

University of Strathclyde

Department of Curricular Studies

**An analysis of the development of religious education within the
secondary school curriculum and educational thinking, and its reception in
the educational world**

by

William Martin Hannah

**A thesis presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy**

2007

Volume 1

Declaration of Author's Rights

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts, as qualified by University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.49. Due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.

Acknowledgements

It is not possible to thank all who have contributed to this study. I must however, name the following:

Professor Walter Humes formerly of the Educational Studies Department, for his advice and support as my initial academic supervisor.

Professor Brian Boyd of the Department of Curricular Studies, for his help and advice as my academic supervisor.

Professor Tom Bryce vice-dean in the Faculty of Education of the University, for his advice and guidance, as my academic supervisor.

The Library Staff who have been incredibly efficient, but also helpful and encouraging.

Participants those who contributed to the study, in particular the six interviewees who were prepared to bare their souls, but also those involved in the provision of religious education throughout Scotland.

Bryce Hartshorn who, as well as being one of the willing interviewees, was also of immense help in detail, as a friend and professional colleague of many years standing.

Dunbarton

the RE staff in the schools of Dunbartonshire
with whom I worked over many years.

ATRES

one of the bedrocks of development of
professional approaches to Religious Education
over a very long time, for their willingness to
allow me extended access to their entire record of
files and data.

EBH

for the sustenance which has made this work
possible...the sunshine of my life.

Table of Contents	Page
VOLUME 1	
Declaration of Author's Rights	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of contents and List of Appendices	iv
Abstract	xiv
 Chapter 1: Introduction to Study	 1
1.1 The Questions which underlie the Study	1
1.2 The methodological strategy of the Study	2
1.3 Methodological Elements	
1.3.1: Documentary Analysis	5
1.3.2: Interviews	8
1.3.3: The National Survey	14
1.4 Analysis of the Data in these three elements	20
1.5 The Concept of Educationalisation	21
1.6 RE and Educationalisation	22
1.7 HMI and Educationalisation	22
1.8 Teacher Education and Educationalisation	23
1.9 The Provision of Religious Education and Educationalisation	23
1.10 RE Teachers and Educationalisation	23
1.11 The Perspective of the Study	24
1.12 The Range of the Study	25
1.13 Basic Methodological Assumptions of the Study	27
1.14 General and specific research questions	27

Chapter 2: The Sources, Origins and Links of Religion and	
Education	29
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Links: Religion and Education	31
2.3 Curricular Links: Religion and	
Education	34
2.4 Realisation of the Link	37
2.5 Religious Education Integral to the	
System	38
2.6 Local Authority Support of	
Religious Education	40
2.7 In Conclusion	42
 Chapter 3: Literature Review	 46
3.1 Introduction	46
3.2 Methodological Approach	48
3.3 Curriculum and Policy	52
3.4 The Application of Educational Psychology to	
Religious Education	58
3.5 The Academic Integrity of Religious Studies	62
3.6 The Range of Philosophies of Religious	
Education	68
3.7 The Contribution of Religious Education to	
the Wider Curriculum	77
3.8 In Conclusion	86

Chapter 4: A Review of Report literature relating to

Religious Education	88
4.1 Aim and Methodological Approach of the Chapter	88
4.2 The Durham report	92
4.3 Working Paper 36	95
4.4 The Millar Report	100
4.5 The Munn Report	105
4.6 Bulletin 1	106
4.7 Bulletin 2	112
4.8 Working Document	115
4.9 Christian Teaching	119
4.10 The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum: 5-14	124
4.11 Religious and Moral Education: 5-14	125
4.12 A Curriculum for Excellence: 3-18	125
4.13 In Conclusion	128

Chapter 5: A Review of HMI Report literature relating

to Religious Education	130
5.1 Methodological Approach	130
5.2 Relationship of Religious Education and the Inspectorate	131
5.3 The HMI Philosophy of Religious Education	135
5.4 Religious Education in the Curriculum: provision, staffing, content	142
5.5 Management of Religious Education	152

5.6	In Conclusion	156
5.7	Scope of the literature review chapters	158

Chapter 6: Analysis of the interviews of three Heads of

Religious Education in university faculties of		
Education		160
6.1	Methodological Approach	160
6.2	Introduction	163
6.3	Key Documents in Religious Education	165
6.4	The Place of Religious Education in Educational Thinking	172
6.5	Provision of Religious Education within the three faculties	182
6.6	Provision of Religious Education within secondary education	191
6.7	The General State of Religious Education within secondary education	196
6.8	In Conclusion	197
6.9	Structure of the areas covered in the Schedule of Questions	198

Chapter 7: Analysis of the Interviews of three HMIs of Schools

with responsibility for Religious Education		199
7.1	Methodological Approach	199
7.2	Introduction	201
7.3	The HMI 1 Interview	203

7.3.1	Making the Choice	203
7.3.2	The Nature of the Remit	208
7.3.3	What was involved in introducing RE to Inspection	215
7.3.4	Developments and the Pattern for the Future	216
7.3.5	Relationships with Management	217
7.3.6	Content of RE	219
7.3.7	In Conclusion	219
7.4	The HMI 2 and HMI 3 Interviews	220
7.4.1	Staffing of the Inspectorate in RE	221
7.4.2	The Mechanics of Inspection	224
7.4.3	Content of Religious Education	227
7.4.4	Provision of Religious Studies	233
7.4.5	Impressions of Progress Overall	237
7.4.6	In Conclusion	242

Chapter 8: Consideration of Responses to the National Survey of Provision in Religious Education conducted for the study			244
8.1	Methodological Approach		244
8.2	Introduction		246
8.3	Phases, Instruments, Tables		248
8.4	Size and Quality of the Responses		256
8.5	Size of School/ Authority Pupil Rolls		257
8.6	Religious Studies Provision		257
8.7	Staffing of Religious Education departments and the HMI 2 advice		260

8.8	Inter-Phase Discussion	267
8.9	Inter-Council Comparison	269

Chapter 9: The Contribution of Religious Education and

General Curricular Thinking	271
9.1	Methodological Approach 271
9.2	Identifying the Parts 272
9.3	Making a case 274
9.4	Criteria for the Religious Education Curriculum 276
9.5	Applying the Criteria 280
9.6	A Direction Indicator 285
9.7	Possible Links 286
9.8	The Missing Element. Further analysis 288
9.9	In Conclusion 294
9.10	Hull's Criteria and Curriculum Principle 294

Chapter 10: Consideration of the Implication of Educationalising

Religious Education	296
10.1	Introduction 296
10.2	Methodological Approach 298
10.3	Contribution of the Universities 298
10.4	Contribution of Teacher Education Institutes 301
10.5	Contribution of HMI 302
10.6	Contribution of Local Authorities and schools 304

10.7	Contribution of the Reports	306
10.8	Contribution of the Literature	307
10.9	Contribution of the SCCORE Reports	308
10.10	Progress of Educationalisation	312
10.11	Implications of Educationalisation	314
10.12	Educationalisation the Ultimate	316
10.13	A note on the nature of Religious Education	317
10.14	In Conclusion	319
10.15	Postscript	321
Bibliography		327
	Bibliographical References made in the Text	327
	Complete Bibliographical Listing	333

VOLUME 2

List of Appendices

There are two sets of appendices.

The first set consists in the schedule of questions and the transcripts of the six interviews conducted. The number is made up of three interviews of teacher educators in faculties of education of universities, and three interviews of HMIs: the Inspector who first introduced RE to inspection, the first specialist RE Inspector to be appointed, and the current National Specialist RE Inspector, when the interviews were conducted. Appendices and tables are

numbered by means of two or three digits. The first digit indicates the chapter to which the item relates, and the remaining digit(s) indicate(s) its place within the chapter.

Interviews	Page
Teacher Educator Interviews	
Appendix 6.1.1 Schedule of Questions of TEI 1.	350
Appendix 6.1.2 Transcript of TEI 1.	353
Appendix 6.2.1 Schedule of Questions of TEI 2.	377
Appendix 6.2.2 Transcript of TEI 2.	380
Appendix 6.3.1 Schedule of Questions of TEI 3.	411
Appendix 6.3.2 Transcript of TEI 3.	413
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools Interviews	
Appendix 7.1.1 Schedule of Questions of HMI 1.	440
Appendix 7.1.2 Transcript of HMI 1.	442
Appendix 7.2.1 Schedule of Questions of HMI 2.	474
Appendix 7.2.2 Transcript of HMI 2.	477
Appendix 7.3.1 Schedule of Questions of HMI 3.	516
Appendix 7.3.2 Transcript of HMI 3.	519
Appendix 7.4 Research and Mini Research Questions.	552

The second set of appendices consists of the survey instruments, and the returns from the National Survey of Provision. Every local authority in the country was asked to provide data about their provision of religious education. The following tables are the figures produced by the survey. They are reproduced here sequentially by phase. They are referred to in volume 1, in cross-phase fashion.

National Survey Returns

The tables listed here are appendices for use with Chapter 8.

Appendix 8.1.1	Phase 1 Instrument 1.	553
Appendix 8.1.2	Phase 1 Instrument 2.	554
Appendix 8.2.1	Phase 2 Instrument 1.	555
Appendix 8.2.2	Phase 2 Instrument 2.	556
Appendix 8.2.3	Council policy on religious education.	557
Appendix 8.3	Relation of numbers of schools, rolls, FTE RE staff, HMI in RE, to advice, and pupil numbers following RS exam courses.	558
Appendix 8.4.1	Provision in RE and pupil numbers following RS exam courses, by Council.	560
Appendix 8.4.2	Higher Still Course pupil numbers by Council.	562
Appendix 8.4.3	Relation of numbers of FTE RE staff to pupil numbers and exam course numbers.	564
Appendix 8.4.4	Analysis of Phase 1 returns in relation to the HMI 2 advice on RE staffing.	566
Appendix 8.4.5	Pupil roll and RE staff complements.	567
Appendix 8.5.1	Provision in RE and pupil numbers following RS exam courses by Council.	568
Appendix 8.5.2	Higher Still course Pupil numbers by Council.	569
Appendix 8.5.3	Local authority Religious Education policies submitted.	570
Appendix 8.5.4	Relation of FTE RE staff to pupil roll numbers and exam course numbers.	571
Appendix 8.5.5	Analysis of Phase 2 returns in relation	572

to the HMI 2 advice on RE staffing.

The titles of the tables showing phase linkage, are:

- Table 8.3 Summary Table: Relation of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE staff, the
HMI 2 staffing advice, and RS Exam Course Totals, by
Council (Phase 1 and Phase 2).
- Table 8.4.1 Provision in Religious Education: Pupil Numbers and RS
Exam Course Numbers by Council (Ph1 Instr1).
- Table 8.4.2 Higher Still Course Pupil Numbers by Council (Ph1 Instr2).
- Table 8.4.3 Relation of FTE RE Staff Numbers to Pupil Roll, and Exam
Course Numbers (Ph1).
- Table 8.4.4 Analysis of Phase 1 Returns in relation to the HMI 2 Advice on
RE Staffing.
- Table 8.4.5 Pupil Roll, RE staff complements and Promoted Posts.
- Table 8.5.1 Provision in RE, Pupil Numbers, and RS Exam Course
Numbers, by Council. (Ph2 Instr1) This table mirrors
table 1.1.
- Table 8.5.2 Higher Still Course Pupil Numbers by Council, (Ph2 Instr2).
This table mirrors table 1.2.
- Table 8.5.3 Local Authority RE Policies submitted (Ph2 Instr3).
- Table 8.5.4 Relation of FTE RE staff to Pupil Roll Numbers and Exam
Course Numbers. This table mirrors table 1.3.
- Table 8.5.5 Analysis of Phase 2 Returns in relation to the HMI 2 advice on
* RE Staffing. This table mirrors table 1.4.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The Transformation of Religious Instruction into Religious Education

The aim of this study is to examine the developing relationship of religious education within Scottish secondary schooling. This relationship will be defined as '*making the justification and rationale of the subject conform to educational criteria*', and to analyse the effect of this concept, and this introduction, on the subject and on its teaching in schools. The term *educationalisation* is used in the study, to refer to the use of educational criteria in relation to religious education, and not, for example, theological criteria.

This task is undertaken by gathering information in different fashions, from a variety of sources. First, interviews with some of those involved in religious education were used. Second, RE teachers themselves were involved, by means of the records of the *Association of Teachers of Religious Education In Scotland*. Third, schools were involved, through Local Education Authorities, in their response to written requests for information about provision in religious education. Fourth, the literature of religious education was involved by means of official reports on the subject, produced by a number of committees, and also by HMI, and the work of academics involved in the fields of religious education, general curriculum, and of policy making. Data from all of these sources has been brought together, to produce the outcome of the thesis.

The methodological strategy adopted for the study is, in the main qualitative, and is discussed in Chapter 1. This approach was chosen because of the wide scope, involving four distinct sources of data, which it offers; and because the range of data available also was broad, covering interview procedures, survey returns, historic records of the period, and last, the literature of the subject during the period under investigation.

