



Lundie, D. (2018) Is RE still not working? Reflections on the Does RE Work? project 5 years on. *British Journal of Religious Education*, pp. 348-356. (doi:[10.1080/01416200.2017.1405791](https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2017.1405791)).

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/206095/>

Deposited on: 17 December 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Is RE Still Not Working? Reflections on the *Does RE Work?* project 5 years on

David Lundie

Associate Professor of Education, University of St Mark & St John

Derriford Road, Plymouth PL6 8BH

dlundie@marjon.ac.uk

Biographical Note:

Dr David Lundie is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education & Social Science, University of St Mark & St John. He was the doctoral student on the AHRC/ESRC funded project: 'Does Religious Education Work? An investigation into the aims, practices and models of effectiveness in RE in the UK' at the University of Glasgow from 2008-2011. Dr Lundie's current research interests are in values in the school curriculum, community cohesion and the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of young people.

5001 words

Abstract:

The 'Does RE Work?' Project, part of the AHRC/ESRC Religion & Society Programme, ran from 2007-2011. Drawing on textual analysis, ethnographic case studies and practitioner enquiry, the study identified core confusions as to the purposes and entailments of Religious Education as practiced across the jurisdictions of the UK. This paper reflects on key developments in the area of religion and schools under the Coalition and Conservative governments in the light of the key findings of the project. While progress has been made toward a shared conception of the meaning and purpose of the subject, confusion persists as to the contested status of RE as a rigorous subject in the academic humanities. The paper makes recommendations with regard to the place of RE in a climate of increased interest and inspection of civic, personal and religious values and their place across the curriculum.

Keywords:

Ethnography; Meaning; Religious Education Policy; Secondary.

Introduction

The 'Does RE Work?' project, which ran from 2007-2011 undertook to understand the conceptions and definitions of Religious Education current at the time, their uses in practical and professional discourse, and their contested character. Drawing on a network of practitioner researchers, ethnographic observations in 24 schools across the UK (Lundie & Conroy, 2015), expert conversations (Baumfield, Conroy, Davis, & Lundie, 2011), surveys and analysis of classroom resources, the project sought to identify the different trajectories from the multiple espoused aims of RE, through enactment in classrooms to outcomes. In so doing, the project sought to enhance the now substantial public conversation on whether the inclusion of RE as a compulsory subject in the curriculum contributes to community cohesion and an understanding of diversity. The intervening years have seen the publication of a

revised (though still non-statutory) National Curriculum Framework (RE Council, 2013), a ‘long report’ by the inspectorate on the contribution of RE to pupils’ academic and personal development, which addresses community cohesion from the very first page (Ofsted, 2013) and revised requirements for subject content in Religious Studies examinations (Department for Education, 2015). More recently, a plenitude of reports (Woodhead & Clarke, 2015) (Butler-Sloss, 2015) (Dinham & Shaw, 2015) (APPG RE, 2013) have made proposals for the subject, including changes to the statutory requirements. These recommendations set the scene for future policy contestations as the All Party Parliamentary Group has signalled a significant divergence from the RE Council, just as the Council prepares for a Commission on the future of the subject.

Employing ethnographic case-studies in 24 schools across England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, the ‘Does RE Work?’ project sought to uncover rich data on the current conceptions and definitions of religious education, their uses and contested character, tracing these contestations from policy through enactment to the inner shape of teachers’ and students’ beliefs about both religion and RE. A key finding of the project was that RE faced a multitude of often competing imperatives, exacerbated by pressures on time and resources. The core elements of learning about and from religions and beliefs were often subservient to a range of social, civic and performative agendas, which varied depending on context, and included, but was not limited to: understanding cultural, racial or multicultural dimensions of contemporary British life, usually enframed as religious due to the nature of the subject; contributing to the spiritual, social or religious ethos of the school; civic and citizenship education, personal, sex and relationships education, sometimes addressing perceived shortfalls elsewhere in the curriculum; providing a space for the expression of opinions on a range of moral and social topics perceived to be of relevance. In some respects, ‘Does RE Work?’ painted a picture of the subject at a crossroads – many teachers emphasised the

importance of RE as a rigorous academic subject in the humanities alongside History and Geography, while two thirds of students participating in a follow up survey stated that RE was most like Citizenship (51%) or PSHE (16%) (Conroy et al. 2013).

