative Document. London: House of Commons.

Arendt, H., (1968) <u>Between Past and Future</u>. Viking Press: New York.

Arthur J. (1998) Communitarianism: What are the implications for education? <u>Educational Studies</u>, 24(3), pp.353-368.

Arthur, J. and Bailey, R. (1999) <u>Schools and Community: The Communitarian Agenda in Education</u>. London: Routledge.

Arthur, J. & Crick, R.D. & Samuel, E. & Wilson, K. & McGettick, B. (2006) <u>Character Education: The Formation of Virtues and Dispositions in 16-19 Year Olds with particular reference to the religious and spiritual</u>. John Templeton Foundation. Available from http://www.learningforlife.org.uk/wplife/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Character-Education_FULL.pdf (downloaded 16/07/2012).

Association of Muslim Social Scientists (2004) <u>Muslims on Education: A position Paper</u>. Association of Muslim Social Scientists. Available from http://www.amssuk.com/docs/pdf/Muslims%20on%20Education%20Position%20Paper%20June%202004.pdf (downloaded 17/06/2009).

Astley, J. (1994) <u>Critical Perspectives on Christian Education: A Reader on the Aims, Principles and Philosophy of Christian Education</u>. Leominster: Fowler Wright.

Atkinson, R. and Kintrea, K. (1998) <u>Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood</u>

<u>Impacts of Owner-occupation</u>. Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.

Atkinson, R. F (1965) Instruction and indoctrination. In Archambault, R. D. (ed.) <u>Philosophical analysis and education</u>. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Atkinson, R. (2006) Padding the bunker: strategies of middle-class disaffiliation and colonisation in the city. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 43(4), pp.819–832.

Alibhai-Brown, Y. (2000) <u>After Multiculturalism</u>. London: The Foreign Policy Centre.

Allen, R. (2007) Allocating Pupils to their Nearest Secondary School: The Consequences for Social and Ability Stratification. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 44(4), pp.751-770.

Allen, R. and West, A. (2009) Religious schools in London: school admissions, religious composition and selectivity. <u>Oxford Review of Education</u>, 35(4) pp.471-494.

Allen, R and West, A (2011) Why do faith secondary schools have advantaged intakes? The relative importance of neighbourhood characteristics, social background and religious

identification amongst parents. British Educational Research Journal, 37(4), pp.691-712.

Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Reading: MA: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, G W and Kramer, B M (1946) Some Roots of Prejudice. Journal of Psychology, 22(1), pp.9-39.

Amin, A. (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. Environment and Planning A, 34(6), pp.959-980.

Amin, A. (2005) In the west, we love to hate. The Guardian 21st January. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/islam/story/0,,1394973,00.html (accessed 30/07/06).

Amir, Y. (1998) Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. In: Weiner, E (ed.) The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence. New York: Continuum Publishing, pp. 162-181.

Amir, Y. (1976) The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and race relations. In: Katz, P. and Taylor, D. (eds.) Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 245–308.

Anderson, P. and Mann, N. (1997) Safety First: The Making of New Labour. London: Granta.

Andrews, R. and Mycock, A. (2007) Citizenship Education in the UK: Divergence Within a Multi-National State. Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 3(1) pp.73-88.

Annette, J. (2005) Faith schools and communities: communitarianism, social capital and citizenship. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.191-201.

Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas (1985) Faith in the City. London: Church House Publishing.

The Archbishops' Council Church Schools Review Group (2000) The Way

Ahead: Church of England Schools in the new millennium. London: Church House. Available from http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1118777/way%20ahead%20-%20whole.pdf (downloaded 02/03/2012)

Arksey, H. and Knight, P. (1999) Interviewing for social scientists: an introductory resource with examples. London: Sage.

Arthur, J. (1995) Government Education Policy and Voluntary-Aided Schools. Oxford

<u>Review of Education Quarterly</u>, 21(5) pp.447-455.

Arthur, J. and Bailey, R. (1999) <u>Schools and Community: The Communitarian Agenda</u>. London: Falmer.

Arthur, J. (1995) <u>The Ebbing Tide: Policy and Principles of Catholic Education</u>. Leominster: Gracewing.

Arthur, J. (2005) Measuring Catholic school performance: an international perspective. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) <u>Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict?</u> Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.147-155.

Atkins, P. (2001) The Church school—good or evil: Against. <u>The Independent</u>, 1st March. Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/the-church-school-good-or-evil-693953.html (accessed 15/06/2010).

Atkinson, D. (1994) <u>The Common Sense of Community</u>. London: Demos. Available from http://www.demos.co.uk/files/thecommonsenseofcommunity.pdf?1240939425 (downloaded 17/01/10)

Bagguley, P. and Hussain, Y. (2003a) <u>The Bradford 'Riot' of 2001: A Preliminary Analysis</u>. Leeds University. Available from www.leeds.ac.uk/sociology/people/pbdocs/Bradfordriot.doc (downloaded 11/06/2006).

Bagguley, P. and Hussain, Y. (2003b) <u>Conflict and Cohesion: official constructions of 'community' around the 2001 'riots' in Britain</u>. Leeds University. Available from www.leeds.ac.uk/sociology/people/pbdocs/Conflict%20and%20Cohesion%204%20conference.doc (downloaded 11/07/06).

Balint, P. (2010) Avoiding an intolerant society: Why respect of difference may not be the best approach. <u>Educational Philosophy and Theory</u>, 42(1), pp.129–41.

Banks, J. and Banks, C. (1995) <u>Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education</u>. New York: Macmillan.

Bard, J. (2007) Faith Schools: minorities, boundaries, representation and control. <u>Forum</u>, 49(3), pp.227-280.

Barker, R. and Anderson, J. (2005) Segregation or Cohesion: Church of England schools in Bradford. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) <u>Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict?</u> Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.122-137.

Barrow, S. (2008) <u>Changing the Agenda on Faith Schools</u>. Open Democracy. Available at: http://www.opendemocracy.net/blog/ourkingdom-theme/simon-barrow/2008/09/01/changing-the-agenda-on-faith-schools (accessed 02/12/2008).

Baubock, R. (1996) Cultural Minority Rights for Immigrants. <u>International Migration Review</u>, 30(1) pp.203-250.

Baubock, R. (2002) Liberal Pluralism Under Attack. In <u>Proceedings of the Runnymede Conference of Cohesion, Community and Citizenship, May 2002</u>. London: The Runnymede Trust.

Bauman, Z. (2001) <u>Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World</u>. Bristol: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2011) <u>Collateral Damge: Social Inequalities in a Global Age</u>. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BBC News (2001) <u>Bradford trouble 'was predictable'.</u> news.bbc.co.uk 9th July. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1430809.stm (accessed 10/10/06).

BBC News (2006) <u>Faith schools 'climbdown' denied</u>. news.bbc.co.uk 27th August. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/6090044.stm (accessed 12/10/06).

Beckford, M. (2009) Christian Pupils Outnumbered by Muslims even in Roman Catholic Schools. <u>The Telegraph</u>. Available at http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/6028500/Christian-pupils-outnumbered-by-Muslims-even-in-Roman-Catholic-schools.html (accessed 14/05/2010)

Beckett, F. (2003) Teaching Tolerance. <u>The Guardian</u>, 14th October. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/education/2003/oct/14/faithschools.schools (accessed 01/02/09).

Beit-Hallahmi, B., and Argyle, M. (1997) <u>The psychology of religious behaviour, belief and experience.</u> London and New York: Routledge.

Bell, D. (1993) <u>Communitarianism and its Critics</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, D. (2005) A Communitarian Critique of Liberalism. <u>Analyse and Kritik</u>, 27(2), pp.215-238. Available from http://www.analyse-und-kritik.net/2005-2/AK_Bell_2005.pdf (downloaded 16/01/10).

Benton, T., Hutchison, D., Schagen, I. and Scott, E. (2003) Study of the performance of maintained secondary schools in England. Windsor: NFER. Available from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003494.htm (accessed 20/11/2013).

Benn C and Chitty C (1996) Thirty years on: is comprehensive education alive and well or struggling to survive? London: David Fulton Publishers.

Bennett, C. (2014) Forget these 'Trojan Horses' – the real issue is faith schools. The Guardian, 7th June. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jun/07/trojan-horse-infiltration-faith-schools-secular-education (accessed 01/08/2014).

Berger, P. (Ed.) (2005) The Desecularisation of the World: Resurgent Religion and world Politics. Washington, DC: Eerdmans.

Berger, P. (ed.) (2010) Between Relativism and Fundamentalism: Religious Resources for a Middle Position. Cambridge: William B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Bevir, M. and O'Brien, D. (2003) From Idealism to Communitarianism: The Inheritance and Legacy of John Macmurray. History of Political Thought, 24(2), pp.305-329.

Berkeley, R. (2008) The Right To Divide? Faith Schools and Community Cohesion. The Runnymede Trust. Available from www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/Summaries/RightToDivide-Summary.pdf (downloaded 03/01/2009).

Bertram-Troost, G.D., S.A. de Roos, and S. Miedema. (2006) Religious identity development of adolescents in religiously affiliated schools: A theoretical foundation for empirical research. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 27(3), pp.303–14.

Bertram-Troost, G., de Roos, S. and Miedema, S. (2009) The relationship between religious education and religious commitments and explorations of adolescents: on religious identity development in Dutch Christian secondary schools. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 30(1), pp.17-27.

Bertram-Troost, G. (2011) Investigating the impact of religious diversity in schools for secondary education: a challenging but necessary exercise. British Journal of Religious Education, 33(2), pp.271-283.

Bettencourt, B. A., Miller, N., & Hume, D. L. (1999). Effects of numerical representation within cooperative settings: Examining the role of salience in in-group favoritism. British Journal of Social Psychology, 38(3), pp.265–287.

Billings, A. (2009) God and Community Cohesion: Help or Hindrance? London: SPCK.

Billings, A. & Holden, A. (2008) The Burnley Project: Interfaith Interventions and Cohesive Communities. Lancaster University. Available from http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Publications/Documents/Document/DownloadDocumentsFile.aspx?recordId=33&file=PDFversion (downloaded 07/08/2013).

Blair, T. (1996) New Britain: My vision of a young country. London: Fourth Estate.

Blair, T. (1998) The third way: New politics for a new century. Fabian Pamphlet No 588, London: The Fabian Society.

Blair, T. (2001) Speech to the Christian Socialist Movement, Westminster Methodist Central Hall, 29 March.

Blair, T. (2002) Interview on BBC's Newsnight, 16th May.

Blalock, H. (1967) Toward a Theory of Minority-group Relations. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Blumer, H. (1958) Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. The Pacific Sociological Review, 1(1), pp.3-7.

Blunkett, D. (2001) Partnership with Faith Communities Vital to Civil Renewal. Home Office Press Release 140/2001, 19th June. Available at http://www.gov-news.org/gov/uk/news/partnership_with_faith_communities_vital/10327.html (accessed 04/05/2011).

Bobo, L. D. (1999) Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations. Journal of Social Issues 55(3), pp.445–72.

Bobo, L. and Licari, F. C. (1989), 'Education and Political Tolerance: Testing the effect of sophistication and target group effects'. Public Opinion Quarterly 53(3), pp.285-308.

Bourdieu, P. (1983) Forms of Capital. In: Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A.

(eds.) (1997) Education: Culture, Economy and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brah, A. (2007) Non-binarized Identities of Similarity and Difference. In: Wetherell, M. Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversirty and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.136-145.

Bramel, D. (2004) The Strange Career of the Contact Hypothesis. In: Yueh-Ting Lee et al (eds.) The Psychology of Ethnic and Cultural Conflict. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, pp.49-67.

Brandon, G. (2011) The Big Society in Context: A means to what end? Jubilee Centre. Available from http://www.jubilee-centre.org/uploaded/files/resource_413.pdf (downloaded 25/08/2011)

Breen, D. (2009) Religious diversity, inter-ethnic relations and the Catholic school: Introducing the responsive approach to single faith schooling. British Journal of Religious Education, 31(2), pp.103-115.

Brettingham, M. (2007) The role of faith schools in an age of diversity, The Times Education Supplement, April 6th, p. 18.

Brewer, M. (1993) The role of distinctiveness in Social Identity and Group Behaviour. In: Hogg, M. And Abrams, D. (eds.) Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp.1-16.

Brewer, M. (1999) The Psychology of Prejudice: Ingroup Love or Outgroup Hate? Journal of Social Issues, 55(3), pp.429-444.

Brewer, M. (2001) The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology. Political Psychology, 22(1), pp. 115-125.

Brewer, M. B., and Brown, R. J. (1998) Intergroup relations. In: Gilbert D. T., Fiske, S. T. And Lindzey, G. (eds.) Handbook of social psychology (Vol.2). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Brewer, M. B., & Gaertner, S. L. (2001) Toward reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In: Brown, R. and Gaertner, S (eds.) Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, (pp.451–472).

Brewer, M. and Pierce, K. (2005) Social Identity Complexity and Outgroup Tolerance. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31(3), pp.428-437.

Brighouse, H. (2005) Faith-based schools in the United Kingdom: an unenthusiastic defence

of a slightly reformed status quo. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) <u>Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict?</u> Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp83-89.

Brighouse, H. (2006) <u>On education</u>. London: Routledge.

British Educational Research Association (2011) <u>Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research</u>. British Educational Research Association. Available from http://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf (downloaded 23/11/2011)

British Humanist Association (1967) <u>Religion in Schools</u>. London: British Humanist Association.