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

Complete in Typescript THESIS ABSTRACT FORM _____ Complete in Typescript
(for inclusion in Aslib: Index to Theses)

FULL NAME (underline surname): William Martin HANNAH

DEPARTMENT: Curricular Studies

DEGREE FOR WHICH SUBMITTED: PhD

TITLE OF THESIS: Analysis of the development of religious education within the secondary school curriculum and educational thinking, and its reception in the educational world.

ABSTRACT (Single line spacing; do not exceed 300 words):

The aim of this study is to examine the developing relationship of religious education within Scottish secondary schooling. This relationship will be defined as 'making the justification and rationale of the subject conform to educational criteria', and to analyse the effect of this concept, and this introduction, on the subject and its teaching in schools.

The term *educationalisation* is used, to refer to the use of educational criteria in relation to religious education, and not, for example, theological criteria. This task is undertaken by gathering information in different fashions, from a variety of sources. First, it was gathered by means of interviews with some of those involved in religious education. Second, RE teachers themselves were involved, by means of the records of the Association of Teachers of Religious Education in Scotland. Third, schools were involved through Local Education Authorities, in their response to written requests for information about provision in religious education. Fourth, the literature of religious education was involved in official reports on the subject, produced by a number of committees, also HMI, and the work of the academics involved in the fields of religious education, broad, general curriculum, and policy making. Data from all of these sources has been brought together to produce the outcome of the thesis. The methodological strategy adopted for the study is discussed in the introductory chapter. This approach has been chosen, firstly because of the wide scope, involving four distinct sources of data, which it offers. Secondly, it was chosen because the variety of data available also was broad, covering interview procedures, survey returns, historic records of the period, and last, the literature of the subject during the period under investigation.

DATE OF DEPOSIT

STRATHCLYDE REF.

BLLD REF.

MORATORIUM
EXPIRES

May 2007

CHAPTER ONE

Methodological Strategy and Introduction to the research study Research Questions and basis of the study

1.1 The questions which underlie the study are:

- 1 How far has the formal *educationalisation* of religious education proceeded?
- 2 How have the emphases of the Munn and Millar reports been taken up in that process?
- 3 What contribution to the growth and education of young people can religious education make?

Specific questions attached to each of these general questions follow below. Both general and specific questions for the study are reproduced for reference on the last two pages of this Introduction.

- 1
 - (i) Is this an appropriate development?
 - (ii) What mechanisms should be used to achieve it?
 - (iii) What are the marks of educationalisation?
 - (iv) Which other curricular elements are educationalised?
- 2
 - (i) What was the major contribution of the Millar Report?
 - (ii) In what way did the Munn Report help in the educationalisation of religious education?
 - (iii) Which other documents have helped the process of educationalisation of religious education?
 - (iv) In terms of significance for RE, have the Millar and Munn reports been superceded?
- 3
 - (i) Does religious education make a major contribution now?
 - (ii) What is its potential contribution?
 - (iii) Is it a minority concern, or a central contributor?

(iv) How might it achieve its optimum contribution?

1.2 The methodological strategy used in the research

The three questions above are used to examine the issues raised by religious education from the perspective of the educational world, from that of the religious educational world, and from that of pupil needs. All of the questions are open. The only assumptions made are basic ones: that educationalisation is, in some measure present, that these reports have had an influence, and that religious education can make some contribution to the development of children and young people. The strategy used in dealing with the questions is *qualitative* in emphasis, in that it attempts to gauge how opinions and attitudes, and therefore behaviour, have been affected by developments during the period examined. The questions are central to the research process, because they go to the heart of what the research study is about. Three emphases which help to define the qualitative strategy referred to above, are that it is:

broadly 'interpretivist', in the sense that it is concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced, produced or constituted...based on methods of data generation which are both flexible and sensitive to the social context..., based on methods of analysis, explanation and argument-building which involve understandings of complexity, detail and context... (Mason 2002, p3).

Mason further defines the content of her view of qualitative research by listing these 'key points' which it should show: that it be,

systematically and rigorously conducted...,

accountable for its quality...,

strategically conducted, yet flexible and contextual...,

involving critical self-scrutiny...,

producing explanation or argument rather than claiming to offer mere descriptions...,

producing generalizable arguments, not antithetical to quantitative research...,

conducted as a moral practice, with regard to its political context
(ibid, pp7-8).

These points align well with the view of Sylvia Gherardi and Barry Turner in their discussion of the equation of qualitative approaches with a 'soft view', over against 'hard' quantitative approaches to social science. The latter are described as '*masculine and to be respected*', and the former, the qualitative approach in social science, as '*soft, feminine, and of a lower order of activity*' (Gherardi and Turner, in Huberman and Miles 2002, p81-2). They conclude the discussion suggesting that:

'as with many unexamined language patterns, these distinctions serve to convey tacit attitudes about the topic under discussion.' In particular that *'The recent growth of interest in qualitative research makes it important to challenge these clusters of assumptions which get smuggled into discussion of research presentation; and with a reduced willingness to tolerate ambiguity in procedures and findings'* (Silverman, 1985, quoted in Huberman and Miles, 2002, p82).

The major qualitative emphasis followed in the study, is well summed up by Maxwell, in his quotation of the approach used by Freidson, discussing the qualitative study of a medical group practice,

There is more to truth or validity than statistical representativeness. In this study I am less concerned with describing the range of variation than I am with describing in the detail what survey questionnaire methods do not permit to be described --- the assumptions, behavior, and attitudes of a very special set of physicians. They are interesting because they were special
(quoted by Maxwell in Huberman and Miles, 2002, p54).

The methods of data generation employed in the study are three: documentary research, being in this case *examination and analysis of narrative* in the subject, interpreted in a wide sense to include the research writings of

academics, but also national reports written about the subject, and also reports written specifically about the subject, produced by HMI. Second, *interviews* of two sets of contributors to the educationalisation of the subject, and last, a *national survey* of provision in the subject in non-denominational secondary education.

This broad and varied range of methods of data generation was employed with the qualitative emphasis of the study in mind, and in particular the three emphases referred to above: *'that it be broadly interpreted'*, *'based on methods of data generation which are flexible and sensitive to the social context'*, and *'based on methods of analysis, explanation and argument-building which involve understandings of complexity, detail, and context'*.

The first and second of the methods are, as discussed below, qualitative. The third has a clear quantitative hue to it. The strategy, therefore, avoids being *'antithetical to quantitative research'* (Mason, 2002, p8), and it also maps out *'the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one point, and in so doing, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data...'* (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p233).

This use of a variety of different methodologies in exploration of the same set of research questions helps enhance the validity of the exercise, according to Mason (2002, p190). Cohen and Manion, in some measure, follow the same line of argument, suggesting that *'the greatest use of investigative triangulation centres around validity rather than reliability checks'* (Cohen and Manion 1994, p238). Pointing to another strength of triangulation of data and methods, in the context of a discussion of ethnographic methods of analysis, Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter (2000, p97) indicate that *'it (is) often proposed for the testing of assumptions'*. On the other hand, Seale broadens the discussion somewhat in referring to the argument put forward by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that *'the trustworthiness of*

a research report lies at the heart of issues conventionally discussed as validity and reliability' (Seale, 1999, p43). He goes on to quote the four questions asked of research reports:

(1) *Truth value: how can one establish confidence in the 'truth' of the findings of a particular enquiry for the subjects (respondents) with whom, and the context in which, the enquiry was carried out?*

(2) *Applicability: How can one determine the extent to which the findings of a particular enquiry have applicability in other contexts or with other subjects (respondents)?*

(3) *Consistency: How can one determine whether the findings of an enquiry would be repeated if the enquiry were replicated with the same (or similar) subjects (respondents) in the same (or similar) context?*

(4) *Neutrality: How can one establish the degree to which the findings of any enquiry are determined by the subjects (respondents) and conditions of the enquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests, or perspectives of the enquirer?* (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p290, quoted in Seale, 1999, pp43-44).

It may be that Lincoln and Guba's term '*trustworthiness*' is useful in this context, and that their four questions asked of research reports are in some measure addressed by the variety of methodologies of data collection employed within the study. The double use of triangulation ensures that the requirements of the four questions of *truth, applicability, consistency and neutrality*, are met in this combination of approaches.

1.3.1 Methodological Element 1: Documentary Analysis

The first element of the methodological strategy is in the form of literature analysis. It subdivides into a review of academic literature, of national reports, and of HMI reports. As narrative, this element fits the

description of Chafe (1990): '*manifestations of the mind in action*' (quoted in Cortazzi 1993, p79). The second and third of these subdivisions in the thought of the same author, also provide other windows. This time it is in relation to the two groups, national report committees, and HMI, providing '*windows on the culture*' of these two groups (ibid).

The methodological strategy adopted in this review section is a miniature of that used throughout the study. The three types of document are used in order to balance each other, and to draw out their strengths and weaknesses in this instance of triangulation, observing the event of *educationalisation* of religious education from the three perspectives, and that of policy and curriculum. The use of this wide variety of documents has another benefit too. It helps, in the view of several writers, '*in representing alternative viewpoints and interests, to overcome the potential problems of reliability and bias*' (McCulloch, 2004, p44).

The first part of this element constitutes chapter 3. Its aim is to cover the key areas of recent research development in the subject, and in curriculum development and curriculum policy, and therefore, principal contributors to those movements. Associated with this standard review of the academic literature is a parallel review of national reports on the subject. As well as being *national* in extent, they have been *fundamental* to the progress of religious education, acting as foci of development, and as stimuli for further movement. This forms chapter four of the study, and is followed by a similar chapter, the last of the three parts, reviewing further reports specifically on religious education, produced, in this case, by HMI, following the introduction of inspection of Religious Education. These reports are included, because HMI had a leading and formative role in the *educationalisation* of religious education at this juncture, in some measure because historically, HMI had been barred from the inspection of religious

education. HMI was instructed by the Secretary of State of the day to introduce inspection of Religious Education for the first time, and therefore, HMI input to this *educationalisation* process came at a vital point, and in a vital manner. Their actions, as well as their statements in these reports, had considerable influence.

These two sets of reports, therefore, are dealt with in the context of the literature of the subject. All three of these chapters are included within this first element of the methodological strategy, the review of literature. The main reason for their inclusion is as discussed immediately above, but they are also included in data analysis, in order to permit cross-referencing of the three sources of data, subject and curriculum research literature, general report literature and HMI report literature. Each of these chapters is discussed further in its own section. These texts are central to the development of educationalisation in religious education, and are treated thus as primary documents in the approach of the study. They are not dealt with, in any sense, as secondary, or to be taken for granted, as Silverman has warned,

Even in qualitative research, texts are sometimes only important as background material for the 'real analysis'. Where texts are analysed, they are often presented as 'official' or 'common-sense' versions of social phenomena, to be undercut by the underlying social phenomena apparently found in the quality researcher's analysis of her interviewees stories. The model is: the documents claim X, but we can show that Y is the case. (Silverman 2001, p 119, quoted in McCulloch 2004, p 25).

McCulloch, in his precise classical language, explains the reasoning behind this movement, tersely, '*Abundant in their profusion and ubiquitous in their propinquity, they (the documents) could easily be taken for granted as a means*

of finding out about the social world' (ibid p25).

These primary documents are analysed using grounded theory. This form of analysis is used in part because of its pragmatic basis, which fits extremely well the nature of the documents concerned, and the concepts with which they deal. In all three types of documentary material examined, the criteria of '*usefulness, value and success*' (Titscher et al, 2000, p74) are met. This is indeed summed up in the continuing statement by Titscher et al, '*What works in practice, is true.*' The approach is used here, also because it requires to find, on the basis of the material itself, the underlying concepts, that is, it aims at data analysis. Finally, GT is used here because this section of analysis is a mini-version of the entire research exercise. It is wide-ranging in its coverage and could be said to merit the broad-ranging, '*extravagant methodology*' contained within this '*strategic*' method of analysis.

1.3.2 Methodological Element 2: Interviews

The second element of the methodological strategy is the *interview*. This is used in methodological triangulation with the two other elements listed. It is intended to fulfil Mason's emphases of '*depth, nuance, complexity and roundedness*' (Mason 2002, p65), overagainst the broad '*view of surface patterns*', which the national survey attempts. Interview is employed at this juncture because the interviewees occupied, in each case, a post which was of particular significance in the process of educationalisation of the subject. This is to say, that the contribution made by each of the interviewees, from their experience of educationalisation, was specific, growing out of the active role each played in its implementation. They do also provide the opportunity of comparison in data analysis, though in the process of the interviews themselves, this was not an aim. The interviews, too, are discussed further in the appropriate chapters.