If the project's aim was to stimulate public conversation, then at first glance this review of developments would point to success. Attentiveness to the subtleties of the ethnographic findings, however, indicates several ways in which the findings have been either misinterpreted, or have yet to find traction within the wide-ranging public and professional debate. Our work found that RE is often led by highly committed, thoughtful and innovative teachers, makes a positive contribution to the skills for living in a multicultural society; is flexible and often stands in a much needed counter-cultural position to the increasingly outcome-oriented and technocratic culture of English education. While these findings were largely positive, this liminoid or threshold status has led to a foundational conflict between the demands of an increasingly examination-driven system and an altogether new element which was not present during our fieldwork in the late 2000s: an increasingly prescriptive, explicit and securitised focus on the teaching of 'Fundamental British Values' (Bamber, Bullivant, Clark, & Lundie, In Development) (Smith, 2013). This paper attempts to draw out some implications from the project to help understand the situation and scope for professional agency understood as the space for RE teachers – individually, nationally, and (another development since the project concluded) through professional social networks such as TeachMeet and #REchatUK – to shape responses in the performative space between these constitutive but not cataclysmic problems (Biesta & Tedder, 2007). Drawing on the project's philosophical, theological and ethnographic analyses, with a particular focus on enacted classroom practice as the critical site in which curriculum is enacted, it is possible to draw attention to the impact of these structural changes – real and proposed – on teacher agency and the future of the subject.

The origins of this new tendency to police and inspect the role of civic values in the life of the school are complex, and it is not the purpose of this paper to enact a comprehensive analysis. The DCSF REsilience programme, active in schools until 2012, operated by consent of school senior leaders (Miller, 2013), in contrast to its successor, the Prevent programme, which operates under the aegis of the Home Office and primarily through a revised inspection framework. This framework, which emerged in the aftermath of the moral panic surrounding allegations of a hard-line Muslim takeover of several Birmingham schools (Miah, 2014) gives attention to the arguably long neglected area of the Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural development of young people in the life of the school. Combined with a duty on all public institutions, including schools, to actively engage the Prevent agenda (O'Donnell, 2016) and the enumeration of 'Fundamental British Values', drawn from the Prevent strategy, in the Teachers' Standards (Smith, 2013) (Bamber, Bullivant, Clark, & Lundie, In Development), it is unsurprising that the securitisation of values education has attracted vocal protest (UCU and NASUWT, 2015) (Lundie, 2015).

In pausing to enumerate the changes already under way, and the changes proposed¹, since the 2011 *Does RE Work?* report was launched, it is possible to reflect on continuity and change, what has been done, for better and worse, and to make some recommendations for the future.

Continuity and Change in RE Policy Determination

While the statutory settlement for RE in England and Wales remains unchanged since the publication of our report, recent years have seen a number of prominent campaigns for change, prompted in part by the increasing discrepancies highlighted in our work (Baumfield,

¹ It must be noted that, in correspondence with the Association of University Lecturers in Religious Education, the Department for Education stated no intention to change the current statutory duty on Local Authorities to convene Standing Advisory Councils on RE, despite plans to effectively abolish the duty of any school to follow the Local Authority Agreed Syllabus. Expectations of change to the statutory settlement may yet prove to be premature or exaggerated.

Conroy, Davis, & Lundie, 2011) between policy and practice. At the time of the 1988 Education (Reform) Act, only local authority, voluntary controlled and voluntary aided schools existed in the state sector. With the stated aim that all schools in England are to become academies by 2022 (Department for Education, 2016), the impact of this change on plurality and local determination cannot be overstated.