British Humanist Association (2002) <u>A Better Way Forward</u>. London: British Humanist Association.

Brooksbank, K. and Ackstine, A.E. (1984) <u>Educational Administration</u>. Harlow: Councils and Education Press.

Brown, A. (2003) Church of England Schools: Politics, Power and Identity. <u>British Journal of Religious Education</u>, 25(2) pp.103-116.

Brown G (2004) Speech to the National Council for Voluntary Organisations Annual Conference. Available at http://www.ncvovol.org.uk/asp/search/ncvo/main.aspx?siteID=1&sID=18&subSID=206&documentID=1942 (accessed 05/07/2005)

Brown, Rupert, Adam Rutland and Charles Watters <u>Identities in Transition: A Longtitudinal Study of Immigrant Children</u>, (2008). Available from http://www.esrc.ac.uk/my-esrc/Grants/RES-148-25-0007/read (accessed 28/01/2014).

Brown, R. (2010) <u>Prejudice. Its Social Psychology</u>. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell

Brown, R. and Hewstone, M. (2005) An integrative theory of intergroup contact. <u>Advances in Experimental Social Psychology</u>, 37, pp.255–343.

Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S. and Stace, K. (2007) Intergroup Contact and Intergroup Attitudes: A Longitudinal Study. <u>European Journal of Social Psychology</u>, 37(4), pp.692–703.

Bruce, S. (2006) Secularization and the Impotence of Individualised Religion. <u>The Hedgehog Review</u>, Spring/Summer, pp.35-45.

Bruegel, I. (2006) Social Capital, Diversity and Education Policy. Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group. Available from: www.lsbu.ac.uk/families/publications/SCDiversityEdu28.8.06.pdf (downloaded 17/11/2008).

Brugues, J. (2009) Some challenges facing Catholic schools today. International Studies in Catholic Education, 1(1), pp.1-11.

Bryk, A.S., V.E. Lee, and P.B. Holland (1993) Catholic schools and the common good. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryman, A. (1988) Quantity and Quality in Social Research. London: Unwin Hyman

Bulkley, K., and Fisler, J. (2003) A decade of charter schools: From theory to practice. Educational Policy, 17(3), pp.317–342.

Bunting, M. (2008) Faith Schools can best generate the common purpose that pupils need. The Guardian, 8th September. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/sep/08/faithschools (accessed 01/02/09).

Burgat, F. (2003) Veils and Obscuring Lenses. In: Eposito, J. and Burgat, F. (eds.) Modernising Islam – Religion in the Public Sphere in the Middle East and Europe. London: Hurst and Co.

Burgess, H. J. (1958) Enterprise in Education. London: National Society.

Burgess, S. and Wilson, D. (2003) Ethnic Segregation in England's School Working Paper No.03/086, CMPO, University of Bristol. Available from: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmpo/publications/papers/2003/wp86.pdf (downloaded 24/07/2008).

Burgess, S., Mcconnell, B., Popper, C. and Wilson, D. (2004) Sorting and choice in English secondary schools Working Paper No.04/111, CMPO, University of Bristol. Available from: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmpo/publications/papers/2004/wp111.pdf (downloaded 04/05/2008).

Burgess, S., Wilson, D. and Lupton, R. (2005) Parallel lives? Ethnic segregation in schools and neighbourhoods. Urban Studies, 42 pp.1027–1056

Burn, J.; Marks, J; Pilkington, P. and Thompson, P. Faith in Education. London: Civitas.

Burnett, J. (2004) Community Cohesion and the State. Race and Class, 45(3), pp1-18.

Burnett, J. (2008) Community Cohesion in Bradford: neoliberal integrationism. In: Flint, J.

and Robinson, D. (eds.) Community Cohesion in Crisis. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Butler, P. (2010) Local Charity cuts jeopardise David Cameron's 'big society'. The Guardian. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2010/jul/23/charity-cuts-big-society (accessed 15/07/2011)

Cabinet Office (2001) A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: National strategy action plan. London: H.M. Government. Available from http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/HTMLDocs/images/NationalStrategyReport_tcm 97-51090.pdf (downloaded 07/08/2010).

Cabinet Office (2010) The Coalition: Our Programme for Government. . London: H.M. Government. Available from http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod_consum_dg/groups/dg_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/dig italasset/dg_187876.pdf (downloaded 05/08/2010)

Cable, V. (2005) Multiple Identities. Living with the new Politics of Identity. Demos. Available from http://www.demos.co.uk/files/multipleidentities.pdf (downloaded 17/06/11).

Cairns, B., Harris, M. and Hutchison, R. (2005) Faithful regeneration: The role and contribution

of local parishes in local communities in the Diocese of Birmingham. Birmingham: Centre of Voluntary Action Research, Aston Business School. Available from http://www.birmingham.anglican.org/upload/pdf/Diocese_FinalReport_TOPCOPY_24Jan05. pdf (downloaded 05/05/2011)

Callan, E. (1995) Common Schools for Common Education. Canadian Journal of Education, 20(3), pp.251-271.

Callan, E. (1996a) Political Liberalism and Political Education. The Review of Politics, 58(1), pp.5–33.

Callan, E. (1996b) Last Word. The Review of Politics, 58(1), pp.49–51.

Callan, E. (1997) Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cameron, D (2010a) Lets mend our broken society. (www) Conservatives. Available at http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2010/04/David_Cameron_Lets_mend_our_br oken_society.aspx (accessed 25/07/2011)

Cameron, D (2010b) The Big Society. (www) Conservatives. Available at http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/11/David_Cameron_The_Big_Society.aspx (accessed 25/08/2011).

Cardinale, H. E. (1967) Religious Tolerance, Freedom and Inter-Group Relations in the Light of Vatican II Council (Robert Waley Cohen Memorial Lecture 1966). London: Council of Christians and Jews.

Castells, M. (1997) The Power of Identity. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castles, S. (1996) Democracy and multiculturalism in Western Europe. Journal of Area Studies, 4(8), pp.51–76.

Castles, S. (2000) Ethnicity and Globalization: From Migrant Worker to Transnational Citizen. London: Sage.

Catholic Education Service (CES) (2006) Quality and Performance: A Survey of Education in Catholic Schools. Catholic Education Service. Available from http://www.cesew.org.uk/temp/QualityspamspPerformancesp-spAspSurveyspofspCatholicspSchools.pdf (downloaded 16/04/2007).

Catholic Education Service (CES) (2008) Catholic Schools, Children of Other Faiths and community cohesion. Catholic Education Service. Available from cesew.org.uk/.../CHERISHING EDUCATION FOR HUMAN GROWTH.pdf (downloaded 15/06/2010).

Chadwick, P. (2001) The Anglican Perspective on Church Schools. Oxford Review of Education, 27(4), pp.475-487.

Chitty, C (2001) The 2001 White Paper and the New Education Bill. Forum, 44(1), pp.13-14.

Chitty, C. (2004) Education policy in Britain. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chitty, C. (2007) The Malign Effects of Faith Schools. Forum, 49(3), pp229-236.

Church of England (1970) The Fourth R (Durham Report). London: National Society.

Church of England (2001) The Way Ahead (Dearing Report). London: Church House Publishing. Available from https://www.churchofengland.org/media/1118777/way%20ahead%20-%20whole.pdf (downloaded 15/04/2010).

Church of England Board of Education (2006) Church schools 'distinctive and inclusive'. London: Church of England Board of Education. Available at: http://www.cofe.anglican.org/info/yearreview/dec06/churchschools.aspx (accessed 24/05/09).

Church of England Archbishops' Council Education Division (2009) Strong Schools for Strong Communities. Church of England Archbishops' Council Education Division. Available from http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1204726/strong%20schools%20for%20strong%20communities%20-%20cofe%20report%20final.pdf (downloaded 15/08/10).

CIC (Commission on Integration and Cohesion) (2007) Our Shared Future. Available from image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Education/documents/2007/06/14/oursharedfuture.pdf (downloaded 16/01/2008).

Clements, B. (2010) Understanding public attitudes in Britain towards faith schools. British Educational Research Journal, 36(6), pp.953-973.

CLG (Communities and Local Government) (2010) Ministers talk Big Society with Faith leaders. (www) Communities and Local Government. Available at http://www.communities.gov.uk/newsstories/communities/1643068 (accessed 25/08/2011).

Clough, P. and Nutbrown, C. (2007) A Student's Guide to Methodology. London: Sage Publications.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) Research Methods in Education. London: Routledge Falmer,

Coldron, J., Tanner, E., Finch, S., Shipton, L., Wolstenholme, C., Willis, B., Demack, S. And Stiell, B. (2008) Secondary School Admissions. Research Report 020, London: DCSF. Available from www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR020.pdf (downloaded 12th January 2010).

Coleman, J. and Hoffer, T. (1987) Public and Private High Schools: the Impact of communities. New York: Basic Books.

Cole, I. And Ferrari, E. (2008) Connectivity of place and housing market change: the case of Birmingham. In: Flint, J. and Robinson, D. (eds.) Community Cohesion in Crisis. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Coleman, J. (1988) Social Capital in the creation of human capital. In: Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A. (eds.) (1997) Education: Culture, Economy and Society. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Community Cohesion Panel, (2004), The End of Parallel Lives? The Report of the Community Cohesion Panel. London: Home Office. Available from http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/153866.pdf (downloaded 15/08/2007)

Connolly, P. (2000) What now for the contact hypothesis? Towards a new research agenda. Race, Ethnicity and Education, 3(2), pp.169–193.

Conservative Party (2010a) The Conservative Party Manifesto 2010. London: The Conservative Party.

Conservative Party (2010b) Big Society not Big Government. London: The Conservative Party

Conway, G, Runnymede Trust, The, and Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia (1997) Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All. Runnymede Trust.

Cooling, T. (2010) Doing God in Education. Theos. Available from https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/education/nicer/docs/DoingGodinEducation.pdf (downloaded 13/05/2013).

Cooling, T., and Green, E. (2014) Mapping the Field. A review of the current research evidence on the impact of schools with a Christian ethos. Theos. Available from http://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/files/files/Reports/Mappingthefield.pdf (downloaded 13/01/2015).

Cook, S. W. (1978) Interpersonal and attitudinal outcomes in cooperating interracial groups. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(1), pp. 97–113.

Coote, A. and Franklin, J. (2010) Transforming welfare: new economics, New Labour and the new Tories. Soundings, 44, pp.37-46.

Copley, T. (1997) Teaching Religion: Fifty Years of Religious Education in England and Wales. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Coulson, A. (1999) Market Education: Unknown history (Studies in Social Philosophy and Policy, no. 21. Washington DC: Social Philosophy and Policy Centre.

Crace, J (2006) Non-believers. The Guardian, 5th December. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2006/dec/05/newschools.schools (accessed 15/06/09).

Crisp, R and Hewstone, M. (1999) Differential Evaluation of Crossed Category Groups: Patterns, Processes, and Reducing Intergroup Bias. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 2(4), pp307-333.

Crisp, R. J. and Turner, R.N. (2009) Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. American Psychologist, 64(4), pp.231-40.

Cruickshank, M. Church and State in English education. London: Macmillan.

Curtis, P (2005) Faith schools 'failing to teach obligation to society. The Guardian. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/education/2005/jan/17/schools.uk (accessed 20/05/2009).

Curtis, P. (2008) Union calls for end to single-faith schools, The Guardian. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/education/2008/mar/25/schools.faithschools (accessed 15/06/2013).

Curtis, P. (2009a) Labour school policies are unconvincing, says poll. The Guardian. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/mar/02/education-standards-poll (accessed 15/06/2013).

Curtis, P. (2009b) Faith schools 'failing to improve standards'. The Guardian. http://www.theguardian.com/education/2009/apr/18/faith-schools-standards-failing (accessed 15/06/2013).

Curtis, S. J. and Boultwood, M. E. (1996) An Introductory History of Education Since 1800. 4th Ed. London: University Tutorial Press.

Cush, D. (2003) Should the state fund schools with a religious character? Religious Education (PCFRE), 25(2), pp.10-15.

Cush, D. (2005) The faith schools debate. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 26(3), pp.435-442.

Czaja, R. and Blair, J. (2005) Designing Surveys. London: Sage Publications.

Dahya, B. (1974) The nature of Pakistani ethnicity in industrial cities in Britain. In: Cohen, A. (ed.) Urban Ethnicity. London: Tavistock, p.77-118.

Davies, L. (2008) Educating against extremism. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Dawkins, R. (2001) No faith in the absurd. Times Educational Supplement, 23rd February, p.17.

D'Costa, G. (1986) Theology and Religious Pluralism. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

D'Costa, G. (1996) The Impossibility of a Pluralist View of Religions. Religious Studies, 32(2), pp.223-232.

D'Costa, G. (2009) Christianity and World Religions. Disputed Questions in the Theology of Religions. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

DES (1992) Choice and Diversity: A New Framework for Schools. London: HMSO. Available at http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/wp1992/choice-and-diversity.html (accessed 14/05/2014).

DCSF (Department for Children, Schools and Families) (2007a) Faith in the System. Department for Children, Schools and Families. London: DCSF. Available from: www.governornet.co.uk/linkAttachments/Faith%20in%20the%20System.pdf (downloaded 19/11/2008).

DCSF (Department for Children, Schools and Families) (2007b) Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion. London: DCSF. Available from https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DCSF-00598-2007.pdf (downloaded 25/05/2010)

DCSF (Department for Children, Schools and Families) (2009) School Admissions Code. London: DCSF. Available from http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/sacode/pdf/SchoolAdmissionsCode100209.pdf (downloaded 01/02/2010).