The type of interview employed, in accord with the general approach in the study, is qualitative interviewing. In analytical mode, Mason identifies four core features of such interviewing which encapsulate the strategy in use:

- 1 *it involves an interactional exchange of dialogue,*
- 2 *it has a relatively informal style, being a conversation or discussion,*
- 3 *it has a topic-centred, biographical or narrative approach, allowing the researcher or the interviewee to develop unexpected themes,*
- 4 *since knowledge is situational and contextual, an interview tries to ensure that the relevant contexts are brought into focus, so that situated knowledge can be produced.* (Mason, 2002, pp62-63).

The situational and contextual emphases made in these four points, as well as being significant in the interviews themselves, were also influential in the selection of prospective interviewees. In other words, the interviewees were invited because of the situation and context in which they had operated in the field of the educationalisation of religious education.

The choice of interviewees, and the questions in the interviews themselves, also support Mason's approach when she says that *'If you choose qualitative interviewing it may be because your ontological position suggests that people's knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences, and interactions, are meaningful properties of the social reality which your research questions are designed to explore'* (ibid, p63).

The form of analysis employed in examining the interviews was that of conversation analysis. In their description of that method, Titscher et al suggest that *'The ethnomethodological orientation implies that it is a matter of reconstructing reality from the point of view of the participants to an interaction'* (Titscher et al, 2000, p109). Later, describing the method, they quote Werner Kallmeyer (1988: 1101), *'sequential procedure, precise observation of ordered*

nature of activities, and the elaboration of reciprocal interpretations are the hallmarks of the method' (Titscher et al, 2000, p110).

The area covered by the study is sufficiently contemporary not yet to have produced a great deal of data at this stage. The proposed interviewees had themselves been directly involved in the process of educationalisation being researched, and in particular, the areas covered by the research questions. The interviews form one element of data generation alongside two others. The question of contemporaneity is already also addressed in the review of literature, and report-literature, and of HMI report-literature, that is, the first element of the methodological strategy.

The National Survey of Provision in Religious Education conducted for the study, also forms an element of the methodological strategy in this approach involving RE teachers and their departments in the collection of data. It deals directly with the contemporary situation at the point of circulation of the survey. The proposed interviews fall into this same category in the strategy adopted in the study. In addition to the intent to ensure contemporaneity, interviews, because by their nature they involve live interaction of questioner with interviewee, contribute as written responses do not. Qualitative interviewing highlights this factor even more, since there was built into the preparation and the process itself a degree of flexibility which fostered open communication. This factor of flexibility was significant in deciding the level of structure to be built into the interviews. A loose structure was selected to ensure that in the interaction, both the interviewees and the interviewer had the greatest possible freedom to respond to the flow of discussion as they wished. It would also ensure that incidental points arising naturally in the discussion could be taken up and developed as appropriate. These points are further discussed in chapters six and seven.

The interview sampling process produced six subjects, three HMIs, and three teacher educators from teacher education institutions across the country. These two groups were selected because of the centrality of their role in the process of educationalisation. They were also selected for interview, because the fact that their numbers were so small it was possible to ensure a good representation of a variety of possible differences of view. Others involved were incorporated in the national survey. The number of HMIs was made up of the HMI given responsibility for the initial introduction of RE to inspection, and the first two national specialist HMIs to follow him (the latter the current incumbent of that post at the time of the interviews). Of these two, each was based in one of the major centres of population. The three teacher educator interviewees consisted of those in the two major centres of population, and one from a smaller centre. The interview form used, in accord with the general qualitative strategy of the study, was semi-structured in nature. This was important for the study, in particular with reference to the freedom left to the interviewer, and the interviewee, to make modifications and departures, within each interview, from the previously devised guide schedule. This freedom was intended as much for the interviewee as the interviewer, in order to ensure the possibility of being innovative and creative in the interview, what Mason describes as being *'able to think on their feet'* (Mason, 2002, p67). Summing it up, she describes such an interview from the perspective of the interviewee, as *'a conversation with a purpose'* (Mason, 2002, p67).

The semi-structured nature of the interviews meant that a variety of avenues might be explored, which, had the questionnaire approach alone been used, would have been restricted, or, at least less flexible. This flexibility has the disadvantage of opening the way to the possible charge of subjectivity and bias. However, the nature of the responses sought also

suggests the questionnaire approach would have been too restrictive, had it not been alongside the interview approach. The data in question involved facts, opinions, as well as attitudes. Although an outcome might have been possible in these areas using the questionnaire format, it was considered, not least in the light of the above discussion, to pursue the interview approach, despite the drawbacks in terms of reliability and error factors.

In all six interviews, therefore, a *semi-structured format* was used. The questions devised were extremely varied in type, from open, to closed, direct to indirect, and specific to non-specific. This is done using the variables dealt with in the study, and derived from the detailed objectives which, in turn, are derived from the general goals of the study and its theoretical basis. The three general research questions formed the first source of the questions put to the interviewees. These three questions were extended into four mini, or specific research questions each, which further refined the areas from which questions might be derived. Already indicated, the research questions and their mini research questions are reproduced at the end of this chapter. Both sets of questions were used to work out the areas or topics for the schedule of questions which formed the structure followed in the interviews.

Interviewing in the study is one of several methods used in pursuit of the research questions. A form of methodological triangulation is involved in the use of this range of different methods of data generation.

The interview method of data collection, therefore, is used as an enrichment of the wider review approach of which the literature review is one strand. It has been suggested that *'it might be used to follow up unexpected results, for example, or to validate other methods, or to go deeper into the motivations of the respondents and their reasons for responding as they do'* (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p273). This is its function in the methodological strategy of the study. It operates here on the basis that knowledge and evidence are

'contextual, situational and interactive' (Mason 2002, p64).

As stated, the interviews were semi-structured. Only the interviewer and the interviewee were involved. They were both involved in the interview itself, and the interviewer consulted the interviewees in advance about the issues and areas to be raised. The topics, areas and issues which formed the schedules of questions, were derived from the three general research questions which appear at the head of the Introduction to the study, in conjunction with specific-research questions linked to each of the three. The transcript in each case was produced by the interviews having been typed by a person uninvolved in the interview process, attention being paid to examples of non-verbal communication on the tape. Their final form was discussed in some detail by the interviewer and the interviewees. The pre-discussion of the schedule, along with the tapes of the interviews, contributed to the context and background of the transcripts, as did the official reports on RE produced by HMI, and discussed below, in Chapter Five.

An attempt has been made to utilise carefully, the *'black-market understandings'* which Charles Hull, of the University of East Anglia, quoting Stenhouse, refers to, as a:

second record of understandings during his time in the field and so may be a privileged position as analyst, able to interpret what appears 'on the record of the transcripts in the light of his accumulated knowledge of participants' meaning systems. The corollary to this privilege, however, is that these black -market understandings put the fieldworker / analyst in a rather more powerful position than researchers should perhaps aspire to, since his interpretations are not accountable to what is available to others as 'project data' but contingent on understandings unique to him as participant in the live situation from which the data are distilled (Hull,

1985, p28).

Hull's definition of interview as '*a conversation, but of a particular kind, where actors talk to a specific and conscious purpose*' (ibid, p30), is followed in the study, and also his more detailed note describing it as, '*a context of interaction, rather than as an opportunity to elicit 'off-guard' comments*'. It leads to his statement that, '*My task as analyst of transcript data was to disclose significances in the transcripts. A critical task*' (ibid, p31). Nonetheless, analysis is undertaken by deriving data in '*literal, interpretive and reflexive manner*' (Mason, 2002, p78). Here, the emphasis is perhaps on the *literal*, followed closely by the *interpretive*.

1.3.3 Methodological Element 3: The National Survey

The third methodological means of data generation used was the national survey. The central intention of the survey was to discover the level of provision in religious education in secondary non-denominational schools. The gathering of data was undertaken by means of five postal questionnaire instruments, which are printed as appendices (appendices 8.1.1-2, and 8.2.1-3). The number of questions, in each case, was very restricted, because the data required was extremely specific. The survey used in the study, however, was relatively complex, in that as well as *gathering data at a particular point in time* (Cohen and Manion 1994, p83), it also aimed to *present relational analysis* (ibid).

The survey was conducted over two successive sessions, in each case at the beginning of December, when initial figures for the session would be well established. Specific questions were sent to RE departments in non-denominational schools, via all local authority education departments, requesting information about provision of religious education. Authorities which did not respond were sent a second request, and if they still did not

respond, it was assumed they were not willing to do so. The survey included three prerequisites necessary in any survey:

the exact purpose of the enquiry, identifying and itemising subsidiary topics;

the population on which the enquiry is to focus; and

the resources available (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p85).

The first of these prerequisites, *the exact purpose of the enquiry*, was to explore the provision of RE made by each local authority education department by establishing the school rolls of secondary non-denominational schools, establishing the full-time equivalent RE (FTE RE) staff in each authority, establishing numbers of promoted posts in RE in each authority, establishing numbers of certificate courses in Religious Studies provided by each authority, establishing the relation of numbers of FTE RE staff, to the HMI 2 advice on this topic.

The second prerequisite, *the population focused*, was the pupil population in secondary non-denominational schools, and their RE teachers, promoted and unpromoted, and certificate course numbers in these schools. This selection was decided on the basis of the subject-matter of the study.

The third prerequisite, *the resources available*, was the researcher alone. There was no external financial, institutional, or other support at any stage. This was a weakness, in the sense that Local Authorities might have made fuller responses had there been a more formal origin of the requests for their co-operation. It also meant that the exercise was lengthier than it might have been, had there been a team of workers available to dispatch the requests and to process the replies.

Given, however, that the survey was for restricted purposes, these disadvantages were not regarded as major. Given that the survey was conducted of *all* Local Authority non-denominational secondary schools,

there was no question at this stage of random sampling error. Nor did this come into play in the schools selected, since, although only secondary and non-denominational schools were concerned, it was *all* secondary non-denominational schools, and it was written-in to the aim of the study that only secondary non-denominational schools were being studied. The question of error arose only in relation to the returns received. Information was requested of *all* thirty-two Authorities.

In Phase One (which had two instruments), 28 Authorities responded to Instrument 1, but only 14 responded to Instrument 2. In Phase Two (which had three instruments), 24 Authorities responded to Instrument 1, and 20 to Instrument 2, and 8 to Instrument 3. No particular reason was discernible for this variety of response. It does, however, mean that there may well be a degree of error in the data and conclusions. However, the purpose of the survey was of significance at this point. Since the figures were not being subjected to a highly technical statistical analysis, but used as an indicator of strengths and directions, the variation has been taken to be, although subject to error, not caused by sampling bias, since there seemed to be little pattern behind the variation in numbers. This being so, the data was regarded as adequate as indicator of strengths and directions of the authorities concerned. Otherwise questions of validity and reliability would have been of higher priority.

When returns were received, they were duly edited to ensure completeness, accuracy and uniformity, before being recorded in tables for use in the study. The returns from the instruments have been reproduced in eleven tables (appendices 8.3, 8.4.1-5, and 8.5.1-5). These results will be discussed under the broad headings of *Size and Quality of the Overall Response, Size of School / Authority Pupil Rolls, Religious Studies Provision, Staffing of Religious Education Departments / HMI 2 Advice, Inter-Phase*

Discussion, Inter-Council Comparison. In the discussion, the term *statutory RE* is used to denote the specific time allocation indicated in the current national curricular reports on the subject, backed up by the direct advice of the Secretary of State for Scotland, in Circular 6/91, which is: 5% of curriculum time in S1 and S2, a minimum of 80 hours over two years in S3 and S4, and a *continuing element* in S5 and S6. *Optional RS* is used to refer to any courses which pupils may *choose* to follow within the mode. These would normally be in addition to statutory RE, but in some few places incorporated the statutory element.

In analysing data from the survey, features of ethnographic methodology are employed. The aim is to use the fundamental reflexivity of ethnography, as it addresses the question of the relationship between culture and language. A number of the features referred to above are: (i) the emphasis in this approach is on data collection, (ii) data collection and data analysis are not separable, (iii) text analysis is carried out in the form of questions which are asked about the text and about the documents to be analysed, (iv) all ethnographic analyses are concerned with pp 92-3 discovering cultural and linguistic patterns and key events (Titscher, et al, 2000, pp92-3).

This method of data generation appears as a quantitative factor in an otherwise qualitative approach. Its function is indeed to balance that largely qualitative emphasis, '*by introducing quantitative data in order to examine the general applicability of findings and insights*' (Cortazzi, 1993, p117). The use of the survey method in this case is not covered by Cicourel's (1964) '*critique of measurement by fiat*' (quoted in Seale 1999, p133). The purpose of the interviews in this present study, is not to explain the '*puzzling findings from questionnaire surveys by recourse to depth interviews in which respondents revealed deeper complexities of meaning than the surveys had been able to identify*'

(Seale 1999, p133). The relationship of interview and survey here lies more in the triangulatory than in the explanatory. They are laid alongside each other, allowing similarities and differences to emerge, in order to allow a fuller picture.