There are in theory 174 different agreed syllabuses in local authorities in England and Wales, a range of different syllabuses in different Anglican and Roman Catholic dioceses, and several thousand different syllabuses in academy schools, which are now a majority of secondary schools in England. The diversity arguably reflects remarkable trust in, and respect for, local decision making. But also it implies a lack of diligence and concern... No other curriculum subject is treated in this way (Butler-Sloss, 2015).

While *Does RE Work?* highlighted the role RE played in many schools in enhancing local demographic considerations (Conroy, Lundie, & Baumfield, 2012, p. 312) including addressing community cohesion and multicultural considerations, outreach and voluntary work in the community and links with local religious institutions, communities and places of worship, this diversity of enactment is neither consonant with nor predicated on the unique plurality of curriculum determination which the subject enjoys. Free schools, introduced by the Coalition Government in 2010 and now subsumed under the general banner of academisation, have seen the entry of a range of new faith-based providers into the state education system, including England's first Greek Orthodox and Buddhist schools, and DfE have consulted *Inform*, the think tank on New Religious Movements, about the suitability of a number of other proposed free school sponsors. Even within the remaining local authority sector, resourcing for SACREs varies widely, from £90,000 in the best funded areas, to nil (APPG RE, 2013, p. 35). With the decrease in parental and local community accountability

which academisation represents, there have been near unanimous calls in recent reports (Butler-Sloss, 2015, p. 35) (Dinham & Shaw, 2015, p. 1) (Woodhead & Clarke, 2015, p. 37) for statutory National determination of the RE curriculum for England, ‘normalising’ the subject within the National Curriculum.

More positively, opportunities for professional development and the sharing of ideas have proliferated since the publication of our report. Events such as the NATRE *StrictlyRE* conference, aimed at teachers, and resource sharing banks such as CatholicREsource.co.uk have enabled teachers to innovate together in the absence of strong central guidance. The erosion of SACREs due to academisation and stronger central guidance has been accompanied by the concomitant rise of a number of regional RE ‘hubs’ providing support and development to the profession. As with academisation, this deregulation of professional development may serve to subvert ‘the dominance of the *official* authorial voice’ (Conroy J. C., et al., 2013, p. 161), though it also has the potential to further displace from criticism the origins and process of curriculum development, the selection of aims considered worthy of inclusion and the means by which such judgments are arrived at (Apple, 1990). Drawing from the examples in the project, the factors which will determine whether such subversion is more real than apparent are likely to be teacher confidence and student expectation.

With regard to the first of these, the influence of inspection on the priority and purpose of RE has experienced a dramatic shift, placing RE teachers in the line of fire in a way not seen during our fieldwork. At times, inspectors’ overlooking of RE’s strengths, as well as its perceived inadequacies, including the outright flouting of schools’ statutory obligations, was the subject of consternation by teachers. Nonetheless, this lacuna opened RE to counter-cultural possibilities in the life of the school. In addition to the re-authoring of the Ofsted handbook (Ofsted, 2015), the withdrawal of inspection powers from alternative providers such as the Bridge Schools Trust in 2015 highlights an increasing government concern with a

predetermined set of shared values, despite rhetoric of greater diversity of school provision. Every mention of spiritual, moral, social and cultural development in the revised Ofsted handbook is accompanied by an imperative to engage with and promote ‘fundamental British values’. While *Does RE Work?* did not engage directly with SMSC, school ethos or collective worship, it was impossible to ignore the clear, and at times exclusive role which RE lessons or RE teachers played in this aspect of the life of the school, and the potential impact of this refocusing on the perceived purpose of the subject. The renewed focus on faith and values in the inspection framework undoubtedly provides opportunities for RE teachers to assert the importance of the subject, though it also creates difficulties, particularly for engaging with the divergent, unsettling elements of religion and belief which were so often key to students developing an authentic connection to their learning (Lundie & Conroy, 2012) (Garner, 2016).