DfE (Department for Education) (2013) National curriculum in England: citizenship programmes of study. London: DfE. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239060/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_Citizenship.pdf (downloaded 24/06/2014).

De Tocqueville, A. (2003) Democracy in America and Two Essays on America. London: Penguin, 2003.

Dearden, R. F. (1984) Freedom and the development of autonomy: a reply to Victor Quinn. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 18(2), pp.271–3.

Deer, C (2005) Faith schools in France. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.166-177.

Dench, G., Gavron, K. and Young, M. (2006) The New East End. London: Profile Books

Dennis, S. (2001) Faith-Based Organizations, Community Development, and the Reform of Public Schools. Peabody Journal of Education, 76(2), pp.222-240.

Dent, H.C. (1963) The Educational Systems of England and Wales. London: University of London Press.

DES (Department of Education and Science) (1986) City Technology Colleges. A new type of school. (London, DES).

DfEE (Department for Education and Employment (1997) Excellence in Schools. London: DfEE. Available from http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/pdfs/1997-excellence-in-schools.pdf (downloaded 25/02/2010).

DfEE (Department for Education and Employment) (1999) Code of Practice on School Admissions. London: DfES.

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2001a) Schools Achieving Success. London: DfES. Available from http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm52/5230/5230.pdf (downloaded 25/08/2010)

DfEE (Department for Education and Employment) (2001b) Schools Building on Success. London: DfEE. Available from http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm50/5050/5050.pdf (downloaded 19/12/2007).

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2002) Investment for Reform: Comprehensive Spending Review 2002. London: Stationary Office. Available from https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Investment_for_Reform.pdf (downloaded 25/06/2010)

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2003) Code of Practice on School Admissions. London: DfES.

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2005) White Paper: Higher standards, better schools for all. More choice for parents and pupils. London: DfES. Available from http://publications.dcsf.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/Cm%206677.pdf.pdf (downloaded 16/02/2006)

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2006) Making places in faith schools available to other faiths. London: DfES. Available at

http://www.dfes.gov.uk/pns/DisplayPN.cgi?pn_id=2006_0149 (accessed 14/09/09)

DETR (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions) (1997) <u>Involving communities in urban and rural regeneration: A guide for practitioners</u>. London: DETR.

DETR (Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions) (2001) <u>A forum for faith communities and government</u>. London: DETR.

Diamond, I. and Jefferies, J. (2006) <u>Beginning Statistics</u>. London: Sage Publications

Dinham, D. (2008) Commentary: From Faith in the City to Faithful Cities: The `Third Way', the Church of England and Urban Regeneration. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 45(10), pp.2163–2174.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 60(7), pp.697-711.

Donlevy, J. (2003) Catholic education and the inclusion of non-Catholic students: Qualitative findings and implications. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.

Donlevy, J. (2008) The common good: the inclusion of non-catholic students in Catholic schools. <u>Journal of Beliefs and Values</u>, 29(2), pp.161-171.

Donnelly, C. (2004a) Constructing the ethos of tolerance and respect in an integrated school: the role of teachers. <u>British Educational Research Journal</u>, 30(2), pp.263-278.

Donnelly, C. (2004b) What price harmony? Teachers methods of delivering an ethos of tolerance and respect for diversity in an integrated school in Northern Ireland. <u>Educational Research</u>, 46(1), pp.3-16.

Donnelly, C. and Hughes, J. (2006) Contact, Culture and Context: evidence from mixed race faith schools in Northern Ireland and Israel. <u>Comparative Education</u>, 42(4), pp.493-516.

Donovan, P. (2007) Faith schools and social cohesion. <u>New Statesman</u>, 27th November. Available at http://www.newstatesman.com/education/2007/11/faith-schools-society-division (accessed 15/11/2010)

Dreeben, R. (1968) <u>On what is learned in school</u>. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Driver, S. And Martell, L (1997) New Labour's communitarianisms. Critical Social Policy, 17(52), pp.27-46

Drever, E. (2003) Using Semi-structured Interviews in Small-Scale Research: A Teachers Guide. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education

Driver, S. and Martell, L. (1999) New Labour: Culture and Economy. In Ray, R. and Sayer, A. (1999) Culture and economy after the cultural turn. London: Sage, pp246-269.

Duncan, D. and Duncan, B. (1955) A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. American Sociological Review, 20(2), pp.210-17.

Economist The (2005a) Kindness of Strangers. A Report on Multiculturalism', The Economist, 28th February pp3-4.

Economist The (2005b) An underclass rebellion. The Economist, 10th November. Available at www.economist.com (accessed 14/12/06).

Edwards, T. and Whitty, G. (1997) Marketing Quality: Traditional and Modern Versions of Educational Excellence. In Glatter, R., Woods, P. and Bagley, C. (eds) Choice and Diversity in Schooling. London: Routledge.

Edwards, R., Foley, M. and Diani, M. (2001) Beyond Tocqueville: Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective. Hanover: Tufts University Press.

Eller, A. and Abrams, D. (2004) Come together: Longitudinal comparisons of Pettigrew's reformulated intergroup contact model and the Common Ingroup Identity Model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American contexts. European Journal of Social Psychology, 34(3), pp.229-256.

Elliot, L (2010) What caused the deficit? The Guardian. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/jun/07/what-caused-budget-deficit (accessed 24/07/2011)

Engebretson, K. (2008) The Catholic school called to dialogue: a reflection on some consequences of the ecclesial unity of the Catholic schools. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 29(2), pp151-160.

Erricker, E. (2006) If you don't know the difference you are living with, how can you learn to live with it? Taking difference seriously in spiritual and religious education. International Journal of Children's Spirituality, 11(1), pp. 137–150.

Evans, P. (2004) Laissez-faire and the Victorians. Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/trail/victorian_britain/education_health/laissez_faire_01.shtml

(accessed 02/02/10)

Everett, H. (2013) Can Church Schools Promote Tolerance in the Twenty-First Century? In Worsley, H. J. (ed.) Anglican Church School Education: Moving Beyond the First Two Hundred Years. London: Bloomsbury, pp.209-222.

Esposito, J. and Burgat, F. (2002) Modernising Islam. London: C Hurst and Co Publishers ltd.

Etzioni, A. (1995) The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda. London: Fontana.

Etzioni, A. (1997) Tony Blair: A Communitarian in the Making? The Times, 21st June, p.20.

Etzioni, A. (2000) The Third Way to a Good Society. London: Demos. Available from http://www.demos.co.uk/files/thethirdwaytoagoodsociety.pdf?1240939425 (downloaded 17/01/10).

Fairclough N. (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. London: Longman

Farnell, R., Furbey, R., Shams Al-Haqq Hills, S., Macey, M. And Smith, G. (2003) Faith in Urban Regeneration: Engaging Faith Communities in Urban Regeneration. London: Policy Press. Available from http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/jr138-faith-communities-regeneration.pdf (downloaded 24/05/2010)

Favell, A. (2001) Multi-ethnic Britain: an exception in Europe? Patterns of Prejudice, 35(1), pp.35-57.

Field, J. (2003) Social capital. London: Routledge.

Fielding, N. & Lee, R. (1998) Computer Analysis and Qualitative Research. London: Sage publications.

Finneron, D. and Dinham, A. (2002) Building on faith: faith buildings in neighbourhood renewal. London: Church Urban Fund.

Finneron, D., Green, L., Harley, S. and Robertson, J. (2001) Challenging communities: church related community development and neighbourhood renewal. London: Church Urban Fund and Churches Community Work Alliance.

Flatley, J., Williams, J., Coldron, J., Connolly, H., Higgins, V., Logie, A., Smith, N. and

Forbes, D. (1997). Ethnic Conflict: Commerce, culture, and the contact hypothesis. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Flick, U. (1998) An introduction to qualitative research. London: Sage.

Flint, J. (2007) Faith schools, multiculturalism and community cohesion: Muslim and Roman Catholic state schools in England and Scotland. Policy & Politics, 35(2), pp.251–268.

Flint, J. and Kearns, A (2004) Enabling and Cohesive or Irrelevant Divisive? The role of Church of Scotland Congregations in Scottish Communities. Scottish Affairs. 48. Available from http://www.scottishaffairs.org/backiss/pdfs/sa48/sa48_Flint_and_Kearns.pdf (downloaded 07/08/2010).

Fopp, R. (2007) Herbert MarCuse's 'Repressive Tolerance' and his Critics. Borderlands, 6(1). Available at http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol6no1_2007/fopp_marcuse.htm (accessed 15/03/2012).

Forbes, H. D. (2004) Ethnic conflict and the contact hypothesis. In: Yueh-Ting Lee et al (eds.) The Psychology of Ethnic and Cultural Conflict. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, pp.69-88.

Forest, R. and Kearns, A. (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. Urban Studies, 38(12), pp.2125-2143.

Francis, L. (1993a) Theology of education and the Church Schools. In Francis, L. And Lankshear, D. (eds.) Christian perspectives on Church schools: A reader. Leominster: Gracewing.

Francis, L. (1993b) Church and State. In Francis, L. And Lankshear, D. (eds.) Christian perspectives on Church schools: A reader. Leominster: Gracewing.

Francis, L. (2000) The domestic and general function of Anglican schools in England and Wales. International Journal of Education and Religion, 1(1), p.166-177.

Francis, L (2003) Recognizing and Educating Religious Minorities in England and Wales. In Iram, Y. (ed.) Education of Minorities and Peace Education in Pluralistic Societies. Westport, CT: Praegar Publishers

Francis, L. and Lankshear, D. (2001) The Relationship between Church Schools and Local Church Life: Distinguishing between Aided and Controlled. Educational Studies, 27(4), pp.425-438.

Francis, L. and Lankshear, D. (1993) The Impact of Church Schools on Village Church Life. In Francis, L. And Lankshear, D. (eds.) Christian perspectives on Church schools: A reader. Leominster: Gracewing.

Fraser, E. (1999) The Problems of Communitarian Politics: Unity and Conflict. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Freedland, J. (2005) France is clinging to an ideal that's been pickled into dogma. The Guardian, 9th November. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/france/story/0,11882,1637188,00.html (accessed 12/12/06).

Fukuyama, F. (1999) The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order. London: Profile Books.

Fullen, M. (1992) The Meaning of Educational Change. London: Cassell.

Fullem, M. (2000) Changes Forces: The Sequel. London: Falmer Press.

Furbey, R. (2008) Beyond 'social glue'? 'Faith' and community cohesion. In: Flint, J. and Robinson, D. (eds.) Community Cohesion in Crisis. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Furbey, R., Dinham, A., Farnell, R., Finneron, D., Wilkinson, G., Howarth, C.,

Furbey, R. and Macey, M. (2005) Religion and urban regeneration: a place for faith? Policy & Politics, 33(1), pp.95–116.

Fuss, D., (1995) Identification Papers. London: Routledge.

Fyfe, N. R. (2005) Making Space for "Neo-communitarianism"? The Third Sector, State and Civil Society in the UK. Antipode, 37(3), pp.536-557

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.). European review of social psychology, 4(1), pp. 1–26.

Gallagher, T. (2005) Faith schools and Northern Ireland: a review of research. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.156-165.

Galston, W.L. (1989) Civic Education in the Liberal State. In: Rosenblum, N. Liberalism and the Moral Life. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Galston, W. L. (1995) Two Concepts of Liberalism. Ethics, 105(April), pp.516–534.

Gamarnikow, E. and Green, A. (2005) Keeping the faith with social capital: from Coleman to New Labour on social justice, religion and education. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp90-102.

Garbin, D. (2007) An overview of religious and political dynamics among the Bangladeshi diaspora in Britain. In: Sahoo, A. K. and Maharaj, B. (eds.) Sociology of diaspora. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Gardner, P. (1988) Religious Upbringing and the Liberal Ideal of Religious Autonomy. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 22(1), pp.89-105.

Gardner, R. (2005) Faith Schools now: an overview. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp7-13.

Gardner, R. and Cairns, J. (2005) Continuing personal and professional development and faith schools. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.222-241.

Gates, B. (2005) Faith Schools and colleges of education since 1800. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.14-35.

Gibbons, S. and Silva, O. (2011) Faith primary schools: better schools or better pupils? Journal of labor economics, 29(3), pp589-635.

Giddens, A. (2000) The Third Way and its Critics. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilchrist, A. (2004) The well-connected community: A networking approach to community development. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Gillborn, D (1990) 'Race', Ethnicity and Education: Teaching and Learning in Multi-Ethnic Schools. London: Unwin-Hyman/Routledge.

Given, L. (2008) The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods Vol 2. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Gillard, D. (2001) Glass in their snowballs: the faith schools debate. Available at http://www.dg.dial.pipex.com/articles/educ22.shtml (accessed 19/04/08).

Gillard, D. (2007) Never mind the evidence: Blair's obsession with faith schools. Available at http://www.dg.dial.pipex.com/articles/educ29.shtml (accessed 19/04/08).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory New Jersey: Transaction

Publishers.

Gledhill, R (2006) Faith Schools will have to teach other religions. Times Online. Available from http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article733611.ece (accessed 04/05/2009)

Glennerster, H. (1991) Quasi-markets for education? Economic Journal, 101(Sept), pp.1268–1276.

Godwin, W. (1793) Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on Modern Morals and Manners. Available at http://www.efm.bris.ac.uk/het/godwin/pj.htm (accessed 16/03/09).