The use of these three methods of data generation together softens the 'alienation' of which McCulloch writes when he draws a line between 'documentary study and surveys, direct observation and interviews' (McCulloch, 2004, p28).

Together, these three methods of data generation, which form part of the methodological strategy of the study, are geared to help avoid the potential for bias, in particular with regard to the provision made within the curriculum for religious education, and the approach taken to the task of teaching it. They are, too, geared to assist the process of cross-checking of, for example, statements and claims made. This first point is taken up in general terms by McCulloch :

Several writers have suggested that in order to overcome these potential problems of reliability and bias, it is necessary to make use of a wide range of different kinds of documents which will represent alternative viewpoints and interests. At times, this process appears to be conceived as a form of triangulation, through which the truth will emerge from testing different kinds of documents against each other (McCulloch, 2004, p44).

McPherson and Raab also identify this problem, and suggest that this kind of :

Triangulation is a common answer to this question (of bias); the view that is that if one sets out different perspectives on an event according to the different vantage points of the participants then the truth of the matter will emerge in the round at the intersection of these perspectives (McPherson and Raab, 1988, p63).

This is a case strongly upheld by Eisenhardt *'The triangulation made possible by multiple data collection methods provides stronger substantiation of constructs and hypotheses'* (Eisenhardt in Huberman and Miles, 2002, p14). In thus making a strong case for multiple data-collection methods, she lists *'the combination of interviews, observations and archival sources being particularly common'* (ibid). The multiple data collection methods are seen by others also as :

support for the use of triangular techniques in the Social Sciences.. (which)... attempt to map out or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one point and in so doing, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data... (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p233).

In his discussion of triangulation Seale lists a number of criticisms of the technique. He discusses Cicourel's illustration about the apparently endless possible number of different versions which might be typed from the same tape (Seale 1999, p57), but concludes that *'Triangulation exercises can then help in adjudicating the accuracy of interview accounts by increasing sensitivity to the variable relationship between an account and the reality to which it refers'* (ibid, p59), and,

Triangulation...if used with due caution, can enhance the credibility of a research account by providing an additional way of generating evidence in support of key claims...if it is accepted that the sort of knowledge constructed by social researchers is always provisional' (ibid, p61).

Summing up the issue, Mason makes the point thus *'Triangulation in its broadest sense, refers to the use of a combination of methods to explore one set of research questions. This exploration of the research questions from different angles enhances validity'* (Mason 2002, p190). Schostak refines this statement somewhat:

Triangulation is not a magic solution to the problems of assuring validity, truth, generalization and objectivity. However, it does provide a means of exploring what is at stake for individuals when they try to co-ordinate actions in relation to a material and symbolic world of others. Through this exploration from a variety of viewpoints, validity, truth, generalization and objectivity become issues to be debated as people search for ways of informing their decision making (Schostak, 2002, p79).

He gives an example, *'by using multiple sources of data collection (documentary analysis, interviewing, direct participation, observation, reflection), it is argued that comparisons and contrasts between these can indicate the generalizability of accounts and theories.'* (ibid, p79).

This enhancement of validity is considered above under the heading of triangulation. It is, as is evident from the position of Mason and of Schostak quoted, a contentious issue in relation to the established procedures of qualitative research. Guba & Lincoln (1989) quoted in Huberman & Miles, (2002, p38) view validity as *'a positivist notion, and propose to substitute for this, the concept of 'authenticity' in qualitative research.'* This is the direction in which the study moves. In this approach, *'validity is not a commodity that can be purchased with techniques...Rather, validity is like integrity character and quality, to be assessed relative to purposes and circumstances'* (Brinberg & McGrath 1985, p13, quoted in Huberman and Miles, 2002, p39). This in turn leads to support for the main point of Wolcott's critique - that is, *'that understanding is a more fundamental concept for qualitative research than validity'* (Wolcott 1990, p146, quoted in Huberman and Miles, 2002, p39).

1.4 Analysis of the Data in these three Elements

The standard threefold understanding of analysis described by Miles and Huberman (1984, p21) is applied in the study. Firstly, the raw data in

each case are refined (data reduction). Second, display of the data is undertaken, again of the three forms of data generated. These two activities (data reduction and data display) allow the meaning of the data to emerge, '*noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions*' (ibid p22), producing the third activity, *conclusion drawing / verification*.

1.5 The Concept of Educationalisation

Educationalisation may be applied to any curricular area as a check on whether the philosophy, content or methodology of that area is truly in conformity with educational principles. This study centres on the concept of '*educationalisation*' as applied to Religious Education, although the concept had already been applied to other areas of the curriculum, for example to Technical Education, or to Home Economics Education, or Business Education. Indeed the term is increasingly attached to many and broader facets of the curriculum, for example, Language Education. Specifically, in the research study, the concept was used to describe the process of development in religious education noted in the investigations conducted by the study.

By *the educationalisation* of RE is implied the full incorporation of that subject into the educational world, the curriculum, educational thinking and the philosophy of education. What is intended by *full incorporation* is that the curricular element RE, be accorded the same treatment as any other curricular component, and that therefore, only curricular principles and criteria be used in deciding on the appropriate treatment. This process therefore, was part of a wider movement in education of applying basic principles to all curricular activities.

1.6 RE and Educationalisation

The curricular subject, Religious Education, its philosophy, content and methodology, is also at the core of the study since *educationalisation* has meant that it, the subject, has had to look at its basic rationale and procedures in order to ensure that they were educational rather than religious in nature and organisation. Until recently it was not subject to inspection in the way that all other areas of the curriculum were. Religious education has, therefore, been attempting to enter the educational world *on the same footing* as the other elements of the school curriculum. Its introduction to inspection was seen as a factor in this process. The study attempts to evaluate the progress made by this curricular element in thus entering fully into the educational world. It takes as a key moment, in the context of the wider process, that point in 1983, when the inspectorate was instructed by the government of the day to extend its remit to include the former *religious instruction*, now definitively renamed *religious education*. It examines in detail the contribution HMI have made to this process of educationalisation.

1.7 HMI and Educationalisation

One of the key moments in the process of *educationalisation* was the introduction of the subject to inspection. The process of inspection, and the context which inspection created, are used as significant markers. In order to gauge how inspection has influenced this process, the study adopts two strategies. First, three of the HMIs, who had, and have, particular roles in inspection of RE, are interviewed about that role, and second, some of the official publications of HMI showing their findings, are examined. These HMIs were interviewed because they were, first, the HMI who introduced RE to inspection, and second, the HMI appointed as the first ever national

specialist HMI, and last, the current national specialist in the subject .

1.8 Teacher Education and Educationalisation

The same methodological approach is used in relation to teacher education. Three Heads of Religious Education in various university faculties of Education are interviewed in order to discover their experience, attitudes and feelings, in relation to the progress RE has made in educationalisation. The three interviewees were chosen to represent the two major centres of teacher education, and the third to represent the smaller centres. Interview, therefore, has been a major factor in the study. Detailed discussion of the process is undertaken above and in appropriate chapters below.

1.9 The Provision of Religious Education and Educationalisation

Another component of the methodological strategy was the national survey. It was used in order to gain information about how far local authorities and their schools and their RE departments reacted to educationalisation, and how far these attitudes were expressed in practice. The survey involved all local authority areas nationally.

1.10 RE Teachers and Educationalisation

A constant in the practice of religious education has been specialist teachers of the subject. At the early stages of development of the subject their numbers were small, and their training had a theological emphasis. In the period covered by this study numbers rose very quickly, and the training emphasis of those involved changed from Theology to Religious Studies, and the General Teaching Council introduced for RE teaching the same training requirements as for any other curricular specialism. ATRES came into

existence to provide the specialist professional voice of RE teachers. The national records of the Association were made available to the study, and have been used to provide input to the questions and issues under consideration, not least, that of *educationalisation*. Their perspective on educationalisation was determined by the nature of the Association. It represented specialist teachers, who saw themselves primarily, and essentially, as teachers. Their rationale, training and practice were, and are, educational.

1.11 The Perspective of the Study

The perspective from which the study is undertaken is that of the wider *educationalisation* process, springing from the Millar Report, *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools* (HMSO 1972), and the movement in Government policy on the curriculum which that report and changing attitudes to religious education reflected. The study is qualitative in emphasis in the sense of '*focusing on people and meanings*' (Schostak, 2002, p11).

Some of the chapters are review chapters, in the same fashion as the literature review (chapter 3). Chapter 4 adopts this approach in examining the work of the national subject committees which have taken the subject forward. Chapter 5 adopts the same strategy in dealing with the reports on the subject by HMI. Treatment of even chapters 6 and 7 is conducted on a qualitative basis. It adopts a qualitative review-type of approach in discussing the outcome of the six interviews conducted for the study. This approach made analysis and interpretation more rational, fitting in well with the intentions of the study. Chapter 8, which contains much quantitative material, does, in fact, also contribute to a qualitative perspective by balancing the clearly qualitative data, and thereby acting in triangular manner.

The survey declares itself to be a *National Survey of Provision*.

Although data and information in quantitative manner are requested, the main purpose of the survey, is to identify opinions and attitudes. This is done by considering the approaches adopted by HMI in their contribution to policy-making, Teacher Educators in professional development, and schools and teachers in actual provision and the practice of teaching in the provision of religious education as opposed to instruction. It is an attempt to enter the experience of those involved in making provision in, and for, religious education. The difference between '*instruction*' and '*education*' is evident, not only in figures showing provision on the ground, but in the attitudes of those making the provision. More significantly, the quality of the provision can also be gauged in the attitudes of those making the provision. The words of Freidson, quoted above by Maxwell, might be creatively paraphrased here to make this point, '*There is more to truth or validity than statistical representativeness. In this study I am concerned with the assumptions, behavior and attitudes of a very special set of educationists*'. More is also said about the various methodologies in appropriate chapters.

The survey was conducted by post, and over two successive sessions. Specific questions were sent to all local authority education departments requesting information about provision of religious education in their secondary non-denominational schools. Authorities which did not reply were sent a second request, and if they still did not respond, it was assumed they were not willing to do so.

1.12 The Range of the Study

Lastly, the historical scope of the study dates from mid-twentieth century to the date of the national survey, the beginning of the twenty-first century. The study limits itself to this process at secondary stages and within

non-denominational schools. To have included primary and nursery would have been to incorporate areas which merit separate studies.

It is limited to the non-denominational sector, because the process of educationalisation, which the study investigates, is specific to the '*open-ended*' (Durham) approach to the subject, and '*which engages and challenges the mass-produced outlook of ready-made values*' (Hull), discussed below, and which are used in that sector, rather than the approach which marks denominational religious education and which places emphasis on the '*faith*' dimension. This dimension is at the heart of the term denominational. That term is used in the study to include in particular the Christian sector which has such schools as well as the Muslim and Jewish sectors. The significant factor is the '*faith*' element, which is common irrespective of the particular religion in question. To have included that sector, therefore, would have been to incorporate questions which would have involved additional criteria, and which, therefore, merit a separate study. The two terms *denominational* and *non-denominational* are used to cover these two sectors throughout the study.

It is of interest that one local authority has, in November 2006 decided to use what it regards as more accurate terminology, *denominational*, for its faith schools, and *multi-denominational* for the majority of its schools (decision taken at the Education Committee of East Renfrewshire Council, on 23 November 06). This reflects, for example, the thinking of Robert Jackson in his book *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality*, discussed below. On its website the council says, *Non-denominational schools in east Renfrewshire are to be known as multi-denominational because of their inclusiveness*. The move comes after Councillor Allan Steele pushed for the change as an alternative term for schools which have pupils of many faiths. Education convener Councillor Mary Montague said, at a Council meeting:

Councillor Steele had felt for a long time that 'non-denominational' was very

negative whereas we have pupils from many faiths at our schools. We have four Catholic schools and one Jewish school being dedicated to their particular faiths, and are denominational in nature. Multi-denominational reflects the real character of the others and that is why we have adopted it (www.east.renfrewshire.gov.uk, 6.12.06).

(East Renfrew has five multi-denominational secondaries and seventeen primaries, as well as two Catholic secondaries and six primaries, and one Jewish Primary).

1.13 Basic Methodological Assumptions of the Study

In summary, therefore, the assumptions of the study in dealing with the nature of '*social reality*' are in the main, of a nominalist ontology, though there is this slight reservation of the section dealing with the survey, and the implications of the use of that method of data generation. Similarly, in terms of acceptable evidence of social realities, epistemologically speaking, the major emphasis is anti-nominalist.

1.14 General and Specific research questions

- 1 How far has the formal *educationalisation* of religious education proceeded?
 - (i) Is this an appropriate development?
 - (ii) What mechanisms should be used to achieve it?
 - (iii) What are the marks of educationalisation?
 - (iv) Which other curricular elements are educationalised?
- 2 How have the emphases of Munn and Millar been taken up in that process?
 - (i) What was the major contribution of the Millar Report?
 - (ii) In what way did the Munn Report help in the *educationalisation*

of religious education?