A more significant departure, and one which clearly draws on the critique of facile misapplications of social constructivism offered by Conroy et al. (2013) and by the Ofsted long report (2013), is the change to the aims as articulated in the non-statutory National Curriculum Framework. While previous guidance has always drawn on Grimmitt’s (1987) post-confessional language of ‘learning about’ and ‘learning from’, the 2013 framework identifies 3 aims:

- A. Know about and understand a range of religions and worldviews...
- B. Express ideas and insights about the nature, significance and impact of religions and worldviews...
- C. Gain and deploy the skills needed to engage seriously with religions and worldviews (RE Council, 2013).

This refocusing, or, rather, sharper articulation, on ‘insight’ and ‘skills’ in place of the more amorphous ‘learning from religions’ are mirrored in the shifting language of Scotland’s Curriculum for Excellence from the more idiosyncratic ‘personal search’ to ‘development of beliefs and values’ (Education Scotland, 2011), and in the revised language of Assessment Outcome 2 at GCSE, which now requires candidates to ‘analyse and evaluate aspects of religion and belief, including their significance and influence’ (Ofqual, 2015).

While there is much in this renewed focus to be welcomed, it is also important to be mindful of the impact high status examinations can have on students’ expectations. Whether RE succeeds in introducing students to a thoughtful understanding of religious ideas as meaningful in the life-world of the believer, or has a merely instrumental efficacy in meeting arbitrary goals will depend more on the examination subject criteria than any other actor in the ecology of our ethnographic studies, which extended from the classroom up to policy-makers at all levels.

[T]he examination system *acted* in ways that were unlikely to conduce to effective learning... The inexorable rise of the culture of performativity... impinges directly and damagingly on religious education. This is pervasively visible in... the implicit subordination of [religious text, practice and reflection] to the examination requirements (Conroy, et al., 2013, pp. 220-222).

If anything, the increased quantity of content knowledge in the new subject criteria can only serve to exacerbate these trends. Some of the most scathing criticism in the *Does RE Work?* project was reserved for short-course GCSE qualifications (Conroy, Lundie, & Baumfield, 2012, p. 314), so the decision to remove these from metrics of school performance, resulting in a precipitous drop in entries, may be cautiously welcomed, though the drop in short-courses is far greater than the increase in uptake of full-course GCSE. Nonetheless,

[c]urriculum provision for GCSE in many of the schools left insufficient time to deepen pupils' understanding of the subject. A number of the schools visited had recently switched to providing a full-course qualification in the time they had previously allocated to a short course (Ofsted, 2013, p. 17),

a trend which has risen just as precipitously as the drop in short courses. In delivering the quantity of knowledge and understanding required by the new criteria, a challenge for teachers will be holding on to sufficient time to bring out the depth of meaning of religious concepts in the life of the believer; conveying a sense of religions and beliefs as cohesive world-views, rather than an assemblage of random practices, doctrines and beliefs.

At the level of resourcing, this speaks to the ongoing struggle for recognition as an academically rigorous subject in the humanities, which was evident in the project's fieldwork, in the subsequent debate surrounding the exclusion of RS from the EBacc, and from the Russell Group's list of 'facilitating subjects' (Russell Group, 2015). The combination of a shift from short-course to full-course, from the systematic study of one religion to two, and from a syllabus which rewarded personal reflection to a greater emphasis on knowledge and analysis entail a clear case for further curriculum time. A potential doubling of content knowledge and academic credit without concomitant increase in time for reflection can only exacerbate the problems illustrated by cases such as the one below, from *Does RE Work?* fieldwork in a school in Scotland, in which the palpable disconnect between the teacher's opening articulation of Buddhism's emphasis on direct experience, and

a very quick-fire S4 examination revision lesson [in which] 23 terms relating to Buddhism are mentioned by the teacher, 12 in English, a further 11 in Pali: in total the terms appear 84 times, spoken or in writing. An average of 2.6 sentences of explanation are given per term. Only 11 examples given to illustrate

terms, only one from within Buddhist thought; on 8 occasions a metaphor is used to explain a term; only once are pupils invited to answer questions (Conroy & Lundie, 2011).