Goldstrom, J. (1972) The Social Content of Education, 1808-1870. Shannon: Irish University Press.

Goleman, D (1996) Emotional Intelligence. London: Bloomsbury.

Gonzalez, K. V., Verkuyten, M., Weesie J. and Poppe, E Prejudice towards Muslims in The Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. British Journal of Social Psychology, 47(4), pp.557-780.

Goodings, F. And Lauwerys, J. (1966) Church and State in Education: the world year book of education. London: Evans.

Goodman, P (2011) Can the Church work with David Cameron? Catholic Herald. Available at http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/features/2011/08/18/can-the-church-work-with-david-cameron/ (accessed 25/07/2011).

Gorard, S., Taylor, C. and Fitz, J. (2003) Schools, Markets and Choice Policies. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gosden, P. H. J. H. (1966) The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales. Oxford: Blackwell.

Grace, G. (2002) Catholic schools: mission, markets and morality. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Grace, G. (2003) Educational Studies and Faith-Based Schooling: Moving from Prejudice to Evidence-Based Argument. British Journal of Education Studies, 51(2), pp.149-167.

Grace, G. (2006) Professor Terence McLaughlin (1949–2006). Available at http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/ceppa/obituaries/mclaughlin.html (accessed 25/09/2013).

Grace, G (2009) Reflections on Allen and West's paper: 'Religious schools in London: school admissions, religious composition and selectivity'. Oxford Review of Education,

35(4), pp.495-503.

Greeley, A (1997) Coleman Revisited: Religious structures as a Source of Social Capital. American Behavioural Scientist, 40(5), pp.587–594.

Greeley, A. M. And Rossi, P.H. (2013) The Education of Catholic Americans. Aldine: New Jersey.

Grey, J. (2008a) The Atheist Delusion. The Guardian, 15th March 2008. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/mar/15/society (accessed 15/06/2010).

Grey, J. (2008b) Black Mass: Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia. London: Penguin.

Griffiths, P. (1976) Pressure Groups and Parties in Late Victorian England. Midland History, 3(3), pp.191-205.

Groothuis, D. (2004) On not abolishing faith schools: A response to Michael Hand and H. Siegel. Theory and Research in Education, 2(2), pp.177-188.

Guardian, The. (2005) What Does it Mean to Be a Citizen? The Guardian, 17th Jan 2005. Available at: www.guardian.co.uk/education/2005/jan/17/faithschools.schools (accessed 19/08/14).

Gurin, P., Nagda, B. r. A. and Lopez, G. E. (2004) The Benefits of Diversity Education for Democratic Citizenship. Journal of Social Issues, 60(1), pp.17-34.

Gutmann, A. (1987) Democratic Education. Princeton: University Press, Princeton NJ.

Gutmann, A., (ed.) (1994). Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gutmann, A. (1995) Civic Education and Social Diversity. Ethics, 105(April), pp.557–579.

Gweini (2008) Faith in Wales: Counting for Communities. Available from http://www.gweini.org.uk/en/faith-in-wales/96 (downloaded 25/08/10)

Hale, S. (2002) Professor Macmurray and Mr. Blair: The Strange Case of the Communitarian Guru that Never Was. Political Quarterly, 73(2), pp.191-197.

Hale, S. (2005) Communitarian Influence? Amitai Etzioni and the Making of New Labour. Unpublished Article. Available from http://www.amitaietzioni.org/documents/2005CommunitarianInfluence.pdf (downloaded

17/11/10).

Hale, S. (2006) <u>Blair's Community: Communitarian Thought and New Labour</u>. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hall, S. (2000) Conclusion: the Multi-cultural Question. In: Hesse, B. (ed.) <u>Un/settled Multiculturalisms</u>. London: Zed Books.

Hallinan, M. (1982) Classroom racial composition and children's friendships. <u>Social Forces</u>, 61(1), pp.56.72.

Halstead, J. M. (1986) <u>The Case for Muslim Voluntary-Aided Schools</u>. Cambridge: The Islamic Academy

Halstead, J. M. (1995) Voluntary apartheid? Problems of schooling for religious and other minorities in democratic societies. <u>Journal of Philosophy of Education</u> 29(2), pp.257–272.

Halstead, J. M. (2002) Faith and Diversity in Religious School Provision. In L. Gearon (ed.), <u>Education in the United Kingdom: structures and organisation</u>, pp. 146-157. London: David Fulton.

Halstead, J. M. (2003) Schooling and cultural maintenance for religious minorities in the liberal state. In K. McDonough and W. Feinberg (eds), <u>Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities</u>, pp. 273-293. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Halstead, M. and Taylor, M (2000) Learning and Teaching about Value: A Review of Recent Research. <u>Cambridge Journal of Education</u>, 30(2), p.169-202.

Halstead, J. and McLaughlin, T (2005) Are Faith School Divisive? In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) <u>Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict?</u> Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.61-73.

Halstead, M. And Taylor, M. (2000) <u>The Development of Values, Attitudes and Personal Qualities</u>. Basingstoke: NFER.

Hand, M. (2003) A Philosophical Objection to Faith Schools. <u>Theory and Research in Education</u>, 1(1), pp.89-99.

Hand, M. (2004) The problem with faiths: A reply to my critics. <u>Theory and Research in Education</u>, 2(3), pp.343-353.

Hanifan, L. J. (1916) The Rural School Community Center. <u>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</u>, 67(1), pp.130-138.

Hansard (1807) 13th June Vol. 9, cc798-806, House of Commons. Available at http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1807/jun/13/parochial-schools-bill#S1V0009P0_b_18070613_HOC_16 (accessed 17/08/2010).

Hansard (2002) 13th March, column 886-7, House of Commons. Available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020313/debtext/20313-03.htm#20313-03_spmin18 (accessed 17/07/2009).

Hansard (2008) 9th July, column 1422, House of Commons. Available at http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm080709/debtext/80709-0005.htm (accessed 15/08/2011).

Hansen, G.B. (1965) Separate but Equal: Some Myths and Realities of English Secondary Education. <u>Comparative Education Review</u>, 9(3), pp.356-365.

Hare, R. M. (1992) <u>Essays on Religion and Education</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hargreaves, David (1982) <u>The Challenge for the Comprehensive School</u>. Abingdon: Routledge.

Harris, M. (1998) <u>Organizing God's Work</u>. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Harries, R (2001) The Church School - Good or Evil: For. <u>The Independent</u>, 1st March. Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/the-church-school-good-or-evil-693953.html (accessed 15/06/2010).

Harrison, M. (2004) <u>Integration and social sustainability: Developing a substitute for the top-down delusions of community cohesion strategy, and creating appropriate research</u>. Leeds:

University of Leeds.

Hayward, J. (2011) Christians will build the 'big society' – if they are allowed. <u>The Guardian</u>. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2011/mar/17/christians-big-society-voluntary-work (accessed 30/08/2011).

Hazel, N. (1995) Elicitation Techniques with Young People. <u>Social Research Update</u>, 12,

Department of Sociology, University of Surrey. Available at
http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU12.html (accessed 15/08/2011).

Helm, T. And Townsend, M. (2014) Taxpayers' cash should not be used to fund faith
schools, say voters. The Observer, 14th June. Available at
http://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/jun/14/taxpayers-should-not-fund-faith-schools
(accessed 05/08/2014).

Hepworth, C. And Stitt, S. (2007) Social Capital and Faith-based Organisations. The
Heythrop Journal, 48(6) pp.895–910.

Herbert, I. (2001) 'Apartheid fears over first Muslim secondary school in state sector. The
Independent. Available at http://education.independent.co.uk/news/article237199.ece
(accessed 25/04/2006).

Herriot, P (2007) Religious Fundamentalism and Social Identity. London: Routledge.

Hewer, C. (2001) Schools for Muslims. Oxford Review of Education, 27(4), pp.515-527.

Hewstone, M., and Brown, R. (1986) Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the
"contact hypothesis." In: Hewstone, M., and Brown R., (eds.) Contact and conflict in
intergroup encounters. Oxford: Blackwell, (pp. 1-44).

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, F., Crisp, R. J. And Niens, U.
(2005) Intergroup contact in a divided society: Challenging segregation in Northern Ireland.
In: Abrams, D., Marques, J.M., and Hogg M.A. (eds.), The social psychology of inclusion
and exclusion. Philadelphia: Psychology Press, (pp.265-92).

Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Hughes, J. And Cairns, E. (2007) Do Neighbourhoods Matter? In:
Wetherell, M. Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversirty and
Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.102-112.

Heywood, A. (1998) Political Ideologies. London: McMillan Press.

Hick, J. (1995) The rainbow of faiths: critical dialogues on religious pluralism. London: SCM
Press.

Hirst, P.H. (1972) Christian education: a contradiction in terms? Learning for Living, 11(4),
pp.6–11.

Hirst, P.H. (1981) Education, catechesis and the church school. British Journal of Religious
Education, 3, pp.85–93.

HMSO (2007) House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, Citizenship Education, (Second Report of the session 2006-07) Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence. House of Commons: London. Available from http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmeduski/147/147.pdf (downloaded 28/0

Hobbs, G. and Vignoles, A. (2007) Is Free School Meal Status a Valid Proxy for Socio-Economic Status (in Schools Research)? Centre for the Economic of Education. Available from http://cee.lse.ac.uk/ceedps/ceedp84.pdf (downloaded 25/08/2013)

Hogan, David E. and Michael Mallott. (2005) Changing Racial Prejudice through Diversity Education. Journal of College Student Development 46, pp.115–25.

Hogg, M, & Reid, S. A. (2006) Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms. Communication Theory, 16(1), pp.7-30.

Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. Social Psychology Quarterly, 58(4), pp.255-269.

Holt, A. (2011) Keeping the Faith. Charity Times, April/May. Available from http://www.charitytimes.com/ct/April_May_2011_Cover_feature_faith_groups.php (accessed 14/05/2013).

Hope, J. and Rogers, J. (2006) Rethinking Values and Integration Beyond 'Multiculturalism'. The Henry Jackson Society. Available at http://zope06.v.servelocity.net/hjs/sections/britain_world/document.2006-08-29.6146841719/view?searchterm=JAMES%20HOPE (accessed 12/09/06).

Home Office (1999) Report of the Policy Action Team on Community Self-Help. London: Home Office. Available from http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ERORecords/HO/421/2/acu/shelp.pdf (downloaded 15/02/2011)

Home Office (2001) Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team (chaired by Ted Cantle). London: HMSO. Available from http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1502708 (downloaded 12/07/2006).

Home Office (2002) Building Cohesive Communities: A Report of the Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion (chaired by John Denham). London: HMSO.

Available from http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1502700 (downloaded 12/07/2006).

Home Office (2004) Working Together: Co-operation between Government and Faith Communities. London: HMSO. Available from http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/151393.pdf (downloaded 16/04/2010).

Humanist Philosophers' Group (2001) Religious Schools: the Case Against. London: British Humanist Association.

Hurt, J. S. (1970) Education in Evolution: Church, State, Society and Popular Education, 1800-1870. London: Rupert Hart-Davies.

Hurt, J. S. (1979) Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes 1860-1918. London: Routledge.

Hussain, D. and Palmer, S. (2005) Faith as social capital: Connecting or dividing? York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Husnu, S. And Crisp, R. (2010) Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46(6), pp.943-950.

Hussain, D. (2007) Identity formation and Change in British Muslims. In: Wetherell, M. Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversirty and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.34-39.

Hyde, K.E. (1990) Religion in childhood and adolescence: A comprehensive review of the research. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Hyman, H. H., and Wright, C. R. (1979) Education's Lasting Influence on Values. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ICM. (2009) ICM poll for the Guardian, 20–22 February. Available from http://www.icmresearch.com/pdfs/2009_feb_guardian_poll.pdf (downloaded 03/07/2010).

Independent, The (2006) Special report: State and religion. The Independent, 10th September.

Institute of Community cohesion (2009) Blackburn with Darwen Baseline Community Cohesion review with a focus on integration. Available from http://www.blackburn.gov.uk/upload/pdf/ICOCO_final_report_2009.pdf (downloaded

25/11/2010).

Ipgrave, J. and McKenna, U. (2008) Diverse Experiences and Common Vision: English Students' Perspectives on Religion and Religious Education. In Knauth, T., Jozsa, D.-P., Bertram-Troost, G. and Ipgrave, J. (Eds.) Encountering Religious Pluralism in School and Society: A Qualitative Study of Teenage Perspectives in Europe, Münster: Waxmann, pp.113-148.

Jackman, M. R. and Muha, M. J. (1984) Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement? American Sociological Review 49(6), pp.751-769.

Jackson, P.W., Boostrom, R. E. and Hansen, D. T. (1993), The Moral Life Of Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Jackson, R. (1997) Religious Education and an Interpretive Approach. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Jackson, R. (2001) Faith Based schools and Religious Education within the states system in England and Wales: Editorial. British Journal of Religious Education 24(1) p.2-6.

Jackson, R. (2003a) International Perspectives on Citizenship, Education and Religious diversity. London: Routledge

Jackson, R. (2003b) Should the State Fund Faith Based Schools? A Review of the Arguments. British Journal of Religious Education, 25(2), pp.89-102.

Jackson, R. (2004) Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

James, D., Taeuber, K. (1985) Measures of segregation. In: Tuma, N. (ed.) Sociological Methodology 1985. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp.1-32

Janmaat, J. G. (2010) Classroom Diversity and its Relation to Tolerance, Trust and Participation in England, Sweden and Germany. London: Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies Institute of Education University of London. Available from http://www.llakes.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/W.-Classroom-Diversity-and-its-Relation-to-Tolerance-Trust-and-Participation-in-England-Sweden-and-Germany.pdf (downloaded 24/05/2012).