- (iii) Which other documents have helped the process of *educationalisation* of religious education?
- (iv) In terms of significance for RE, have the Millar and Munn reports been superceded?

3 What contribution to the growth and education of young people can religious education make?

- (i) Does religious education make a major contribution now?
- (ii) What is its potential contribution?
- (iii) Is it a minority concern, or a central contributor?
- (iv) How might it achieve its optimum contribution?

CHAPTER TWO

SOURCES, ORIGINS and LINKS of RELIGION and EDUCATION

tracing the roots of religious education

2.1 Introduction

This present chapter assumes the methodological strategy proposed for the study. Its purpose is to prepare the way for that strategy to be followed through. The aim of this chapter is to provide a background to the development of contemporary religious education, in Scotland. The adjective *contemporary* is used to indicate the period from the nineteen-sixties to the present day. That period is chosen because it was the beginning of the radical transformation of religious instruction (formalised in the legal language used to refer to the subject) into religious education, for which the concept '*educationalisation*' is used in the study. In the process of doing this, the chapter discusses the relationship of religious education to the rest of the educational world, and to the world of religion. It considers the direction in which it developed historically, examining some of the key Scottish documents which have played a part in defining its place in education.

Four documents are considered briefly here. They are: the Scottish Education Department *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools* (the Millar Report, 1972), the *Structure of the Curriculum in the Third and Fourth Years of the Scottish Secondary School* (the Munn Report, 1977), and the first two *Scottish Central Committees on Religious Education Bulletins* (SCCORE: Bulletin 1, 1978, and Bulletin 2, 1981). The Millar and the SCCORE documents are also dealt with, in greater detail alongside other reports in chapters 4 and 5, in the context of element 1 of the methodological strategy.

This present chapter is followed up in Chapter 3, by consideration of

a range of research which has been undertaken in the subject from the mid-twentieth century. Chapter 3 selects developments in thinking of particular significance for the purposes of this present study, highlighting major movements in thought which deal with ideas and practice which may have helped form and inform the present stage of development of RE in Scotland. The chapter reviews and evaluates contributions to thinking about general curriculum, and about general policy-making practice within education, as well as within religious education, specifically, to set the scene for the research which follows with its particular setting and questions. Emphasis is placed, initially, on the mid-twentieth century, because the 1960s was a significant decade in development for religious education.

The movement of thought which was taking place then in religious education reflected a movement in the wider educational world, where fundamental rethinking was in process. In some senses this period saw the beginning of modern religious education, in the development not only of ideas about the content and philosophy of the subject in, for example, the work of Ninian Smart (1960s and 1970s), but also of its relationship to the world of education and psychology, as for example through the work of Piaget (1930s) in relation to education in general and of those academics and researchers in religious education who followed the Piaget lead.

Writers like these from Ronald Goldman in the 1960s, and Harold Loukes in the same decade and Michael Grimmitt in the 1980s, prepared the way for the following years which in turn, were to produce the detailed developments seen in the national religious education reports referred to below. This is seen for example, in Working Paper 36 (1971) within the English education setting, and in Scotland, in the Millar Report (1972). These had an immense influence on the development of the subject.

2.2 Links between Religion and Education

Christianity, continuing from Judaism, is a religion of the Word. Although that is a theological concept, it does also have literary and educational connotations. The Christian belief in Jesus as the Word, brings these two together. Within Christianity there has always been a close link between religion and education. This was for sociological and practical reasons, as well as theological. From around the sixth century AD, the Christian church relied heavily on communities of monks who '*set themselves apart*' from ordinary life for special functions including prayer and study. The ascetic movement was the first form this development took. Fourth century Egyptian ascetics, Pachomius and Anthony, were early examples of this expression of Christianity. It involved individuals going off, away from society, to live lone lives of contemplation.

The ascetic emphasis moved on to become monasticism, changing from an individual to a community basis. St Benedict (495-543AD) was a pre-eminent figure in this context. Education of their own members was one of the areas on which monastic communities concentrated. In his rule, Benedict laid down, in some detail, how the brothers of the community were to live. One of the subsections of the rule, xxxviii, is entitled, '*Of the weekly Reader.*' It indicates that, '*at the meal times of the brothers, there should always be a reading...*' (Bettenson, 1963, pp168-169). The assumption therefore was that brothers would be able to read. St Benedict was one of the foremost innovators in the monastic movement. '*His monks were not clergy, but simple people, Italian peasants and rustic Goths. They needed to learn letters for their duty of devotional reading...and for the daily offices, 'the work of God'*' (Chadwick, 1967, p183). The motivation towards reading was therefore high in the view of the community, because it was theological. Similarly, being the centre of religious life for their community, the monks were guardians of the Bible.

Indeed, in many communities it might be that only the monks would be able to read, and for them this skill was essential if they were to read the daily office and pass on to the community the teachings of Christianity. The skills of reading and writing therefore were fostered in the monastic communities for this religious reason as well as for the other practical benefits they brought with them. Writing skills were highly developed, since the monks saw it as their duty to copy the Bible in their possession for the sake of future generations, hence their nickname 'scribes'. Clearly, the ability to read and write was of great benefit to the entire community in its daily life.

Education, therefore, had a particular link to religion, since it was required to maintain the religious life. It was, by and large, however, a matter kept within the religious community. It was not general education for the community, but education in the skills required for the common life, and for the performance of religious duties. The passage of time did see the development of education beyond the needs of the monastic community, to meet some of the needs of the wider community outside the monastery, but only on a limited scale.

The sixteenth century saw the beginning of the modern era in Scotland, educationally as in other ways. Till the Reformation, education was church/clergy dominated, and was for a select few. The Reformation left religion in the driving seat, but with a whole new dimension. Knox's *First Book of Discipline* (1560) aimed very clearly for a school in every parish, up and down the country.

The patrimony of the church was to be used in support of the poor, and the furtherance of education. The reformers instructed the Lords, '*your Honours be most careful for the virtuous education and godly upbringing of the youth of this realme*' and, '*every several kirk shall have a schoolmaster*' (cited in Cameron, J. ed. 1972, p55). This was a fundamental advance, and although

the purpose of education remained religion-directed, and aimed perhaps at ensuring an adequate supply of ministers, (as today it aims at producing adequate numbers of police, doctors and other public servants), it was also an attempt to prepare all pupils to deal with life in the community as it was, and was to be. It was, in a word, for all. In his book *John Knox Democrat*, Roderick Graham emphasises the universal intention behind Knox's plans, quoting the fifth head of the Book of Discipline,

And further, we think it expedient that in every notable town...(there) be erected a College, in which the Arts, at least Logic and Rhetoric, together with the Tongues (Greek and Hebrew) be read by sufficient masters for whom honest stipends must be appointed: as also provision for those that be poor, and be not able by themselves, nor by their friends, to be sustained at letters, especially such as come from landward (rural) areas (cited in Graham, 2001, p129).

In one sense this is a basis of modern RE, in that it took account of the needs (as perceived then) of young people about to enter adult life, or, indeed, of the community. To that degree it was need-centred.

To view the world of knowledge and experience as consisting of a variety of different areas, or modes, each of which may meet particular needs in developing pupils, is to adopt this same need-centred approach to education, although this terminology and conceptual structure were not current at that period. This is the context of the current state of RE.

However education itself, with the increasing sophistication and specialisation of knowledge, has tended to encounter a process of internal subdivision or specialisation, with a rationale formed more nearly to justify each unit in its own context rather than in relation to the wider field. This process produced conditions for fundamental re-examination of thinking

about the curriculum.

2.3 Curricular Link between Religion and Education

A general curricular problem which arose in the twentieth century in secondary school education, was that of disintegration of the curriculum. It was, in large measure caused by the increasing richness of what schools were able to offer to pupils. The philosophy of education, addressing this problem, tended to draw curricular areas together to form groups which had a common factor.

One such philosophy attempting to produce a rationale to make sense of the growing complexity of knowledge and the consequent drift towards disintegration of the curriculum, can be seen in the work of Paul Hirst (Hirst, 1974a, p45), who further developed the idea of *forms of knowledge* as a basis for organising the curriculum, and a way of ensuring that pupils would be able to experience a broad range of knowledge. Hirst's solution to the '*problem*' of the curriculum did not, by any means, receive universal support, but the rationale was helpful in the development of RE, in that Hirst lists the following forms of knowledge:

'the sciences, physical and social, mathematics, moral knowledge, literature and the fine arts, historical knowledge, religious knowledge (and later), philosophy' (ibid p45).

He links up with the thought of another philosopher, Philip Phenix, without agreeing with him in all details. The common factor is Phenix' statement that *'general education is the process of engendering essential meanings'* (Phenix, cited in Hirst, 1974, p54). Phenix lists six '*realms*', parallel to Hirsts '*forms*'. He says, *'Six fundamental patterns of meaning emerge from the analysis of the possible distinctive modes of human understanding. These six patterns may be designated respectively as symbolics, empirics, esthetics, synoetics, ethics, and*

synoptics' (Phenix, 1964, p6). In justifying forms of knowledge, in the context of debate, Hirst suggests, *'It is because they involve different kinds of concepts, logical structures and truth tests that we can distinguish not only kinds of knowledge, but kinds of experience, skills, attitudes, values, etc.'* (Hirst, 1973, in *Learning For Living*, 12,2,11, pp8-10). In the same article, he makes it plain that: *I conclude that there is a proper place in the maintained school for religious studies. I can see no justification whatever for teaching religion, if that means teaching which aims at pupils coming to believe or practise a particular religion, but if so teaching about religion cannot possibly be reduced to a simple recitation of true statements. In this area, as in any other, teaching about something is concerned with pupils understanding and imaginatively getting inside what it is they are asked to consider* (ibid, p10). Hirst's thinking was taken up and used by an official CCC report.

In 1977, the Scottish Education Department published the report of a subcommittee set up by the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, to review the curriculum at S3 and S4. The report was entitled, *The Structure of the Curriculum*, sometimes referred to by its chairman's name. The Munn Report's subject was the entire curriculum for S3 and S4. It dealt with the place of religious education at these two stages in this wider context.

In the Munn Report, eight modes were set out to help achieve the given aims:

We ...propose in the light both of epistemological theory, and of practical experience, that high priority be given to certain modes of activity, which constitute for us distinctive ways of knowing and interpreting experience... We consider therefore, that these modes of activity, pursued in accordance with our four sets of aims, constitute essential areas of learning, which all pupils should be required to engage in throughout the period of compulsory schooling (ibid. pp23-27).

- The modes listed are:
- 1 *linguistic and literary study*
 - 2 *mathematical studies*
 - 3 *scientific study*
 - 4 *social studies*
 - 5 *creative and aesthetic activities*
 - 6 *physical activity*
 - 7 *religious studies*
 - 8 *morality.*
-

The origins of modern RE therefore, derive in part from a wider attempt to make the curriculum in institutional education more effectively pupil-oriented, by making it take better account of pupil needs, the requirements of the society in which they are to take part, and the knowledge and experience needed effectively to live in society. Pupil needs clearly vary, but attempts have been made to define them in various ways, by academics (e.g. Hirst), by societal interest (as expressed in, for example, the SED Millar Report), and by educationists (for example, the SCCC subcommittee under Mr Munn). These needs, however, must be under continuous review, and ready for alteration as appropriate. There is no sort of special pleading needed here in the case of religious education. Rather it is a matter of broad educational strategy across the board. It is the fundamental question of whether basic knowledge is all that is required to enable one to have the fullest life possible, or whether a wider experience is more desirable. When this decision had been made, that RE in the curriculum was able to, and would be expected to, adhere to the same criteria as all the other modes, or forms of knowledge, it proceeded to meet them .

The Munn Report had come three years after the publication of the

work by Paul Hirst referred to above. It followed five years after the Millar Report, *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools* (HMSO,1972). The Millar Report was a formative document, dealing with the direction in which religious education should develop. The Millar committee was set up by the Secretary of State for Scotland, because of the anomalous position religious education occupied in Scottish education. It was effectively the only subject required by statute to be taught. Under the legislation of 1872 '*the continuance of religious instruction and religious observance was required in public schools*'. There was, however, no means of supervising it, or guiding its development, and no way of providing adequate support. Her Majesty's Inspectorate were forbidden from making any contribution to how this might be done, and there was no advisory service. It was the responsibility of the local education authority to ensure that the legal obligation was met, but they had no mechanisms for doing so.

2.4 Realisation of The Link

Millar had, in a very practical sort of way, set out the existing state of RE, what steps might be taken to improve it, and how it might develop. It was interesting that the membership of the committee was very broad in nature, with practising school teachers, college lecturers, other educationists, and representation from outwith the broader education world. It was a positive indicator that Millar had its finger on the curricular pulse, in that the report was influenced by the line taken in the work of academics like Paul Hirst, who presented the educational argument for RE to be included in the curriculum. Thus the way was prepared for the inclusion of RE in the work of national reports on the curriculum. This was a good scene-setter for the development of RE at the three levels mentioned by the Millar report, '*the school, the education authority, and nationally*' (ibid, p114).