Reflecting the realities of the performative climate in which many schools operate, and indeed the findings of the project that in many places RS failed to resonate with the lifeworld and experiences of young people, such change may also presage arguments for an end to compulsory RE beyond Key Stage 3 (Butler-Sloss, 2015) (Woodhead & Clarke, 2015).

Principally, however, it is the emphasis on *meaning* that has perhaps been most comprehensively absent from subsequent debates about the implications of *Does RE Work?* In the commendable desire to infuse RS qualifications with more academic rigour, the worst elements of both phenomenological and doctrinal approaches risk advancing definitions of curriculum success which further repel the subject from the lived experience of students. If students expect academic rigour to be synonymous with gradgrindian accumulation of facts, then RE's counter-cultural status in the life of the school may need to be with us for some time longer.

In Defence of Meaning

A foundational concern with meaning concerns the comparative descriptions of social phenomena and practices as a way of not only construing but of *being in* the world. In this regard, the lifeworld of the practising believer will present to the dispassionate observer a fundamental displacement of meaning, notwithstanding the capacity for the observer to describe those practices or beliefs (Felderhof, 2007).

The phenomenological tradition, which has strong advocates even today in the RE community (O'Grady, 2013) (Cush & Robinson, 2014) has much to commend it in so far as it

seeks appreciative engagement with the phenomena of the lived experience of religion. In the context of an increasingly quantitative knowledge-focused curriculum and ever narrowing resource, however, there is a risk of detaching phenomena from the context in which they have meaning. To reduce religion to multiple, disjointed acts of ‘religioning’, and indeed to presenting lives so comprehensively religiously enframed as to offer little point of contact to the believer, let alone the unbeliever, is to do violence to the very nature of religions as providing a sense of *religare* – a binding in the life of the believer or believing community. In such a misrepresentation, to be more religious is to do more religioning. Such is the case with the textbooks on Judaism which Jackson and colleagues’ study (2010) found, in which a majority stated that Passover begins with purging the house of leaven, a practice only adhered to by the most strict Orthodox Jewish families. The presentation of an idealised Catholic family in examination and diocesan approved texts: virginal until married, open to life, faithful to devotional practices and liturgical obligations, will likely appear alien to a vast majority of children (Wilkinson, 2013) (McDonough, 2012), quite possibly leaving the child wondering whether he has ever met a ‘real’ Catholic. The irony of this inversion between the very many real individuals expressing belonging to a Catholic religious identity in the child’s life, and the ascription of authority to the ‘givenness’ not of a religious, but of a pedagogical text, stands as archetypal of this failure of meaning.

The divergent control over processes of curriculum determination in Religious Education may exacerbate this tendency. Concern over the plurality of lived experiences of religion as a way of being in the world is displaced by prescriptive outcomes, specified by an examination focus at Key Stage 4 and above, and increasingly by prescriptive values, displacing earlier child-centred approaches to spiritual development (Nye, 2009). Processes of local and collective determination heap up competing interpretations of the lived tradition, and these rub up against processes of social control operated by the institutional structures of

organisations representing the official positions of major religious faith groups. In such a fraught climate, there is a tendency to adopt a both-and approach to religious experiences; whatever practices might be common most within the tradition, there will always be others less common. More 'religioning' can always be added to the heap. While such a process may be fascinating to the expert sociologist, it offers little in the way of resources for the young person trying to understand the role played by religion in her own life world, and the lives of those around her.

While theological literacy has much to commend it, this too has often been subject to a sorites-like pressure to cover quantity, more so under recent curriculum reforms. In place of an attempt to apprehend the ways in which religions ground meaning in an understanding of, and relation to, final Reality, what often emerges is a concern with enumerating doctrines, debatable issues and source texts. In presenting the importance of *meaning* for Religious Education (Conroy, Lundie, & Baumfield, 2012), *Does RE Work?* drew upon a Wittgensteinian epistemology, in which meaning is derived from the process and context of pedagogy. 'How did we learn the meaning of this word...? From what sort of examples? In what language games?' (Stickney, 2008, p. 680). It was not our intention to present 'meaning' as synonymous with 'definition', as is so evident in the revised GCSE syllabi when enumerating such content as:

- The meaning of the terms:
 - benevolent
 - omniscient
 - omnipotent
 - monotheistic
 - judge
 - eternal

- transcendent
- immanent
- personal
- forgiving...
- The concept of the Trinity as one God, three persons (Father, Son, Holy Spirit)...
- Different types of evil: natural evil and moral evil
- Causes of evil
- The Fall of mankind as the result of Free Will
- The concept of original sin...
- The meaning of the terms: Messiah, Son of God, Lord and Saviour...
- The meaning of the following terms:
 - Salvation – restoring the relationship between God and mankind
 - Atonement – God in Christ reconciles the world to himself
 - Law – its function to identify sin by laying down commandments
 - Sin – Pauline views, all have sinned and fallen short of the mark
 - Grace – God’s redemptive love to save sinners
 - Spirit – the Holy Spirit...
- Common and divergent Christian beliefs about the need for salvation
- Common and divergent Christian beliefs about the role of Jesus Christ in salvation
- Different interpretations and emphases given to sources of wisdom and authority by different Christian denominations
- The meaning of the terms resurrection, life after death, heaven and hell
- Apocalyptic ideas in the Early Church
- Common and divergent beliefs about the Second Coming of Christ (Parousia)

- Common and divergent beliefs about, and interpretations of, death, judgement, purgatory, heaven and hell... (OCR, 2016)

As with the heaping up of phenomena, the heaping of doctrines, texts and definitions, in the absence of an organising principle, distorts the capacity of pedagogical activity to appear purposive to any end other than the rote learning of definitions. As we have argued (Conroy, Lundie, & Baumfield, 2012), meaning in this sense is intrinsic to the very activity of RE. Understanding the subtle and complex nature of religious systems, above all, their rootedness in the conceptual coherence of a given tradition (Carr, 1996) amounts to more than the naming of parts. At its worst, such formulations lead to the view that to progress in religion, like Lewis Carroll's Queen of Hearts, is a matter of believing progressively many and various impossible things!

Conclusion

The problems enumerated above are not constitutive of either the phenomenological or the doctrinal approach. Indeed the potential exists here for *Does RE Work* to do more harm than good in its critique. Uniquely for RE, the most foundationally problematic approach is the hybrid curriculum which seeks to address the shortcomings of one pedagogy by incorporating elements of another. While such a hybrid may be welcome for pragmatic reasons in other curriculum areas – supplementing phonics with whole word recognition, for example – the fundamentally incompatible epistemologies underpinning the study of religions as human cultural phenomena, as revealed Truth, or as responses to existential and ethical dilemmas means that such hybridity inevitably breeds confusion. Even seemingly simple terms of pedagogical art, such as 'religious literacy' cannot admit of consistent definitions across epistemic models without at least implicitly foregrounding one or the other. What is proposed

cannot therefore be construed as yet another curricular or epistemic model, nor does it offer a simple corrective to current practices in and of itself. Rather, it is an open invitation to commitment to some one pedagogic lens or disposition toward religion(s) while recognising its incommensurability with some others. The way in which religion is studied guides the way it is understood and evaluated, a point which is understood by a number of subsequent pedagogical developments (e.g. Freathy et al. 2015) which steers a more consciously pluralist course between the chaos of eclecticism and the educational jeopardy of dogma.

Recognising the significant changes which have taken place at Key Stage 4 and 5 in the revising of the subject criteria, the identification of Religious Studies with a rigorous approach to the humanities is clearly, though not unproblematically, articulated. At the same time, while attention has been drawn by the revised Ofsted inspection handbook toward the Spiritual dimension of school life, a revised focus on political and security concerns has seen this focus shift away from RE, towards Citizenship, PSHE and the wider pastoral life of the school (Lundie 2017), potentially freeing up the subject from some of its confusions and contestations as evidenced in the findings of ‘Does RE Work?’ at the turn of the decade.