Johnson, H. (2002) Three contrasting approaches in English Church/Faith schools: Perspectives from headteachers. International Journal of Children's spirituality, 7(2), pp.209-

219.

Johnson, H. (2006) Reflecting on faith schools. Abingdon: Routledge.

Johnson, N. (1999) The personal social services and community care. In Powell, M. (ed) New Labour, new welfare state? The 'third way' in British social policy. Bristol: The Policy Press, pp.77-100.

Johnson, N. (2007) Building an Integrated Society. In: Wetherell, M., Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.24-33.

Johnston, R., Forrest, J. and Poulsen, M. (2002a) Are there ethnic enclaves/ghettos in English cities? Urban Studies, 39(4), pp.591-618.

Johnston, R., Forrest, J. and Poulsen, M. (2002b) The ethnic geography of EthniCities. Ethnicities, 2(2), pp.209–235.

Johnston, R., Poulsen, M. and Forrest, J. (2005a) On the Measurement and Meaning of Residential Segregation: A Response to Simpson. Urban Studies, 42(7), pp.1221–1227.

Johnston, R., Wilson, D. and Burgess, S. (2004) School Segregation in Multiethnic England. Ethnicities 4(2), pp237-265.

Johnston, R., Wilson, D. and Burgess, S. (2005b) England's multiethnic educational system? A classification of secondary schools. Environment and Planning A, 37(1), pp.45-62

Johnston, R., Burgess, S., Wilson, D. and Harris R. (2006) School and Residential Ethnic Segregation: An Analysis of Variations across England's Local Education Authorities. Regional Studies, 40(9), pp.973- 990

Jordan, B. And Johns, N. (2007) New Labour: Trust, equality of opportunity and diversity. Social and Public Policy Review, 1(1). Available from www.uppress.co.uk/socialpolicy_pdf/Johns.pdf (downloaded 15/08/2010)

Judge, H. (2001) Faith-based Schools and State Funding: A Partial Argument. Oxford Review of Education, 27(4), pp.463-74.

Kearns, A. and Forrest, R (2000) Social Cohesion and Multilevel Urban Governance. Urban Studies, 37(5-6), pp.995-1017.

Keast, J. (2005) Faith schools, religious education and citizenship. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.213-222.

Kelly, A. (2001) Talking Point. Times Educational Supplement, 23rd February, p.6.

Kendall, J. and Knapp, M. (1996) The voluntary sector in the UK. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kennedy, N (2009) For Whom the School Bell Tolls. The Tablet, 8th August 2009, pp.4-5.

Kettle, M. (1995) Blair puts faith in community spirit. The Guardian, 13th March 1995, p.2.

Khan, O. (2007) Policy, Identity and Community Cohesion: How Race Fits. In: Wetherell, M., Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.40-58.

Kisby, B. (2010) The Big Society: Power to the People? The Political Quarterly, 81(4), pp.484-491.

Kokkonen, A., Esaiasson, P and Gilljam, M. (2008) Ethnic Heterogeneity in Schools: Its Effects on Trust, Tolerance and Civic Knowledge' (paper presented at the Conference on Educational Research, Gothenburg Sweden, 10-12 September 2008). Available from: http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228964074_Ethnic_Heterogeneity_in_SchoolsIts_Effects_on_Trust_Tolerance_and_Civic_Knowledge (Accessed 14/05/2013).

Kundnani, A. (2002) The death of multiculturalism. Institute of Race Relations. Available from http://www.irr.org.uk/2002/april/ak000001.html (accessed 11/06/2006).

Kundnani, A. (2001) From Oldham to Bradford: the violence of the violated. Race and Class, 43(2), pp.105-111.

Kundnani, A. (2006) Cant on Cohesion. Institute of Race Relations. Available at http://www.irr.org.uk/2006/august/ak000009.html (accessed 05/10/2006).

Kunzru, H. (2010) Looking back on New Labour. The Observer, 4th April. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/apr/04/hari-kunzru-on-new-labour (accessed 09/11/10).

Kymlicka, W. (1999) Education for Citizenship. In Halstead, J.M. and McLaughlin, T.H. (ed.) Anglican Church School Education: Moving Beyond the First Two Hundred Years. London: Bloomsbury, pp.209-222.

Lankshear, D. (1996) Churches Serving Schools. London: The National Society.

Labour Party (1997) The Labour Party Manifesto 1997. London: The Labour Party.

Labour Party (2001) The Labour Party Manifesto 2001. London: The Labour Party.

Labour Party (2005) The Labour Party Manifesto 2005. London: The Labour Party.

Lang, D. (Bishop) (2003) Reflecting on the Place of the Catholic School in Society Today. Paper presented to the Catholic Association of Teachers, Colleges and Schools conference, January.

Langan, J. (1990) Catholicism and Liberalism – 200 Years of Contest and Consensus. In Douglas, R., Mara, G. And Richardson, S. (eds.) Liberalism and the Good. London: Routledge, pp.105-124.

Lawrence, D. G. (1976) Procedural norms and tolerance: A reassessment. American Political Science Review 70(1) pp.80-100.

Lawton, D. and Cairns, J. (2005) Faith schools: some political issues an agenda for research. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.242-256.

Leach, A.F. (1911) Educational charters and documents 598 to 1909. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available from http://ia700302.us.archive.org/19/items/educationalchart00leaciala/educationalchart00leaciala.pdf (downloaded 10/11/2011).

Le Grand, J. and Bartlett, W. (1993) (eds.) Quasi-markets and social policy. London: Macmillan.

Leonardelli, G. J., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). Minority and majority discrimination: When and why. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37(3), pp.468–485.

LeVine, R.A., & Campbell, D.T. (1972). Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior. New York: Wiley.

Levin, L. (2005) Through the looking glass: religion, identity and citizenship in a plural

cultural: from the viewpoint of the modern Orthodox Jewish school. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.138-144.

Levitas, R. (1998) The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Leech, K. (20010 Through our Long Exile. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Levinson, M. (1999) The Demands of Liberal Education. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LGA (Local Government Association) (2002a) The Local Government Association's Guidance on Community Cohesion. London: LGA.

LGA (Local Government Association) (2002b) Faith and Community: A Good Practice Guide. London: LGA.

Liddle, R. (2006) How right wing the left sounds after its moment of racial truth. The Times 27th August. Available at http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,24393-2330258,00.html (accessed 6/10/2006).

Lightfoot, L (2005) Muslim schools accused of 'undermining our society'. The Telegraph. Available at http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1481425/Muslim-schools-accused-of-undermining-our-society.html (accessed 25/04/2008).

Lindon, S. (2005) Diversity in question. Open Democracy. Available at http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-multiculturalism/diversity_3138.jsp (accessed 09/10/2006).

Lindsay, T. and Lindsay, J. (2005), 'Integrated Education in Northern Ireland and the impact on children's attitudes'. In A. Osler (ed.) Teachers, human rights and diversity: educating citizens in multicultural societies. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books, pp. 41-52.

London Churches Group, (2002) Regenerating London: Faith Communities and Social Action. London: London Churches Group for Social Action. Available from http://www.londonchurchesgroup.org.uk/GLE-Faith-Communities-October2002.pdf (downloaded 28/07/2011)

Longley, C. (1995) Introduction. In Sacks, J. Faith in the Future. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Longshore, D. (1982) Race Composition and White Hostility: A research note on the problem of control in desegregated schools. Social Forces, 61(1), pp.73-78.

Lovatt, R., Lyall-Grant, F., Morris, Z. And Whitehead, C. (2005) Faith in the East of England. Cambridge: East of England Development Agency/East of England Faiths Council/University of Cambridge.

Lowndes, V. and Chapman, R. (2005) Faith, hope and clarity: developing a model of faith group

involvement in civil renewal. Civil Renewal Research Programme Report, De Montfort University. Available from http://www.ad.dmu.ac.uk/Images/Faith_Report_tcm6-6311.pdf (downloaded 06/06/2010).

P. Lukka, P. And Locke, M. (2000) Faith, Voluntary Action & Social Policy: A Review of Research. Voluntary Action 3(1). Available from http://www.ivr.org.uk/Institute+of+Volunteering+Research%2fVA+Documents%2fVA3_1% 2farticle2_lukkalocke.pdf (downloaded 07/05/2005).

MacIntyre, A. (1981) After Virtue. London: Duckworth.

Mackinnon, D. and Statham, J. (1999) Education in the UK: facts and figures (3rd Edn). London: Hodder and Stoughton/Open University.

Maclure, J. (1965) Educational Documents England and Wales 1816-1963. London: Chapmen and Hall.

MacMullen, I. (2007) Faith In Schools? Autonomy, Citizenship and Religious Education in the Liberal State. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

MacMurray, J. (1961) Persons in Relation. London: Faber and Faber.

Malik, K. (2002) Against multiculturalism. Kenanmalik.com. Available at http://www.kenanmalik.com/essays/against_mc.html (accessed 18/09/06).

Malik, K. (2005a) What Muslims Want. Despatches. Available at http://www.channel4.com/news/microsites/D/dispatches2006/muslim_survey/muslims.html (accessed 11/08/06).

Malik, K. (2005b) Born in Bradford. Kenanmalik.com. Available at http://www.kenanmalik.com/essays/bradford_prospect.html (accessed 05/10/05).

Malik, S. (2007) My Brother the Bomber. Prospect Magazine, 135, 30th June.

Manton, K. (2002) Kevin Manton regrets the political decision to remove direct democratic control over education a hundred years ago. History Today, 52(12), pp.18-19.

Marcuse, H. (1965) Repressive Tolerance. Available from http://la.utexas.edu/users/hcleaver/330T/350kPEEMarcuseToleranceTable.pdf (downloaded 15/03/2013).

Maritain, J. (1962) The education of man. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Markham, I. (1993) Creating Options: Shattering the 'Exclusivist, Inclusivist and Pluralist' Paradigm. New Blackfriars 74(867), pp.33-21.

Marples, R. (2005) Against faith schools: a philosophical argument for children's rights', International Journal of Children's Spirituality, 10(2), pp.133-147.

Mason, A. (1997) Review of Multicultural Citizenship. Philosophical Quarterly, 47(187), pp.250-253.

Mason, A. (1999) Political Community, Liberal Nationalism, and the Ethics of Assimiliation. Ethics. 109(January), pp.261-281.

Mason, A. (2000) Community, Solidarity and Belonging. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mason, M. (2005) Religion and schools – a fresh way forward? A rights based approach to diversity in schools. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp74-82.

Mason, J. (1996) Qualitative Researching. London: Sage Publications.

Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1988) The dimensions of residential segregation. Social Forces, 67(2), pp. 281–315.

Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1989) Hypersegregation in United States metropolitan areas: Black and Hispanic segregation across five dimensions. Demography, 26 (3), pp. 373–391.

Masters, D (2009) Blears: No proselytising with public money. Interfaith. Available at http://www.interfaith.org/2009/02/09/blears-no-proselytising-with-public-money/ (accessed 15/08/2011)

May, T. (1997) Social Research: issues, methods and process 2nd edition. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Mayor of London (2004) The State of London's Children Report. London: Greater London Authority. Available from

http://www.familieslink.co.uk/download/june07/State%20of%20Londons%20children.pdf (downloaded 06/05/2010).

McCall, G., & Simmons, J. (1978) Identities and interactions. New York: Free Press.

McDonough, K. (1998) Can the liberal state support cultural identity schools? American Journal

of Education, 106(4), pp. 463–499.

McGettrick, B. (2005) Perceptions and practices of Christian Schools. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.105-112.

McGhee, D. (2003) Moving to 'our' common ground – a critical examination of community cohesion discourse in twenty-first century Britain. The Sociological Review, 51(3), pp.376-404.

McGhee D (2005a) Trouble up north: building community cohesion in Bradford Intolerant Britain. Berkshire: Open University Press

McGhee D (2005b) Patriots of the Future? A Critical Examination of Community Cohesion Strategies in Contemporary Britain. Sociological Research Online, 10(3). Available at http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/3/mcghee.html (accessed 11/07/06)

McGhee, D. (2008) The end of Multiculturalism? Maidenhead: Open University Press.

McGlynn, C., Niens, U., Cairns, E. and Hewstone, M. (2004) Moving Out of Conflict: The Contribution of Integrated Schools in Northern Ireland to Identity, Attitudes, Forgiveness and Reconciliation. Journal of Peace Education, 1(2), pp. 147-163.

McGrath, A (2007) The Dawkins Delusion. London: SPCK

McLaughlin, T. H. (1984) Parental Rights and the Religious Upbringing of Children. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 18(1), pp.75-83.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1985) Religion, Upbringing, and Liberal Vales: A Rejoinder to Eamonn Callan. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 19(1), pp.119-127.

McLaughlin, T (1996) The distinctiveness of Catholic education. In: McLaughlin, T., O'Keefe, J. and O'Keefe, B. (eds.) The Contemporary Catholic School. London: Farmer.

McKenna, U., Neill, S. and Jackson, R. (2009) Personal Worldviews, Dialogue and Tolerance -Students' Views on Religious Education in England. In Valk, P., Bertram-Troost, G., Friederici, M. and Béraud, C. (eds.) Teenagers' perspectives on the role of religion in their lives, schools and societies: A European quantitative study. Münster: Waxmann, pp.49–70.