The first such national report on the curriculum was the Munn Report.

The chronology was:	1972	The Millar Report
	1974	The work of Paul Hirst
	1977	The Munn Report

The Munn Report dealt with the whole curriculum in S3 and S4. The detailed work for each of the modes remained to be done within the Munn framework. It offered a clear rationale. The Munn report made a contribution to the fundamental question of fragmentation of the curriculum, by suggesting a whole-curriculum structure, which had a basis in the work of curriculum thinking, rather than simply in existing practice in schools.

2.5 RE Integral to the System

There is a final layer to uncovering the origins of RE, and that is the work of the Scottish Central Committee on RE (SCCORE), which developed in the light of the Millar report, Hirst, and the Munn report. The SCCORE committees, as central committees of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, dealt with detailed curriculum for religious education. SCCORE produced Bulletin 1 (HMSO, 1978), Bulletin 2 (HMSO, 1981), which together have clearly determined the shape of RE as it exists now. Both Bulletins went straight to the task of offering detailed curricular guidance. They argued that the basis of RE is an educational one, following the style of the Millar and Munn reports, and that its development in schools is undertaken on this footing. It was, in this sense, that SCCORE was immediately radical. The statutory position remained the same.

Much other baggage was brought from the past history of the teaching of RE. Yet the main section of Bulletin 1 was concerned with areas not previously given such high importance and centrality in discussion of RE.

This section was entitled '*The Curriculum*', and its opening words were, '*The approach to curriculum development in religious education is no different from that appropriate for other subjects*' (HMSO 1978, p5).

As a starter, the four aims listed in Bulletin 1 (ibid, p5) are clear. Indeed, in the context in which they were produced, they defined very well how the subject should develop:

The aims of RE within the curriculum are seen as:

- (a) *to identify with pupils the area of religion in human experience;*
- (b) *to enable pupils to explore questions about the nature and meaning of existence and the answers that religions offer;*
- (c) *to help pupils understand the nature and importance of commitment whether within a religious or secular context and to appreciate what it means to be committed to a particular way of life; and*
- (d) *to encourage in pupils an awareness of the wider social and cultural impact of religions* (HMSO, 1978, p5).

They were, however, a starter only. Bulletin 2 reduced these four aims to

- three :
- (a) *to help pupils to identify the area of religion in terms of the phenomena of religion and the human experience from which they arise;*
 - (b) *to enable pupils to explore the nature and meaning of existence in relation to the questions religions pose and the answers they propose;*
 - (c) *to encourage pupils to develop a consistent set of beliefs, attitudes and practices which are the result of a personal process of growth, search and discovery* (HMSO,1981, p3).

Perhaps a key factor in these reports discussed above is the decisive

approach which they make in dealing with the subject. This approach is simply outlined in the statement that the entire discussion is of educational questions. There is now no call to ask questions which are not directly educational, and this is forcibly underlined by the need for teachers of RE to have the same education and training to the same standards, as teachers of any other subject. They are specialist teachers of their own subject.

This major change is what in the end distinguishes modern approaches to the subject from those of the past. These reports were a measured attempt to state what required to be done, to ensure the introduction of this effectively '*new*' aspect of the curriculum. They had done the work systematically. A pathway was now laid. Responsibility for the actual implementation of the detail of the Munn and Millar reports lay at the feet of the local authority education departments.

2.6 Local Authority Support of RE

In the 1970s the way was being prepared for the re-organisation of local government from the old counties to new regional councils. In the West of Scotland, for example, the biggest of the new regional authorities was to be Strathclyde. It incorporated the former authorities of Glasgow, Lanark, Dunbarton, Renfrew, Argyll and Bute, and Ayr in a single authority. The proposed regionalisation sparked off some development in the existing education departments, which generated a much expanded advisory service. In some cases, this augmented service included a specialist advisor for every secondary school subject area, and a small team of advisors for primary.

The thinking behind this expansion seems to have been the impending regionalisation, rather than new curricular thinking. It was almost an administrative act, simply appointing additional specialist staff to work in the pre-existing framework. A result of this move was that, before

regionalisation, all the counties which were subsequently to form Strathclyde, with the exception perhaps of Argyll and Bute, had a full-blown advisory service. All five of these authorities appointed an adviser in religious education.

The function of the RE adviser was simply to develop the provision of RE in the area, to support existing RE specialist teachers, to encourage schools with no specialist provision to make an appointment, and, thereafter to encourage schools to increase provision in RE systematically. Such development led to the appearance of departments of more than a single member of staff, and thus to the creation of principal teacher posts.

All of this progressed at least in some areas, fairly easily. The advisory service had, as a main function, the support of such teachers and departments. They also identified the need to help the specialist teachers within the authority to work together as a team, in order to think through their curricular needs, and as a team, to produce curricular material for use in their own schools.

One pattern which evolved, was for each school to send a specialist to join the authority RE Panel, which planned how to meet the curricular needs of the schools, and decided how these needs would be met. The set-up in such areas therefore, was a local version of the national picture, where the CCC appointed subject Central Committees. The development of RE in this fashion was swift in some authorities. It may however, not always have been on the basis of schools becoming convinced of the educational benefits of the subject to pupils, but sometimes, rather on the basis of the existence of, for example, the Millar Report and the Munn Report, and the support of the educational directorate. The requirement was not great. Initially it involved the appointment of a single teacher. Only when moves were made beyond this minimal provision was it possible to observe if senior

management of schools felt that this was more than a placatory move. At the outset it was on the basis of making minimal provision for RE. Most head-teachers were able to take on a single person to be the specialist in RE.

Except in unusual cases this took little persuasion. The move however, from this level of provision to that required for an effective RE department, which could live up to the sorts of criteria used in judging other departments in the school, and which could offer the best practice available within the subject itself, is more complex. It required educational engagement, not administrative manipulation.

2.7 In Conclusion

At a fundamental level religion, by definition, has built-in association with the educational process. It is part of the structure of religion that the followers of a religion be able to think *in depth* about the *big issues* of life. The ability to do this requires the passing on of knowledge and experience from one generation to another. In the question of formal, general education, this fundamental association created some problems because it was designed to meet the needs of *followers* of the religion in question, whereas general education was designed for the entire community. The issue in modern times, where the community no longer claims membership of a religious community, has been whether this fundamental link between religion and education retains significance and could be transferred in some way to meet the needs of the majority who might have no link, or commitment to religion. Was there indeed an educational curricular link with religion? Putting flesh on the bones of religion, thus defined educationally, proved to be a long, difficult task and it required religion to submit to the requirements of the educational process, and education to look at actual pupil needs rather than fixed concepts of content. However, it was

a matter of some significance because of the needs which potentially religion might meet.

Religion as defined above was significant because it dealt with some needs in that it provided a context in which the meaning of life could be sought. Religious education in terms of curricular aims, while not as all-encompassing as religion itself, nonetheless was directed at dealing with some of the fundamental needs of pupils which were not addressed by any other curricular area on offer. The sources of modern religious education are quite inseparable from the onward trend of educational development and practice. Mostly what happened in religious education was reflective of these broader movements. Re-thinking was underway on the curriculum as a whole and religious education was incorporated within that development, so that it became a mode in the thinking of Paul Hirst and subsequently in the findings of the Munn committee report. This broad curricular movement in turn, was reflected in the development in thinking on the nature of RE as expressed in Working Paper 36, and the Millar Report, both making quite plain that the task to be undertaken was an educational task and that the criteria of success were strictly educational.

The political will for this type of RE to be incorporated fully in the curriculum was present at national and local government level, and this resulted in the appointment of local authority advisers in religious education in most authorities in Scotland in the nineteen-seventies and beyond. This was a direct strategy aimed at policy implementation. Once again, this was part of a general development in educational thought. It was not restricted to religious education. There had been advisers in some subjects for many years before that time, mainly for the practical subjects, but there was a great expansion then in the service, and RE advisers were for almost the first time, appointed and eventually widely appointed. These appointments

created a much-needed focus for the mode.

The main functions of advisors were to support the subject teachers in schools, to encourage headteachers to appoint RE staff, and to advise the directorate of progress. Subsequently support for teaching staff became provision of in-service, and then opportunities to engage in curriculum development with their colleagues. At this early stage of development there were few opportunities for promotion in the subject area, and within schools the RE staff were looked after either by an assistant headteacher or by an appropriate principal teacher, from another subject area. As suggested above, progress to the stage of having one specialist in most reasonably-sized secondary schools was not too problematic, at least in some local authority areas.

The next step in transferring policy into practice was more difficult. To consider the possibility of having a standard department with at least two members of staff, and including a principal teacher was rather more difficult, not least for reasons of cost. But it was only at this point that senior management would have, educationally, to justify their decisions as well as justifying them on a purely financial basis. Up to that point all that was asked was such minimal provision that it could be achieved with barely a passing educational thought because there were few, if any, knock-on effects of a staffing or curricular nature. Religious Education provision in Scotland progressed reasonably well to this point of minimal and administratively acceptable provision. How far it might move beyond this will be discussed at various points below.

In the chapter which follows immediately on this present one, the *educational* rationale and justification for whole-heartedly welcoming the subject into the active curriculum is discussed. This is chosen rather than the a-curricular, administrative approach used by senior management in many

schools. This is done because an educational justification was required, and also a curricular, developmental justification, not simply a management/ educational/ administrative/ justification. The issues at heart are not management issues alone. They are educational issues. Hirst and the Millar and Munn Reports all assume the perspective of education. The primary helpful question to determine the direction for thought and action is: *does this curricular area have a contribution to make to the development of children which they cannot do without?*

The following chapter aims to engage this question.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

a review of major trends in curriculum and policy-making, and in the academic literature of religious education in the latter half of the twentieth century and into the present.

3.1 Introduction

The origins of religious education in the curriculum were considered in the second chapter. The third chapter is part of that section in the study which is concerned with review of literature related to religious education, and which is made up of chapters three four and five. The aim of this chapter is to highlight major development significant for the purposes of the study. Two such areas will be discussed: development in curriculum and policy-making on one hand, and development within religious education on the other. The first of these forms the context for discussion of the second and of the other two chapters of this section of the study.

As indicated in Chapter Two, the period under discussion is that from the 1960s to the present day. The shape of this review of literature dealing with development in thought is based on three main factors:

- 1 development in thought on the general curriculum and policy (3.3),
- 2 development of religious education on its educational merits (3.4-6),
- 3 the issues arising from the radical restatements of justification of the subject made then (3.7-8).

First, development in thought on curriculum and policy-making is an overarching factor. This is not a religious education-specific area. It deals with general thinking, and developments in thinking and policy-making

across the board in education. It does however provide the context for consideration of the other two factors. Curriculum and policy are examined from two points. One is that of official reports on the overall curriculum and on religious education. This is undertaken in chapter four which forms the second leg of the literature review.

The second factor is modern development of religious education on its educational merits (picking up from references in chapter two) and not simply, for example, for its sociological or religious significance. This movement recognising the educational potential developed from the latter half of the twentieth century, particularly from the nineteen-sixties and seventies. It was an extremely creative period for the practice theory and philosophy of the subject, in terms of academic thinking and writing, the production of national reports, and the setting down of the findings of HMI. The second factor relates to the set of issues which arose from the radical re-statements of the justification of the subject which were made at that time. In the remaining part of this factor in the present chapter, literature on curriculum development and policy will be considered and this will lead on to the general curriculum documents as well as the RE-specific curriculum documents of chapter four.

The documents which will be considered here are curricular documents which have a clear significance for religious education and its place within the broad curriculum. The documents which fit that category, and which will therefore be referred to here, are the Millar Report, the Munn Report, the 5-14 documents, and Curriculum for Excellence: 5-18. Three of these are general curriculum documents and the remaining one, the The Millar Report, is religious education-specific. More detailed consideration of these curriculum development and policy reports is undertaken in chapter four which deals specifically with trends in the development of religious

education via the report literature.

The aim of this study is to assess this *educationalisation* of religious education. One facet of educationalisation, which process began in the nineteen-sixties, was the introduction of inspection in 1983. The symbolic significance of this involvement of HMI in RE, and how it measures against those wider ideas, is an indication that major changes were in the air in Scotland in religious education, as they were in other parts of the United Kingdom. The developments in thought chosen for consideration here have been selected in order to measure them against RE as it was emerging in Scotland within the period indicated, and not least in the light of the steer which HMI gave to the subject.

Analysis of the documents contained in these three chapters dealing with literature review is undertaken on the same footing, that of Grounded Theory (GT) in Strauss & Corbin's definition,

one (a Grounded Theory) that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents. That is, it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon. Therefore, data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other. One does not begin with a theory and then prove it. Rather one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge (Strauss & Corbin

1990:23, quoted in Titscher, et al, 2000, p76).