In particular, the focus on meaning has consequences for the increasing emphasis on challenging ‘extremism’ in schools. The rigidity of extremist thought, its reliance on increasingly precise definitions of increasingly numerous precepts, cannot be challenged successfully through closed dialogue alone. Often, the contrast is offered between ‘moderate’ and ‘extreme’, and in this the RE curriculum is not exempt. As critics of this discourse have observed, however, moderateness is delimited extrinsically to the lived experience of the believer (Modood, 2010), requiring a commitment to a strong form of state secularism, which assumes priority over religious loyalties. Less troublingly, an emphasis on meaning would enable the experience of shared humanity to set the boundaries of acceptable belief and practice, without distorting or denying the lived experience of belief. Such an open-ended

approach to religion requires an attention to purpose, pedagogy and context, not at the expense of the details, but in order to relate the parts to the whole. The evidence of *Does RE Work?* was that such committed openness was essential to an RE which connected with the lifeworld of young people (Lundie & Conroy, 2015). While there have been many strides in the right direction in the policy and practice of Religious Education in the intervening five years, in this one regard we have seen a heaping up of curriculum content, and a tightening up of surveillance, offering little to be commended.

Acknowledgements:

The project: 'Does RE Work? An analysis of the aims, practices and models of effectiveness in Religious Education in the UK' was funded by the AHRC/ESRC Religion and Society Programme (award #AH/F009135/1).

The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of Professor Vivienne Baumfield, Dr Philip Barnes and Professor James Conroy in the development of this paper.

References:

- APPG RE. (2013). *RE: The truth unmasked - the supply of and support for Religious Education teachers*. London: All Party Parliamentary Group on Religious Education.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A., & Lundie, D. (In Development). Beginning teachers' understandings of Fundamental British Values: A multi-method case study. *Teachers and Teaching*.
- Baumfield, V., Conroy, J., Davis, R., & Lundie, D. (2011). The Delphi Method: Gathering expert perspectives in religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education*.
- Biesta, G., & Tedder, M. (2007). Agency and learning in the lifecourse: Towards an ecological perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 132-149.

- Butler-Sloss, E. (2015). *Living with Difference: Community, diversity and the common good. Report of the commission on religion and belief in British public life*. Cambridge: Woolf Institute.
- Carr, D. (1996). Rival conceptions of spiritual education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 221-238.
- Conroy, J. C., & Lundie, D. (2011). The capacity of RE to introduce students to religious language and concepts. *Does RE Work? Launch of Findings Conference*. Glasgow: 30 Mar 2011.
- Conroy, J. C., Lundie, D., Davis, R. A., Baumfield, V., P, B. L., Gallagher, T., . . . Wenell, K. (2013). *Does Religious Education Work? A multi-dimensional investigation*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Conroy, J., Lundie, D., & Baumfield, V. (2012). Failures of meaning in religious education. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 309-323.
- Cush, D., & Robinson, C. (2014). Developments in religious studies: Towards a dialogue with religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 4-17.
- Department for Education. (2015). *GCSE subject content for religious studies: DFE-00045-2015*. London: Department for Education.
- Department for Education. (2016). *Educational Excellence Everywhere*. London: HMSO.
- Dinham, A., & Shaw, M. (2015). *RE for Real: The future of teaching and learning about religion and belief*. London: Goldsmiths University of London.
- Education Scotland. (2011). *Religious and moral education: Experiences and outcomes*. Edinburgh: Education Scotland.
- Felderhof, M. (2007). Religious Education, Atheism and Deception. In M. Felderhof, P. Thompson, & D. Torevell, *Inspiring Faith in Schools: Studies in Religious Education* (pp. 87-97). Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Freathy, G., Freathy, R., Doney, J., Walshe, K., & Teece, G. (2015) *The RE-searchers: A new approach to religious education in primary schools*. Retrieved from: <http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/collegeofsocialsciencesandinternationalstudies/education/research/groupsandnetworks/reandspiritualitynetwork/The%20RE-searchers%20A%20New%20Approach%20to%20RE%20in%20Primary%20Schools.pdf>
- Garner, R. (2016, Mar 28). *Government's Prevent strategy means pupils 'too scared to talk in case they're branded radical'*. Retrieved from Independent: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/pupils-are-afraid-to-engage-in-classroom-debate-in-case-theyre-seen-as-extremist-a6956411.html>
- Grimmitt, M. (1987). *Religious education and human development: The relationship between studying religious and personal social and moral education*. Essex: McCrimmons.