McKie, R. (2002) Schools where hatred breeds. The Observer, 8th December. Available at
 http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/dec/08/scotland.race (accessed 15/06/05).

McKinney, S. (2006) The faith-based schools debate: challenging assumptions and stereotypes. Journal of Moral Education, 35(1), pp.105-115.

McKinney, S. (2008) Catholic schools in Scotland and divisiveness. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 29(2), pp.173-184

McLaughlin, T., O'Keefe, J. & O'Keefe, B. (eds.) (1996) The Contemporary Catholic School:

context, identity and diversity. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Mendus, S. (1989) Toleration and the limits of liberalism. Basingstoke and London: MacMillan.

Merry, M. S. (2007) Culture, identity, and Islamic schooling: a philosophical approach. New

York; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994) Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Miller, H. (2006) Citizenship Education and Jewish Schools. Birkbeck College Conference: Citizenship Education 18th May 2006. Available from www.citized.info/pdf/conferences/Helena_Miller_18_05_06.pdf (downloaded 19/11/2008).

Miller, K., Brewer, M. and Arbuckle, N. (2009) Social Identity Complexity: Its Correlates and Antecedents. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 12(1), pp.79-94.

Miller,N. (2002) Personalization and the promise of contact theory. Journal of Social Issues, 58(2), pp.387–410.

Mill, J. S. (1825) The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XXI - Essays on Equality, Law, and Education. The Online Library of Liberty. Available from http://files.libertyfund.org/files/255/Mill_0223-21_EBk_v5.pdf (downloaded 24/02/2010).

Milofsky, C. (1997) Organisation from community: a case study of congregational renewal. <u>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly</u>, 26(4), Supplement, pp.S139-S160.

Minogue, D. (1997) Etzioni's Communitarianism: Old (Communion) Wine in New Bottles. <u>Politics,</u> 17(3), public policy.161-168

Mirza, M. (2005) Multiculturalism and the promotion of faith schools – steps backward in education? <u>Education Forum</u>, 4th July. Available from http://www.instituteofideas.com/transcripts/edforumfaith.pdf (downloaded 04/05/2010)

Modood, T. (2004a) Multiculturalism or Britishness: a false debate. <u>Connections</u>, Winter 2004/2005. Available at http://www.cre.gov.uk/publs/connections/articles/04wi_falsedebate.html (accessed 07/02/2006).

Modood, T. (2004b) <u>Defined by some distinctly hyphenated Britishness</u>. Bristol University. Available from www.bristol.ac.uk/sociology/ethnicitycitizenship/times_hyphenated_britishness.pdf (downloaded 08/06/2006).

Modood, T. (2005a) Disaffected Muslims will make their votes count. <u>Financial Times</u> 28th April. Available from www.bristol.ac.uk/sociology/ethnicitycitizenship/tm_muslimsandtheelection_ft.pdf (downloaded 08/06/2006).

Modood, T. (2005b) <u>Remaking multiculturalism after 7/7</u>. Open Democracy. Available at http://www.opendemocracy.net/conflict-terrorism/multiculturalism_2879.jsp (accessed 07/02/06).

Modood, T. (2005c) How to live with who we are. <u>The Guardian</u>, 21st January. Available at <u>http://www.guardian.co.uk/islam/story/0,,1394784,00.html</u> (accessed 30/07/06).

Moreton, C. (2010) Can Religion rescue Dave's Big Society? <u>The Independent</u>. Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/cole-moreton-can-religion-rescue-daves-big-society-1935226.html (accessed 24/08/2011).

Morris, A. (2009) Contextualising Catholic school performance in England. <u>Oxford Review of Education</u>, 35(6), pp.725-741

Morris, A. (2010) Bridging Worlds: Ethnic Minority Pupils in Catholic Schools in England. <u>Journal of Belief and Values</u> 31(2), pp.203-213.

Morris, A (2014) Some social benefits of English Catholic schools. International Studies in Catholic Education, 6(1), pp.75-90.

Mulhall, S. And Swift, A. (1996) Liberal and Communitarians. Oxford: Blackwell

Murphy, J. 1968. Religion, the state and education in England. History of Education Quarterly, 8(1), pp.3-34.

Murphy, J. (1971) Church, state and schools in Britain, 1800-1970. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Murphy, A. (2005) Learning together: the case for 'joint church' schools. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.113-121.

Murray, D. (2013) Richard Dawkins Interview: 'I have a certain love for the Anglican tradition'. The Spectator, 14th September. Available at http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9018391/interview-richard-dawkins-on-what-hed-miss-if-christianity-vanished/ (accessed 14/04/2014).

Norman, J. and Ganesh, J. (2006) Compassionate Conservatism. London: Policy Exchange. Available from http://www.jessenorman.com/downloads/Compassionate_Conservatism.pdf (downloaded 23/08/2011)

Norris, P. and Inglehart, R. (2006) Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA) (2003) Faith in England's Northwest: The Contribution made by faith communities to civil society in the region. NWDA. Available from http://www.faithnorthwest.org.uk/assets/_files/documents/dec_07/faith__1196766921_contributiontofaithcommunities.pdf (downloaded 26/07/2011)

Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA) (2005) Faith in England's Northwest: Economic Impact Assessment. NWDA. Available from http://www.faithnorthwest.org.uk/assets/_files/documents/dec_07/faith__1196946056_economicimpactassessment2005.pdf (downloaded 26/07/2011)

Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA) (2009) Faith in England's Northwest: How Faith communities Contribute to Social and Economic Wellbeing. NWDA. Available

from
http://www.faithnorthwest.org.uk/assets/_files/documents/dec_09/faith__1260360339_FaithE nglandsNorthwest3_Final.pdf (downloaded 08/06/2011)

Novak, M. (1993) The Roman Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Free Press.

Ogden, J. (2009) Religious Liberty, Vatican II and John Courtney Murray. Kena Institute for Ethics. Available from http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Case-Study-Vatican-II.pdf (downloaded 15/10/2012).

Ogden, S.M. (1992) The Reality of God and Other Essays. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Ofsted. (2009) Independent Faith Schools. Available from http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/independent-faith-schools (downloaded 17/06/2012)

O'Keeffe, B. (1986) Faith, culture and the dual system. London: Falmer.

O'Keeffe, B. and Zipfel, R. (2003) Ethnicity, identity and achievement in Catholic

schools: supporting minority ethnic pupils in Catholic Secondary Schools. Catholic Education Service.

O'Keeffe, B. (1992) A Look at the Christian Schools Movement. In Watson B. (ed.) Priorities in religious education: a model for the 1990s and beyond. London: Falmer Press, pp.92-112.

Oldfield, A. (1990) Citzenship and Community. Civic Republicanism and the Modern State. Routledge: London

Oldfield, E., Hartnett, L., Bailey, E. (2013) More than an educated guess: Assessing the evidence on faith schools. Theos. Available from http://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/files/files/More%20than%20an%20educated%20guess.pdf (downloaded 30/10/2013).

Opie, C. (ed.) (2004) Doing Educational Research. London: Sage Publications

Orton, A. 2007. Contesting "Good Practice" in Faith-Based Action for Social Change: Diversity, Dialogue & Dilemmas in Christian Community Work. The Journal for Faith, Spirituality and Social Change, 1(1), pp.20-33.

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2003) Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: theoretical debates and young people's experiences. Educational Review, 55(3), pp.243-254.

Ota, C (1997) Learning to Juggle – the experience of Muslim and Sikh children coping with different value systems. Journal of Beliefs and Values, 18(2), pp.227-234.

Ouseley, H. (2001) Community Pride not Prejudice (The Ouseley Report). Bradford: Bradford City Council. Available from www.bradford2020.com/pride/report.pdf (downloaded 22/11/2006).

Parekh, B. (1986) The Concept of Multicultural Education. In Modgil, S., Verma, G., Mallick, K. and Modgil, C. (eds.) Multicultural Education: the Interminable Debate. Lewes: Farmer Press.

Parekh, B. (1996) Minority Practices and Principles of Toleration. International Migration Review, 30(1), pp.251-284.

Parekh, B. (2001) The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain Reporting on a Report. The Round Table, 362, pp.691-700.

Parekh, B. (2002) Common Belonging. In Proceedings of the Runnymede Conference of Cohesion, Community and Citizenship, May 2002. London: The Runnymede Trust.

Parekh, B. (2005a) British commitments. Propspect Magazine. 114(September). Available from http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=7003 (downloaded 9/10/2006).

Parekh, B. (2005b) Multiculturalism is a Civilized dialogue. The Guardian, 21st January. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jan/21/islamandbritain.comment9 (accessed 15/06/08).

Parker-Jenkins, M. (2002) Equal Access to State Funding: the case of Muslim Schools in Britain. Race Ethnicity and Education, 5(3), pp.273-289.

Parker-Jenkins, M. (2005) The legal framework for faith-based schools and the rights of the child. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp36-48.

Parker-Jenkins, M., Hartas, D. and Irving, B. (2005) In Good Faith Schools Religion and Public Funding. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Parsons, E., Chalkley, B. and Jones, A. (2000) School Catchments and Pupil Movements: a case study in parental choice. Educational Studies, 26(1), pp33-48.

Passow, H. (1961) Secondary Education for All: The English Approach. Columbus, Ohio:

Ohio State University Press.

Payne, B. K., Cheng, C. M., Govorun, O., and Stewart, B. D. (2005). An inkblot for attitudes: Affect misattribution as implicit measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89(3), pp.277–293.

Peach C (1996) Does Britain Have Ghettos? Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 21(1), pp.216-235.

Peach, C. (1998a) Loïc Wacquant's 'Three Pernicious Premises in the Study of the American Ghetto. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 22(3), pp507-510.

Peach, C. (1998b) South Asian and Caribbean ethnic minority housing choice in Britain. Urban Studies, 35(10), pp.1657–1680.

Peach, C. (1999) London and New York: contrasts in British and American models of segregation. International Journal of Population Geography, 5(5) pp.319-351.

Peshkin, A. (1986) God's Choice: The Total World of a Fundamentalist Christian School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peri, P. (1999) Education and Prejudice against Immigrants. In L. Hagendoorn and S.Nekuee (eds), Education and racism: a crass national inventory of positive effects

of education on ethnic tolerance (pp. 21-32). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1971) Racially separate or together? New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997) Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23(2), pp.173–185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998) Intergroup Contact Theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 49(1), pp.68-85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (2009) Secondary transfer effect of contact: Do intergroup contact effects spread to noncontacted outgroups? Social Psychology, 40(2), pp.55-65.

Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2000) Does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Recent Meta-analytic Findings. In: Oskamp, S. (ed.) Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2006) A Meta-analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90(5), pp.751–83.

Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life (2009) The Establishment Clause and Government Funding of Religious Schools and Other Faith-Based Organisations. Pew Research Centre. Available from http://pewforum.org/newassets/images/reports/funding/funding.pdf (downloaded 07/11/2011.

Pew Research Centre (2006) The Great Divide: How Westerners and Muslims View Each Other. Pew Research Centre. Available from http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/253.pdf (downloaded 11/11/2006).

Pennell, H., West, A. and Hind, A. (2006) Secondary school admissions in London. Clare Market Papers 19 (London, LSE Centre for Educational Research). Available from www.lse.ac.uk/collections/ERG/pdf/cmp19.pdf (downloaded 16/05/2009).

Pennell, H., West, A. and Hind, A. (2007) Religious Composition and Admission Processes of Faith Secondary Schools in London. Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust Limited. Available from www.lse.ac.uk/collections/.../FaithSchoolsMay2007%5B1%5D.pdf (downloaded 15/02/2010)

Pfaff W (2005) A monster of our own making. The Observer, 21st August. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/aug/21/july7.terrorism (accessed 21/05/2007)

Phillips, D. (1998) Black minority ethnic concentration, segregation and dispersal in Britain. Urban Studies, 35(10), pp. 1681–1702.

Phillips, D. (2002) Movement to opportunity? South Asian relocation in northern cities. End of Award report, ESRC R000238038. School of Geography, University of Leeds.

Phillips, D. (2006) Parallel lives? Challenging discourses of British Muslim self-segregation. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 24(1), pp.25–40.

Phillips, D., Simpson, L. and Ahmed, S. (2008) Shifting geographies of minority ethnic settlement: remaking communities in Oldham and Rochdale. In: Flint, J. and Robinson, D. (eds.) Community Cohesion in Crisis. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Phillips, T. (2005a) After 7/7: Sleepwalking to segregation. Commission for Racial Equality. Available at http://www.cre.gov.uk/Default.aspx.LocID-0hgnew07s.RefLocID-0hg00900c002.Lang-EN.htm#british (accessed 03/08/06).

Phillips, T. (2005b) A Burning Issue for Us All. The Observer, 6th November. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/france/story/0,,1635431,00.html (accessed 18/10/06).

Phillips, T. (2005c) Could the French borrow a little our pragmatism? Le Monde, 11th November. Available at http://www.lemonde.fr/web/article/0,1-0@2-706693,36-709200@51-704172,0.html (accessed 18/10/06).

Plant, E. A. (2004). Responses to interracial interactions over time. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30(11), pp.1458–1471.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(6), pp.790–801.

Populus (2006) Populus/daily politics, faith schools. Available from http://populuslimited.com/uploads/download_pdf-261006-The-Daily-Politics-Faith-Schools.pdf (downloaded 25/08/2009).