3.2 Methodological Approach

The methodology by which these major developments are noted and analysed is by looking specifically and in detail at some of the thinking in the debate which produced the creative input to change RI into RE, with all that the second of these terms implied. All this is done through the lens of the

two concepts and major factors: *the educational merits of religious education*, and the restatement of the *justification* made of the subject in the latter half of the *twentieth century*, in the wider context referred to of development in general curriculum thinking and in curriculum policy. This approach is chosen because the total number of contributors was wide-ranging and not all of the same quality. Some were responsible for fundamental research and some refined such work. The adopted approach also covers, in measured terms, the half century over which the change has been taking place ensuring a broad view of the debate. Last, the approach filters out those issues not key to the '*educationalisation*' of religious instruction.

Five major areas are identified for discussion, and researchers writers and practitioners have been selected who do this over the period from mid-twentieth century to the present. The context in which the four Religious Education-specific areas are discussed is significant since this is the soil out of which the developments grew. It embodies the term *educationalisation*, used elsewhere to signify the relationship of religious education to wider educational thinking. It is this wider thinking which marked out *religious education* over against the former *religious instruction*. This context subdivides in two: that of the development of thinking in the broad curricular front, and of thinking in policy-making.

The five major areas are:

- i) thinking in general curriculum and policy,
- ii) the application of educational psychology to the
content and methodology of
religious education,
- iii) the academic integrity of religious studies,
- iv) the range of philosophies in religious education,
- v) the contribution of religious education to the

wider curriculum.

The areas are central in significance to the transformation of religious instruction, as indicated above. They are highlighted by an initial group of writers who focus the wider discussion of the review, and this focus-group fans out to other contributors to the process. Those in the initial focus-group have played a creative role in stating and implementing these ideas.

They are approached, following areas i-v, with in each case a decade highlighted: (i) in the area of policy, Bryce and Humes, in the first decade of the present century (and also under (i), Roger and Hartley, in the area of curriculum in the same decade).

(ii) A whole range of researchers who from the nineteen-sixties initiated an emphasis which applied to religious education the same sorts of psychological techniques, language, and procedures, as in any other area of child learning and development by highlighting the work of Jean Piaget and its relevance for religious education.

(iii) Ninian Smart in the nineteen-seventies for introducing academic rigour as appropriate in any discipline, and a clear philosophy for the subject, for the education of teachers, and consequently for pupils.

(iv) Michael Grimmitt, bridging the centuries in the nineteen-nineties and beyond, for making full use of the advances made by those who pursued the psychological or child-centred emphasis, and also for refining the philosophy of the subject as stated by Smart, and for bringing together a collection of differing pedagogies in use in religious education for analysis, and last,

(v) Robert Jackson, also in the contemporary decade, publishing his latest volume in 2004, for his identification of the contribution religious education may make in the context of the broader curriculum. He did this by taking full account of the cultural, and sociological environment in

which learning currently takes place. In that context he too refined the work of Ninian Smart, and advanced the Piagetian emphasis of child-centred approaches in relation to curricular content .

These writings are used as focus for the discussion which follows and which broadens out to consider the wider field of other researchers and of appropriate journals including the daily press when it makes significant reference to Religious Education. All of these sources will be used to give more definition to the factors and ideas referred to above. The findings in relation to these developments, will be linked to the changes which have taken place in RE in Scotland. These include reference to the contribution made by the Inspectorate of schools, and also to the formal literature of the reports produced on religious education. Together the findings and discussion will assume the work of four scholars working in the field of religious education who set the precise context for thinking about the subject within the Scottish scene. They are:

JWD Smith for his revised work of 1975 *Religion and Secular Education* in which he advanced the child-centred emphasis in Religious Education correcting some of the flaws in earlier thinking.

AR Rodger for his work of 1982, *Education and Faith in an Open Society*, in which he made it plain that he saw *Religious Education as education: it will be education for understanding, for openness and for autonomy, it will also be education for decision and commitment in response to evidence and experience in the light of his own appraisal of these* (Rodger, 1982, p61).

ICM Fairweather, and JN MacDonald for their work of 1992, *Professional Issues in Religious Education*. They stated three related factors in the educational justification of Religious Education: how we understand *modern society*, how we understand *the educational process today* and third how does our understanding of the *nature of religion* affect our view of Religious

Education.

Given that chapters three four and five of the study, as indicated above, all deal with facets of literature review, the overall context in which they are considered will be discussed at the end of chapter five.

3.3 Curriculum and Policy development in the latter part of last century and into the present, in thinking about the general curriculum and developing patterns of policy.

Curriculum and policy are discussed separately in some of the literature and elsewhere are considered in their inter-relationship. The period covered by the study politically covers the last decades of the pre-devolution period, and the time since the introduction of devolution. Because of the shortness of that latter period there are more data available on pre-devolution than on post-devolution Scottish education.

Policy

In pre-devolution terms the general view is that policy making in education depended on '*strong central direction*'. Bryce and Humes make this point and suggest that it was led by a group of senior Scottish Office Ministers and civil servants and that '*the degree of democratic scrutiny and debate was limited*' (Bryce and Humes 1999, p6). This leads them further to suggest that '*despite claims of widespread consultation, leading to consensus, the policy community in Scotland has been carefully controlled in a variety of ways*', and that this in turn has led to the creation of '*a conformist ideology which permits discussion of procedural matters (how? questions), while discouraging discussion of substantive matters (why? questions)*' (ibid). In Roger and Hartley's account, '*the policy community consists in three main partners: central government, local authorities, and teachers*', and that '*traditionally, policy was a product of consensus*' (Roger and Hartley, 1990, p3). Whether '*consensus*' is intended to mean

simply that Local Authorities and teachers merely had their say before central government made its decisions is not made clear at this point, but in juxtaposing '*debate followed by consensus*' with '*consultation followed by imposition*' (ibid p1), she does seem to suggest that the former is creative, with the consensus actively involved in the formulation of policy.

The policy process is clearly seen in particular cases. The Munn and Dunning exercise is one such case, as are the introduction of Action Plan and of *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s*.

In his study on the Munn and Dunning process, including reporting and implementation, the views of Gordon Kirk former principal of Moray House College are clear. He indicates that :

the whole Munn and Dunning exercise demonstrated central control : two national committees, ministerial pronouncements, SED controlled feasibility studies and development programme. Both committees were united on the need for centrally determined syllabus guidelines and Dunning recommended that assessment be weighted towards the external examination (Kirk, 1982, pp100-1).

Action Plan shows even more clearly the policy process in operation. In a discussion paper for a Seminar on Policy Learning in 14-19 Education of 15 March 2005, John Hart of the Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh, and Ron Tuck Independent Educational Consultant, suggest that in the Plan there were three phases running from central direction to local accountability as the main features:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Phase 1 | Policy makers of the SED ; HMI, EA managers, |
| Phase 2 | Practitioners involved in workshops and seminars -
though the level of consensus reached is disputed, |
| Phase 3 | Post-devolution. Cross-party committee, Ministers in
control, policy making associated with |

Government pledges (Hart and Tuck, 2005, p1).

Before devolution, SED could take the lead role in policy making:

Indeed it was the claim of some senior civil servants that they were able to maintain a steady course for Scottish education with only minor diversions as the party in power changed. Only occasionally, it appears, were changes made at a political level to the plans drawn up by civil servants (Hart and

Tuck, 2005, p5).

And, *'the Higher Still development Programme started in the last years of a Conservative Government which had been driving change in education in Scotland, continued under New Labour and was completed under the devolved coalition administration'* (ibid).

A third example of policy making relates to the discussion paper *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s*. Already referred to, it is discussed by Angela Roger in the book she edited with David Hartley. Roger feels that Scotland may be on *'the ninth of ten steps on the slippery slope'* of central control described by Ted Wragg. That step includes *'Centrally prescribed objectives, materials, strategies, test items, remedial programmes, and publication of results by schools'* (Wragg, 1980, quoted in Roger and Hartley, 1990 p12). She takes a rather different view of the process of policy making and implementation. In her description of the introduction of *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s*, she suggests that the policy was imposed on an unwilling profession, and that this indicated *'a shift in policy making from debate followed by consensus, to (brief) consultation followed by imposition'* (ibid, p1). The traditional means, according to Hartley, of arriving at policy, was by consensus. This interpretation of what had preceded the episode she describes differs from that of the others, quoted above, and in particular, Bryce and Humes.

The Standards in Scotland's Schools Act (2000) created a new

beginning for all educational policy making, by defining the responsibilities of Ministers and increasing the accountability of EAs.

Kirk, in his treatment of curriculum and assessment in Scottish secondary schools considers that '*Munn and Dunning undoubtedly marked a watershed in policy and change in Scottish education*' (Kirk 1982, quoted in Roger and Hartley 1990, p6). Following the Munn and Dunning period, the importance of *Action Plan* saw an extension of more overt control over education, and with the publication in 1987 of the two SED papers, *School Management and the Role of Parents*, (1987a), and *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: a Policy for the 90s*, (1987b), central control of policy is clearly demonstrated: the Minister circulated his proposals for consultation, and gathered responses centrally (there was no open debate).

Bringing the focus again on to post-devolution Scotland, Hart and Tuck point out that, *in 2004 the Scottish Executive published a handsome folder containing two complementary documents under the heading A Curriculum for Excellence. It contained the recommendations of a Curriculum Review Group, established twelve months earlier, and the Ministerial Response to the Group's proposals. The scope of these papers is for the first time ever, a single curriculum 3-18, supported by a single and effective structure of assessment and qualifications. These documents might be seen as a culmination of the process of post-devolution policy-making.*

Whether they point to a continuation of the central control identified as the mark of policy making pre-devolution, or a change in the direction of the *new beginning* expected of the Scottish Parliament is not yet clear. What can be said is that their origin is the centre. What will determine whether they are of the new policy making culture, is the treatment they receive from this point on, and what professional input will be permitted to the documents and to the principle of the single curriculum 3-18.

Curriculum

The reception of discussion paper *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s* (SED 1987), already referred to, is discussed by Angela Roger (Roger and Hartley, 1990). From the outset her conclusion is clear: *'The ensuing short consultation period demonstrated that there was widespread concern throughout the profession about the substance and purpose of the proposals... Nonetheless, the decision was made to proceed with the implementation of the proposals'* (Roger and Hartley 1990, p1). This she considers is all *'evidence of a shift in policy making style in Scotland from debate followed by consensus, to consultation followed by imposition'* (ibid p 1).

The three principal partners in Scottish education were,

Central government: consisting of politicians in the SED: the Secretary of State, and the Minister for Education. The SED was made up of HMI, civil servants, Research and Intelligence Unit,

LEAs their political identity was the Regions. The regions acted as COSLA (including the Directorate of Education - ADES),

Teachers the teacher unions.

Traditionally, policy was reached through consensus reached by the partners (Roger and Hartley, 1990, p3). The question for proposals was do they demonstrate negotiation and consensus, or central control and imposition? Significant reforms had followed a pattern of debate and negotiation among the traditional partners, for example: 1965 *Primary Memorandum* (SED 1965), 1980 *Learning and Teaching in P4 and P7* (SED 1980).

Roger and Hartley, supporting their thesis that before the imposition of *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland* the means of making decisions in education was debate, leading to consensus, leading to policy in education.

They cite the great change in education since the Second World War. They describe it as '*an unprecedented period of change and expansion in education*', and suggest it was achieved by consensus, listing as evidence:

- 1965 the *Primary Memorandum* (SED 1965),
- 1980 *Learning and Teaching in P4 and P6* (SED 1980),
- 1983 *Primary Education in the Eighties* (CCC 1983),
- 1986 *Education 10-14 in Scotland* (CCC 1986),
- 1974 the beginning of the Munn/Dunning process,

with the setting up of the two committees. And in the same period, the implementation of Standard Grade was in process and this was followed by the curriculum development of Action Plan.

All of these developments reflected a steady move towards a pupil-centred curriculum which had been pin-pointed in the Primary Memorandum's emphasis on Piagetian psychology, the individual and society together, and method rather than content. The '*unprecedented development*' in the Primary sector, referred to above was mirrored at secondary also:

There was a virtual revolution in all secondary subjects, with new content, new approaches and resources being advocated...Central committees were autonomous, and therefore there was little attempt to study the secondary curriculum as a whole. There was little advice to headteachers as to how the different subjects were to knit together to form a coherent educational experience for pupils (Gatherer 1989, pp113-4).

The main problem remained that '*the secondary curriculum was grossly overcrowded*' (ibid, p114). An important need therefore, given this melee of development, was for balance. This was the context in which the Munn and Dunning committees were set up.