- Jackson, R., Ipgrave, J., Hayward, M., Hopkins, P., Fancourt, N., Robbins, M., . . . McKenna, U. (2010). *Materials used to teach about world religions in schools in England: Research Report DCSF-RR197*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Lundie, D. (2015, 07 19). *Reporting on students' religious views will squash classroom debate*. Retrieved from SchoolsWeek: <http://schoolsweek.co.uk/lets-hold-on-to-true-british-values/>
- Lundie, D. (2017). Religion, schooling, community, and security: Exploring transitions and transformations in England. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 117-123.
- Lundie, D., & Conroy, J. (2012). Seeing and seeing through: Forum theatre approaches to ethnographic evidence. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 329-342.
- Lundie, D., & Conroy, J. (2015). 'Respect Study' the treatment of religious difference and otherness: An ethnographic investigation in UK schools. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 274-290.
- McDonough, G. P. (2012). *Beyond Obedience and Abandonment: Toward a theory of dissent in Catholic education*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Miah, S. (2014, 07 01). *Trojan Horse, Ofsted and the 'Prevent'ing of Education*. Retrieved from DiscoverSociety: <http://www.discoversociety.org/2014/07/01/trojan-horse-ofsted-and-the-preventing-of-education/>
- Miller, J. (2013). REsilience, violent extremism and religious education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 188-200.
- Modood, T. (2010). Civic recognition and respect for religion in Britain's moderate secularism. In Y. Birt, D. Hussain, & A. Siddiqui, *British secularism and the state: Islam, society and the state* (pp. 55-76). London: Kube Publishing.
- Nye, R. (2009). *Children's Spirituality*. London: Church House.
- OCR. (2016). *Religious Studies GCSE(9-1) Specification J625*. Cambridge: OCR.
- O'Donnell, A. (2016). Securitisation, counterterrorism and the silencing of dissent: The educational implications of Prevent. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 53-76.
- Ofqual. (2015). *GCSE Subject Level Guidance for Religious Studies: Ofqual/15/5695*. London: Ofqual.
- Ofsted. (2013). *Religious Education: Realising the potential*. London: Office for Standards in Education.
- Ofsted. (2015). *School inspection handbook: Handbook for inspecting schools in England under section 5 of the Education Act 2005*. London: Ofsted.
- O'Grady, K. (2013). The religious dimension of intercultural education. Contributions to a contextual understanding. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 347-349.
- RE Council. (2013). *A Review of Religious Education in England*. Religious Education Council of England and Wales.

- Russell Group. (2015). *Informed Choices: A Russell Group guide to making decisions about post-16 education*. London: Russell Group.
- Smith, H. (2013). A critique of the teaching standards in England, 1984-2012: Discourses of equality and maintaining the status quo. *Journal of Education Policy*, 427-448.
- Stickney, J. (2008). Training and mastery of techniques in Wittgenstein's later philosophy: A response to Michael Luntley. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 678-694.
- UCU and NASUWT. (2015, 12). *UCU and NASUWT statement on the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015*. Retrieved from UCU: <https://www.ucu.org.uk/counterterrorismact>
- Wilkinson, P. (2013, Nov 15). *British Catholics who follow Church teaching 'a rare species'*. Retrieved from The Tablet: <http://www.thetablet.co.uk/news/110/0/british-catholics-who-follow-church-teaching-a-rare-and-endangered-species-survey-finds>
- Woodhead, L., & Clarke, C. (2015). *A New Settlement: Religion and belief in schools*. Lancaster: Westminster Faith Debates.