Portes, A. and Landolt, P. (1996) The Downside of Social Capital. The American Prospect 7 (26). Available at http://prospect.org/cs/articles?articleId=4943 (accessed 05/08/2010)

Portes Alejandro (1998) Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern

Sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 24, pp.1-24.

Poulsen, M., Johnston, R. and Forrest, J. (2001) Intraurban ethnic enclaves: Introducing a knowledge-based classification method. Environment and Planning A, 33(11), pp2071-2082.

Poulsen, M., Johnston, R. and Forrest, J. (2002) Plural cities and ethnic enclaves: introducing a measurement procedure for comparative study. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 26(2), pp.229–243.

Pring, R. (2005) Faith Schools: Can they be justified? In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp51-61.

Putnam, R. D. (1993) Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. (2000) Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R., Feldsetin, L. and Cohen, D. (2003) Better Together: Restoring the American Community. Australia: Simon and Schuster.

QCA. (2008a), KS3 Citizenship curriculum guidance. Available at:

http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/key-stage-3-and4/subjects/citizenship/keystage3/index.aspx.

(accessed 13/1/2009).

QCA. (2008b), KS4Citizenship curriculum guidance. Available at:

http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/key-stage-3-and4/subjects/citizenship/keystage4/index.aspx.
(Accessed 13/01/2009).

Race, A. (1983) Christians and Religious Pluralism: Patterns in the Christian Theology of
Religions. London: SCM Press.

Race, A. (2001) The Twin Tracks of Theology & Dialogue. London: SCM Press.

Race, A. and Hedges, P. M. (eds) (2008) Christian Approaches to Other Faiths. London:
SCM

Press.

Ragin, C. C. (1987) The comparative method: moving beyond qualitative and quantitative

strategies. Berkeley; London: University of California Press.

Ramadan, T. (2005) Islam allows us to integrate into Britain's shared national culture. The
Guardian, 21st January. Available at

http://www.guardian.co.uk/islam/story/0,,1395052,00.html (accessed 30/07/06).

Ratcliffe, P (ed.) (1996) Ethnicity in the 1991 Census: Volume Three Social Geography and

Ethnicity in Britain: Geographical Spread, Spatial Concentration and Internal Migration.
London: HMSO.

Rattansi, A. (2002) Who's British?: Prospect and the new assimilationism. In Proceedings of
the Runnymede Conference of Cohesion, Community and Citizenship, May 2002. London:
The Runnymede Trust.

Rattansi, A. (2003) Migration fantasies: how not to debate immigration and asylum. Open
Democracy. Available at http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-
migrationeurope/article_1254.jsp (accessed 30/07/06).

Rattansi, A. (2004) New Labour, new assimilationism. Open Democracy. Available at
http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article.jsp?id=1anddebateId=111andarticleId=2141
(accessed 30/06/2006).

Ray, J. J. (1983) Racial Attitudes and the Contact Hypothesis. The Journal of Social
Psychology, 119, pp.3-10. Available from http://jonjayray.tripod.com/contact.html (accessed

25/06/2013).

Rawls, J. (1972) <u>A Theory of Justice</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rawls, J. (1993) <u>Political Liberalism</u>. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reich, R. (2002) <u>Bridging Liberalism and Multiculturalism in American Education</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reith, T. (2003) <u>Releasing the Resources of the Faith Sector: A Faithworks Report</u>. London: Faithworks.

Renzulli, L., and Evans, L. (2005). School choice, charter schools, and white flight. <u>Social Problems</u>, 52(3), pp.398–418.

Rex, J. and Moore, R. (1967) <u>Race, Community and Conflict.</u> London: Oxford University Press.

Ritchie, D. (2001) <u>Oldham Independent Review: One Oldham, One Future</u>. Manchester: Government Office for the North West. Available from http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2001/12/11/Oldhamindependentreview.pdf (downloaded 07/08/2010)

Rivkin, S. G. (1994) Residential Segregation and School Integration. <u>Sociology of Education</u>, 67(4), pp.279-292.

Rizvi, S. (2007a) <u>Muslim Schools in Britain: Socialization and Identity</u>. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Rizvi, S. (2007b) New Cultures, Security and transnational belonging: cross generational perspectives among British Pakistani women. <u>European Journal of Cultural Studies</u>, 10(3) pp.327-42.

Robinson, D. (2005) The search for Community Cohesion: Key themes and dominant concepts of the public policy agenda. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 42(8), pp1411-1427.

Robinson, D. (2008) Community cohesion and the politics of communitarianism. In: Flint, J. and Robinson, D. (eds.) <u>Community Cohesion in Crisis</u>. Bristol: The Policy Press

Robson, C. (2002) <u>Real World Research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers</u> (second edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Roccas, S. and Brewer, M. (2002) Social Identity Complexity. <u>Personality and Social</u>

Psychology Review, 6(2), pp.88-106.

Romain, J. (2001) The lesson of Bradford is not to create apartheid in our schools. The Times, 26th July, p.18.

Romain, J. (2005) Faith schools are a recipe for social disaster. The Times, 1st October. Available at http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article573184.ece (accessed (24/08/2008).

Romain, J. (2008) I'm for Faith, not Faith Schools. The Guardian, 2nd September. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/sep/02/faithschools.schools (accessed 15/09/09)

Runnymede Trust, The (2000) The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report. London: Profile Books.

Russell, L. (2007) Keeping the Faith. Forum, 49(3).

Sajid, M. (2005) The gap between us: British Muslims and 7/7. Open Democracy. Available at
http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article.jsp?id=3anddebateId=124andarticleId=2682 (accessed 03/08/06).

Sandel, M. (1982) Liberalism and the Limits of Justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schofield, B. (2002) Partners in Power: Governing the Self-Sustaining Community. Sociology, 36(3), pp.663-683.

Sasano, Y. (2003) The creation of British Muslim identity in the Islamic schools of London. Unpublished MPhil thesis. Japan: Hitotsubashi University.

Semprebon, M. (2004) Managing Diversity: Rotterdam and Leicester Compared. Research and training network urban Europe. Available from www.urban-europe.net/working/07_2004_Semprebon.pdf (downloaded 01/02/2006).

Sayyid, B. (2004/05) Fear and integration. Connections, Winter. Available at http://www.cre.gov.uk/publs/connections/articles/04wi_fear.html (accessed 03/08/06).

Schagen, S., Davis, D., Rudd, P. and Schagen, I. (2002) The Impact of Specialist and Faith Schools on Performance. Slough: NFER.

Schagen, I. and Schagen, S. (2005) The Impact of faith schools on pupil performance. In:

Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) <u>Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict?</u> Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.202-212.

Schofield, J (1993) Promoting Positive Peer Relations in Desegregated Schools. <u>Educational Policy</u>, 7(3), pp.297-317.

Schrag, F. (1998) Diversity, Schooling and the Liberal State. <u>Studies in Philosophy and Education</u>, 17(1), pp.29-46.

Schweitzer, F. (2007) Religious individualization: new challenges to education for tolerance. <u>British Journal of Religious Education</u>, 29(1), pp.89-100.

Schweitzer, F. and Boschki, R. (2004) What children need: cooperative religious education in German Schools – results from an empirical study. <u>British Journal of Religious Education</u>, 26(1), pp.33-44.

Selbourne, D. (1994) <u>The Principle of Duty</u>. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.

Sellgreen, K. (2002) Warning about Bin Laden schools. <u>BBC News Online</u>. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/1893911.stm (accessed 16/01/2008).

Shepherd, J. and Rogers, S. (2012) Church Schools Shun Poorest Pupils. <u>The Guardian</u>, 5th March.

Short, G. and Lenga, R-A. (2002) Jewish Primary Schools in a Multicultural Society: responding to diversity? <u>Journal of Beliefs & Values</u>, 23(1), pp.43-54.

Short, G. (2002) Faith-based schools: a threat to social cohesion? <u>Journal of Philosophy of Education</u>, 36(4), pp.559-572.

Short, G. (2003a) Faith schools and social cohesion: opening up the debate. <u>British Journal of Religious Education</u>, 25(2), pp129-41.

Short, G (2003b) Faith Schools and Indoctrination: A Response to Michael Hand. <u>Theory and Research in Education</u>, 1(1), pp331-341.

Siedlecka, J (2008) <u>Mainstream religious leaders united to defend schools</u>. Independent Catholic News. Available at http://www.indcatholicnews.com/news.php?viewStory=24 (accessed 24/02/2009).

Siegel, H. (2004) Faith, Knowledge and Indoctrination: A friendly Response to Hand. <u>Theory and Research in Education</u>, 2(1), pp.75-83.

Silverman, D. (1993) <u>Interpreting Qualitative Data: methods for analysing</u>

<u>tall; text and interaction</u>. London: Sage Publications.

Silverman, D. (2005) Doing Qualitative Research: a practical handbook. 2nd Ed. London: Sage Publications.

Simon, B., & Brown, R. (1987). Perceived intragroup homogeneity in minority-majority contexts. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 53(4), pp.703–711.

Simpson, Charlotte (2012) My baby's not a Christian or a Muslim. She's a Guardian reader. <u>The Guardian</u>, 25th February. Available at http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2012/feb/25/parental-right-responsibility-child-religious (accessed 25/08/2013).

Simpson, Ludi (2004) Statistics of Racial Segregation: Measurers, Evidence and Policy. <u>Urban Studies</u>, 41(3), pp.661-681.

Sin, C. H. (2002) The Interpretation of Segregation Indices in Context: The Case

of P* in Singapore. <u>The Professional Geographer</u>, 54(3), pp.422–437.

Sivanandan, A. (2001) Poverty is the New Black. <u>Race and Class</u>, 43(2), pp.1-7.

Sivanandan, A. (2004) Our common values are brought about by a clash of cultures. <u>The Guardian</u>, 26th February. Availble at http://politics.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,9115,1156551,00.html (accessed 18/12/06).

Sivanandan, A. (2006a) Race, terror and civil society. <u>Race and Class</u>, 47(3), pp.1–8.

Sivanandan, A. (2006b) <u>Racism, Liberty and the War on Terror</u>. Institute of Race Relations.

Available at http://www.irr.org.uk/2006/september/ak000011.html (accessed 05/10/06).

Skinner, G. (2002) Religious Pluralism and School Provision in Britain. <u>Intercultural Education</u>, 13(2), pp.171-181.

Smith, A. (2001) Religious Education and the Emergence of the Integrated Schools in Northern Ireland. <u>Oxford Review of Education</u>, 27(4), pp.559-575.

Smith, Greg (1998) A Very Social Capital: Measuring the Vital Signs of Community Life in Newham. In Knight, B., Smerdon, M. and Pharoah, C., (eds.) <u>Building Civil Society</u>. West Malling, Kent: Charities Aid Foundation, pp.51–73.

Smith, G. (2001) Religion as a Source of Social Capital in the Regeneration of East London.

Rising East, 4 (3), pp.128–157.

Smith, Greg (2002) Religion, and the rise of social capitalism: the faith communities in community development and urban regeneration in England. Community Development Journal, 37(2), pp.167-177.

Smith, Greg (2003). Faith in the Voluntary Sector : A common or distinctive experience of religious organisations? Manchester, Working Papers in Applied Social Research, Dept of Sociology: University of Manchester. Available from http://gregsmith.synthasite.com/resources/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20The%20Faith%20Sectorfor%20manchester%20monograph%20_final_.pdf (downloaded 01/06/2011)

Smith, Greg (2004) Faith in community and communities of faith? Government rhetoric and religious identity in Urban Britain. Journal of Contemporary Religion, 19(2), pp.185-204.

Smith, Graeme (2008) A short history of secularism. London: I. B. Tauris.

Smith, K (2004) Faith in the North East: Social Action by Faith Communities in the Region. Commission in the North East. Available from http://www.northeastchurches.org.uk/library/files/5~Faith_in_The_North_East_report.pdf?PHPSESSID=vgeramjm (downloaded 25/06/2010)

Smith, M. (2010) From Bog Government to Big Society: Changing the State–Society Balance. Parliamentary Affairs, 63(4), pp.818–833.

Smyth, C. (1961) Joshua Watson and The National Society. An oration delivered by Canon Charles Smyth on the occasion of the 150th Anniversary of the Foundation of The National Society. Available at http://www.natsoc.org.uk/society/history/jwatson.html (accessed 02/02/10).

Snook, I. A. (1972) Indoctrination and Education. London: Routledge.

Social Justice Policy Group (2006) Breakdown Britain. Social Justice Policy Group. Available from http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/CSJ%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf (downloaded 25/08/2011).

Socialist Education Association (1981) The Dual System of Voluntary and County Schools. London: Socialist Education Association.

Socialist Education Association (1986) All Faiths in All Schools. London: Socialist Education

Association.

Sopel, J. (1995) Tony Blair: The Moderniser. London: Bantam.

Spinner-Halev, J. (2000) Surviving Diversity: Religion and Democratic Citizenship. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Stables, A. (2003) Leaning, identity and classroom dialogue. Journal of Educational Enquiry, 4(1), pp.1-18

Stathi, S., and Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining intergroup contact promotes projection to outgroups. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44(4), pp.943–957.

Stephens, M. and Roderick, G. (1973) Changing attitudes to education in England and Wales 1833-1902: The governmental reports, with particular reference to science and technical studies. Annals of Science, 30(2), pp.149-164.

Stephan, W. G. and Stephan, C. W. (1985) Intergroup anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41(3), pp.157–175.

Stephenson, K. (2001) Parents' Experience of the Process of Choosing a Secondary School. Research Report RR278. London: DfES. Available from http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR278.PDF (downloaded 18/05/2009).

Strauss, A. (1987) Qualitative analysis for social scientists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stringer, M., Irwing, P., Giles, M., McClenahan, C., Wilson, R. and Hunter, J. (2010)

Parental and school effects on childrens' political attitudes in Northern Ireland.

British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(2), pp.223-240.

Strike, K. A. (1996) Must Liberal Citizens be Reasonable? Review of Politics, 58(1), pp.41.48.

Sutherland, G. (1973) Policy-making in elementary education, 1870–1895. London: Oxford University Press.

Swann, M. (1985) Education for All: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. London: HMSO. Available at

http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/swann/index.html (accessed 16/06/2010)

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In Austin, W. G. and Worchel, S. (Eds.) The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole .

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human Groups and Social Categories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In Worchel, S. and Austin, L.W. (Eds.) Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, pp.7-24.

Tam, H. (2007) The Case for Progressive Identity. In: Wetherell, M., Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversirty and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.17-23.

Tausch, N., Hewsyone, M., Kenworthy, J., Psaltis, C., Schmid, K., Popan, J., Cairns, E. and Hughes, J. (2010) 'Secondary Transfer' Effects of Intergroup Contact: Alternative Accounts and Underlying Processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99(2), pp.282-302.

Taylor, C. (1985) Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, D. and Moghaddam, F. (1994) Theories of Intergroup relations: International social Psychological Perspectives. Westport: Greenwood Press

Taylor, J. (2002) After Secularism: British Governance and the Inner Cities. Whitefield Briefing, 7(5). Available from (http://klice.co.uk/uploads/whitfield/Vol%207.5%20Taylor.pdf)

Taylor, M. (1998) Local Racial/Ethnic Proportions and White Attitudes: Numbers Count', American Sociological Review, 63(4), 512–35.

Taylor, M. (2000) Communities in the lead: power, organisational capacity and social capital. Urban Studies, 37(5-6), pp.1019-1035.

Taylor, C., Gorard, S. and Fitz, J. (2000) A re-examination of segregation indices in terms of compositional invariance. Social Research Update 30, pp.1–8. Available from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU30.html (accessed 10/05/10).

Thiessen, E. J. (1987) Two Concepts or Two Phases of Liberal Education? Journal of Philosophy of Education, 21(2), pp.223-234.

Thiessen, E. J. (1993) Teaching for commitment: liberal education, indoctrination and Christian nurture. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Tonder, L. (2013) Tolerance: A Sensorial Orientation to Politics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tonnies, F. (2003) Community and Society. New York: Dover Publications.

Tomlinson, S. (2001) Education in a post-welfare Society. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Totterdell, M. (2005) Exclusion or embrace? Faith, social ideals and 'common schooling' in America's public education. In: Gardner, R., Cairns, J. and Lawton, D. (eds.) Faith schools: Consensus or Conflict? Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.166-177.

Tough, S. and Brooks, R. School Admissions Report: Fair choice for parents and pupils (IPPR, 2007). Available from http://oxydiane.net/IMG/pdf/schooladmissions.pdf (downloaded 15/08/2013).

Toynbee, P (2001) Keep God out of Class. The Guardian, 09th November. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/nov/09/schools.uk (accessed 14/03/2011)

Toynbee, P. and Walker, D. (2001) Did Things Get Better? An Audit of Labour's Successes and Failures. London: Penguin.

Travis, A. (2002) Anger at Blunkett 'whining maniacs' attacks. The Guardian, 6th September. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2002/sep/06/raceequality.politics (accessed 24/01/08).

Trevelyan, G. M. (1944) English social history: A survey of six centuries: Chaucer to Queen Victoria. London: Longmans, Green.

Tritter, J. and Chadwick, P. (1997) The Ties that Bind: Understanding Church Schools' Responses to Grant Maintained Status. Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Warwick.

Tritter, J. and Chadwick, P. (1998) <u>Competing Interests? Churches, Schools and Grand Maintained Status</u>. ESRC Research Group. Available from: http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/3763%5Cmrdoc%5Cpdf%5Ca3763uab.pdf (download 25/06/2010)

Troyna, B and Hatcher, R (1992) <u>Racism in Children's Lives. 'A Study of 'Mainly-White' Primary Schools</u>. London: Routledge.

Tropp, A. (1957) <u>The School Teachers: The Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day</u>. London: Heinemann.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005) Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. <u>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</u>, 31(8), pp.1145–1158.

Tropp, L. and Prenevost, A. (2008) The Role of Intergroup Contact in Predicting Children's Interethnic Attitudes: Evidence from Meta-analytic and Field Studies. In: Levy, S. and Killen, M. (eds.) <u>Intergroup Attitudes and Relations in Childhood Through Adulthood</u>. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 236-48.

Troyna, B (1987) Beyond Multiculturalism: Towards the Enactment of Anti-racist Education in Policy, Provision and Pedagogy. <u>Oxford Review of Education</u>, 13(3), pp.307-20.

Troyna, B and Carrington, B (1990) <u>Education, Racism and Reform</u>. London: Routledge.

Troyna, B., and R. Hatcher. (1992). <u>Racism in children's lives: A study of mainly-White primary schools</u>. London: Routledge.

Tucker, H. F. (1999) <u>A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture</u>. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, J. C. (1999) Some Current Issues in Research on Social Identity and Self-categorisation

Tufford, L. and Newman, P. (2012) Bracketing in Qualitative Research. <u>Qualitative Social Work</u>, 11(1), pp.80.96.

Theories'. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears and B. Doosje (eds) <u>Social identity: context, commitment, content</u>, (pp.6-34). Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). <u>Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory</u>. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, R.N. and Crisp, R.J. (2010) Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice. British Journal of Social Psychology, 49(1), pp.129–142

Turner, R.N., Crisp, R.J. and Lambert, E. (2007) Imagining Intergroup Contact Can Improve Intergroup Attitudes. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10(4), pp.427-441.

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., and Voci, A. (2007) Reducing explicit and implicit prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and intergroup anxiety. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93(3), pp.369-388.

Turner, R., Hewstone, M., Voci, A. and Vonofakou, C. (2007) A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95(4), pp.843-860.

Turner, J. C. and Onorato, R. S. (1999) Social Identity, Personality, and the Self-Concept: A Self-Categorization Perspective'. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer and O. P.John (eds) The psychology of the social self (pp.11-41). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Twinch, E. (2009) Faith, funding and the state. Thirdsector.com. Available at http://www.thirdsector.co.uk/news/Article/914534/religious-charities-faith-funding-state/ (accessed 24/05/2011).

UK Parliament (1998b) Human Rights Act 1998. Right To Education, Schedule 1 - The First Protocol, Part II, Article 2. Available at http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/schedule/1/part/II/chapter/2 (accessed 17/04/2011)

Underkuffler, L. (2001) Public funding for Religious Schools: Difficulties and dangers in a pluralistic society. Oxford Review of Education, 27(4), pp.577-592.

Uslaner, E. (1997) Faith, Hope and Charity: social capital, trust and collective action. Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland.

Uslaner, E. (2000) Producing and Consuming Trust. Political Science Quarterly, 115, pp. 569-590.

Van Driel, B. Confronting Islamophobia in Educational Practice. Trentham Books Ltd.

Van Laar, C., Levin, S. & Sinclair, S., Sidanius, J. (2005). The effect of college roommate contact on ethnic attitudes and behaviors. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41,

pp.329-345. Available from https://psych.princeton.edu/psychology/research/sinclair/pubs/roommate.pdf (downloaded 25/07/2013).

Verkuyten, M. (2004) Everyday Ways of Thinking about Multiculturalism. <u>Ethnicities</u> 4(1), pp53–74.

Verkuyten, M. (2005) Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multicultural hypotheses. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 88(1), 121–138.

Verkuyten, M., Thijs, J. And Bekhuis, H. (2010) Intergroup Contact and Ingroup Reappraisal : Examining the Deprovincialization. <u>Social Psychology Quarterly</u>, 73(4), pp398-416.

Vermeer, P. (2009) Denominational schools and the (religious) socialisation of youths: a changing relationship. <u>British Journal of Religious Education</u>, 31(3), pp.201-211.

Vogt, W. P. (1997) <u>Tolerance and Education</u>. London: Sage Publications.

Wagner, U., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T., Stellmacher, J. and Wolf, C. (2006) Prejudice And Minority Proportion: Contact Instead Of Threat Effects. <u>Social Psychology Quarterly</u>, 69(4) pp.380-390.

Walford, G. (2001) Funding for religious schools in England and the Netherlands. Can the piper call the tune? <u>Research Papers in Education</u>, 16(4), pp.359-380.

Walford, G. (2008) Faith-based schools in England after ten years of Tony Blair. <u>Oxford Review of Education</u>, 34(6), pp.689-699.

Walsh, P. (2000) New wine in renewed wineskin: a Jesuit school now. In Cairns, J., Gardner, R. and Watson, P. <u>Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness with school improvement</u>. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Walker, D. 2004 Margins for Error. <u>The Guardian</u>, 17th November. Available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2004/nov/17/publicsector.guardiansocietysupp.lement1 (accessed 25/11/2008).

Walzer, M. (1983) <u>Spheres of Justice: a defence of Pluralism and Equality</u>. Oxford: Robertson.

Walzer, M. (1997) <u>On toleration</u>. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ward, S. (2008) Religious control of schooling in England – diversity and division. Intercultural Education, 19(4), pp.315-323.

Warsi, S. (2010) The Importance of faith to life in Britain. (www) Conservatives. Available at

http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2010/09/Sayeeda_Warsi_The_importance_of _faith_to_life_in_Britain.aspx (accessed 25/07/2011)

Weisse, W. (2011) Reflections on the REDCo Project. British Journal of Religious Education, 33(2), pp.111-125.

West, A., Barham, E. And Hind, A. (2009a) Secondary School Admissions in England: Policy and Practise. London: Research and Information on State Education Trust. Available from http://www.risetrust.org.uk/Secondary.pdf (downloaded 21/04/2010).

West, A. and Hind, A. (2003) Secondary school admissions in England: Exploring the extent of

overt and covert selection. London: Research and Information on State Education Trust. Available from http://www.risetrust.org.uk/admissions.pdf (downloaded 26/01/2010)

West, A. and Hind, A. (2006) Selectivity, admissions and intakes to 'comprehensive' schools in London. England, Educational Studies, 32(2), pp.145-155.

West, A. and Hind, A. (2007) School Choice in London, England: Characteristics of Students in Different Types of Secondary Schools. Peabody Journal of Education, 82(2), pp.498- 529.

West, A., Hind, A., and Pennell, H. (2003) Secondary schools in London: Admissions criteria and cream skimming. London: Research and Information on State Education Trust. Available from http://www.risetrust.org.uk/london.html (downloaded 15/07/2007).

West, A., Hind, A. and Pennell, H. (2004) School admissions and 'selection' in comprehensive schools: policy and practice. Oxford Review of Education, 30(3) pp.347-369.

West, A. and Pennell, H. (2003) Underachievement in Schools. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

West, A., Pennell, H. And Hind, A. (2009b) Quasi-regulation and Principal–Agent Relationships: Secondary School Admissions in London, England. Educational Management, Administration and Leadership, 37(6), pp.784-805.

West, E. (2010) Why socialists and egalitarians hate the Big Society. The Telegraph. Available at http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/edwest/100047738/why-socialists-and-egalitarians-hate-the-big-society/ (accessed 24/08/2011).

Weil, S (2005) The Need for Roots. Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Wetherell, M. (2007) Introduction, Community Cohesion and Identity Dynamics: Dilemmas and Challenges. In: Wetherell, M., Lafleche, M. and Berkeley, R. (eds.) Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion. London: Sage Publications, pp.1-14.

White, M. J. (1986) Segregation and Diversity Measures in Population Distribution.

Population Index, 52(2), pp.198-221.

Williams, R.M. Jr. (1947) The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Williams, R. M. (1964). Strangers next door: Ethnic relations in American communities. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wilson, B. (1982) Religion in sociological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J. (2011) Faith organisations worry about funding. (www) BBC News. Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-lancashire-12881631 (accessed 25/08/2011)

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Bachelor, J. (2003). Intergroup contact: Effects on group

evaluations and perceived variability. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6(1), pp.93–110.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind perspectives on judgements of groups and individuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(4), 635–654.

Woolcock, M. (2001) The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes. ISUMA Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2(1), pp.11-17.

Worley, C. (2005) It's not about race. It's about the community: New Labour and 'community cohesion'. Critical Social Policy, 25(4), pp.483-496.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., and Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73(1), pp.73-90.

Yablon, Y. B. (2011) Religion as a basis for dialogue in peace education programs'.

Cambridge Journal of Education, 40(4), pp.341-35l.

Yin, R. K. (2003), Case Study Research: Design and Methods. (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Yorkshire Churches (2002) Angels and advocates: Church social action in Yorkshire and the Humber. Leeds: Yorkshire Churches (The Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber).

Young, I.M. (1990) The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In: Nicholson, L. (ed.) Feminism/postmodernism. London: Routledge, pp.300–23.

Young, J. (2003) To these wet and windy shores: recent immigration policy in the UK. Punishment and Society, 5(40), pp.449-462.

Young, G. M. and Hancock, W. D. (eds.) (1956) English historical documents XII (1), 1833-1874. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Zembylas, M. (2011) Toleration and Coexistence in Conflicting Societies: Some Tensions and Implications for Education. Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 19(3), pp.385-402