In 1987 the CCC produced a set of guidelines for headteachers to

facilitate the development of a rationale which might ensure *'coherence, continuity, articulation, and progression in the curriculum'* (ibid p121), taking as markers Munn's three curricular claims:

*'the demands of knowledge
the psychological needs of the pupil
the requirements of society'.*

The guidelines were very detailed, listing the different components of curriculum, the eight modes of which it should consist, how to ensure balance and breadth of curriculum for every pupil. They even offered time allocations for the various modes. Gatherer's view of the CCC guidelines, as also of the Munn suggestions, is that the pattern is *'essentially the old orthodox subject-based curriculum of Scottish educational tradition'* (ibid, p124), and that there is no movement in the direction of school-designed curricula. His argument leads inexorably towards the developing policy movement of centralist prescription of curriculum. Summing this up Gatherer suggests *'a new authoritarianism which could well destroy much of the progress we have made over the last quarter century'* (ibid p127) has been created. The cause of this in his view is the politicisation engendered by the then Secretary of State with the introduction of the term *'mandatory guidelines'* and the actions and attitudes which accompanied that phrase and with the promulgation of innovation in curriculum and assessment by fiat rather than by cooperative, creative consultation.

3.4 The Application of Educational Psychology to Religious Education

Focusing discussion of this topic in the study is the application of the developmental psychology of Piaget, to religious education. One of the initiators of this child-centred approach to consideration of religious education was Ronald Goldman. His contribution to discussion of religious

education lies in perceiving the significance of a child-centred approach. He did not contribute greatly to the subject content of religious education, or to the philosophy of the subject. He does not produce developed ideas in this area of the subject, which still stand forty years on. Indeed, he does not even talk exclusively about religious education. He considers it as linked closely to Christian education (Goldman 1965, p59), suggesting that he is simply assuming the given pattern of thought of many of his contemporaries at this point, that is, viewing religious education as the early stages of Christian education. This is the explanation of his assumptions and statements about '*personal encounter with the divine*' (ibid p65), and his discussions about the place of the Bible within religious education (Goldman 1964, p4). He is in fact in these cases simply applying his research findings to what he sees to be the practice around him.

However, in discussing recent writing and research on RE, the major English report, *Schools Council Working Paper 36* (Schools Council, 1971) lists these approaches to religion in schools: '*the neo-confessional*', '*the implicit religion approach*', and the '*explicit religion approach*'. The report places Goldman in the '*neo-confessional camp*', and then indicates that '*this neo-confessionalism though undoubtedly sincere, cannot be the basis of religious education in maintained schools; it is just as open to objection from non-christian teachers as the old confessionalist*' (ibid, p31). The Working Paper, as well as being concerned about those teaching the subject, could also have asked whether Goldman's *neo-confessional* approach actually squared with the experience of adolescents any more than did the old confessional approach.

If his contribution to the debate were to remain with what he says about subject content, there would, at this stage, be no justification for referring back to his work. It would very much be entirely time-conditioned. It would, therefore, in order to derive benefit from Goldman's contribution in

the context of this present study, be necessary to separate his emphasis in the field of psychology from the application of these findings to the RE content he used. He is highlighted, here merely as an *introducer* of child-centred emphases in religious education. Much more detailed and progressive work in this field has subsequently been carried out. For example the work of J W D Smith. In his book *Religious Education in a Secular Setting* (SCM, 1969) moves on from the Goldman emphasis. Smith speaks from the perspective of religious education and how to teach it, whereas Goldman was more at home with psychology alone. At primary, the work of Violet Madge in *Children in Search of Meaning* (SCM Press, 1965), also followed on from the awareness of the significance of psychological understanding of the development of children in religious education.

Another example of work in this area, indicating that this approach was strong and developing in education generally, was the Newsom Report, *Half Our Future*, which was concerned *with the education of secondary school pupils of 'average and below average ability'* (Ministry of Education, 1963). This in turn inspired the research study *Religion and Slow Learners* of Kenneth Hyde (1969).

Secondly, in his research Goldman is narrowly enquiring into understanding of the Biblical text, and not even of its status as Holy Writ. His research is not effectively broader than that. He does not produce results which shed light on the broad scope of religion, as for example defined by Ninian Smart (see below). In terms, therefore, of research into religion and understanding of religion, his work is very limited indeed. However, his contribution for the purposes of this study lies in his emphasis that religious education is to be treated in all respects like any other area of the curriculum offered to children. His '*psychological analysis*' of religious education, and the conclusions he reached following his application of the

work of Jean Piaget, are what remains of significance. It is not the use of his findings in relation to the subject content then current which makes Goldman's work useful. It is in relation to his attitude to content that the charge of '*neo-confessionalism*' made by Working Paper 36, and referred to above, is justified. Rather, his application of psychological principles to religious education is what is of note. More precisely, his insistence that there were not specifically *religious needs* just *children's needs* is central. This emphasis was vital within an understanding of the subject, as well as within an understanding of children.

In religious education, this insistence has contributed much to the debate about the nature of the subject. There exists a strong lobby currently which rejects the idea of a sacred / secular divide within the subject as unhelpful. This reflects child-centred thinking. Its insistence, that there is no special group of religious needs also reinforces the move in the direction of children's needs and abilities, which in turn has had immense influence on the content of all curricular areas. These two factors are strong justification for the inclusion of consideration of this emphasis for the purposes of this present study.

This emphasis in part was carried forward in '*an empirical study of the place of religion in the understanding of boys and girls 6-15 years. It was designed to take account of contemporary religious diversity and current shifts in the scope of religious education*' (Gates 1976). The study involved 1000 pupils from eight schools for written interview: 82 Anglicans, 81 unattached, 38 Non-conformist, from the above for further oral interviews, as well as 40 Roman Catholics, 41 Jews, 19 Sikhs and 17 Muslims. It was an interesting study from the perspective of the present study, since, as well as being a psychological enquiry, it took account of the work of Ninian Smart. Indeed extensive use is made of Smart's dimensions of religion. This is how the question '*How is*

religion to be approached' is answered (Gates, p17). He pursues this approach, indicating that *'throughout this research religion has been taken as an ordering activity concerned with any person's attempt to make some final sense of being in the world'* (ibid, p355). Again the use of Smart is underlined: *'It was also to hold open the possibility of detecting signals of transcendence within the 'secular' experience of children'* (ibid p 387).

Particular use was therefore made of Ninian Smart's analysis of the constituent elements of the religious experience of mankind in setting out the ground to be covered, and his model was elaborated to include some everyday human counterparts of the distinctively religious elements.

3.5 The Academic Integrity of Religious Studies

For religious education to enter the realms of educationalisation it was essential that rigour be introduced into academic discussion of its philosophy and practice. Writing some years later, in this case in 1970, Ninian Smart had a different perspective from that of the psychology of learning. Smart was primarily concerned with the nature of religious studies, and the philosophy of religion. In a sense his ability to work in this area in this way depended on the kind of work done by the *psychologists*. Smart can therefore, in some ways be seen by practitioners in the field as continuing from where the child-centred approach of psychology left off. Smart's emphasis is described as *'a non-dogmatic, phenomenological approach in which teacher and learner alike were encouraged to 'bracket out' their presuppositions in order to attempt empathetically to grasp religion from the insider's perspective'*, and the context for this was *'a predominantly secular and increasingly religiously pluralistic democracy'* (Jackson,1997, p2).

The key to his approach to religious studies is the word *'descriptive'*. It is so in the sense of being anxious to study what is there rather than to

compare or make any judgement. It is to be studied because it is there and because it is a sphere which it is vital to understand if one is to understand one's life... *'in the contemporary world one must understand other nations' ideologies and faiths in order to grasp the meaning of life as seen from perspectives often very different from one's own'* (Smart 1970, p11). He takes the concept of *'descriptive'* even further: *'We must see the way in which the externals and inner meanings of religion are fused together'* (ibid, p11). Description therefore involves both *deep understanding* and *deep feeling*. He is most anxious that the precision of observation and the importance of understanding and feeling be highlighted, *'As with science, so it would not be helpful to speculate about religious truth without a proper knowledge of the facts and feelings of religions'* (ibid, p12). He himself specifically makes the point that he is setting out to describe rather than to pass judgement on the phenomena of religion. This, says Smart, must be done *'dispassionately and objectively'* (ibid, p12).

He is in no doubt that the study of religion is a science, in the sense of being open to an objective approach but it is one which requires a *'sensitive'* and *'artistic'* inclination. In making this point he takes hold early on of the objection sometimes made that it is impossible to appreciate a faith to which one is not committed, and he describes that charge as a *'dangerous exaggeration'* (ibid, p13). He does not say it is nonsense. He accepts that there is a potential difficulty there for those who do not proceed with an appropriate method of enquiry. Initially he identifies six dimensions of religion (subsequently adding the seventh, the Material Dimension) : *the Ritual dimension, the Mythological dimension, the Doctrinal dimension, the Ethical dimension, the Social dimension, and last, the Experiential dimension* (ibid, pp16-22). The Smart Dimensions are further discussed in chapter 9 of this study.

Each dimension analyses one area of religion facilitating study in the scientific manner to which he refers earlier. It is interesting that Smart set

out to study and analyse, what was 'on the ground', instead of following the path of earlier writers who assumed that the way to advance knowledge and understanding in religious education, was to look to the procedures of practising faiths, and in particular to theology, 'Queen of the Sciences'.

Smart discusses the relationship between experience and revelation. It is at this point that he makes clearly, again, his fundamental point that '*we are not primarily concerned to say anything directly about the truth of religion*' (ibid, p25). The exercise does not involve one in judgement. The task is '*to describe the facts about man's religious experience scientifically*' (ibid, p25). When applied to consideration of the Bible this principle is stated thus: '*The idea that God's revelation is to be located in the words of scripture is a doctrine believed by many people: the theory of revelation of the doctrinal dimension of Christianity*' (ibid, p25). Summing this up, he says, '*...throughout it must be remembered that the content of scripture represents an important aspect of the doctrinal and mythological dimensions of the religions in question*' (ibid, p27).

However he qualifies this definition of revelation by describing it, in the words of the theologians as '*non-propositional*', that is, it occurs within Judaism and Christianity not only through the '*inner experiences*' of individuals but externally, through '*historical events*'. A religious experience here involves some kind of perception of the '*invisible world*'. He enlarges on this by examples of the relationship between experience and faith: '*the Crucifixion is an example of the way in which an historical event is given depth through the doctrinal and mythological dimensions*' (ibid, p28). He offers a definition of religion in terms of the dimensions: '*religion is a six-dimensional organism typically containing doctrines, myths, ethical teachings, rituals and social institutions, and animated by religious experience of various kinds. God is primarily the object of worship*' (ibid, p31).

So strong and widespread have been the developments, and so

significant the content of the world's religions that Smart reaches the powerful conclusion that no one can understand mankind without understanding the faiths of humanity. Because of, for example, recent developments like the translation of holy scriptures from round the world, it has only of late become possible for religions to enter into any kind of dialogue or to understand each other. He notes for example, that in the past the world's other great religions have been a relatively unknown area for Christians. They would have known something about Judaism from which their own faith developed, and even about Islam, but the others were a closed book.

This emphasis was subsequently taken up and developed by Robert Jackson, and is referred to below. Smart raises a very broad question. He asks whether it is not better to think that all religion essentially is one, and whether there is not a basic unity among the religions. It looks like an aspiration rather than a question, but the answer is in some measure in accord with Smart's stated procedures. He notes that in the '*Semitic*' religions of Judaism, Islam and Christianity, there is much common ground in the creator God. Yet he notes that Buddhism '*rejects belief in such a creator*' (ibid, p673).

Again Christianity believes in the incarnation of God. Islam and Judaism reject this totally, and Hinduism believes in many incarnations, rejecting the uniqueness of Christ. In each case the position of the believers, the practitioners, presents problems. In the field of ethics the religions do have much more in common. All the great religions insist on good conduct. He argues therefore, that there is much unity in content. On examining the area of experience rather than doctrine, he argues that there are two types of experience: devotional and prophetic on one hand, and mystical experience on the other. The first pair are linked to a '*personal*' God and the latter need

not be. There is, therefore, no unity to be found in experience. However his argument for unity of content is of significance in justifying and providing a rationale for curricular religious education as essential for all pupils. Smart's case for a lack of unity of experience provides justification that this is one of the aims of RE.

This is the point of Smart's self-description as '*one who studies world views*'. It is also the point which is extensively developed by Robert Jackson in the context he describes as '*a predominantly secular and increasingly religiously pluralistic democracy*' (Jackson, 1997, p2). The strength of Smart's work from the perspective of this present study is that he operates on the unassailable assumption that the only possible rationale for religious studies is educational. He extends this meaning to cover '*scientific*', and by implication '*universal*'. Smart's work provides a direction of development for Religious Studies as distinct from, for example, *Theology*. It establishes a clear rationale to guide work in the area. It therefore has fed into the debate about the nature and purpose of Religious Education in the curriculum. The nature of his thought and writing has contributed greatly to the continuing debate about the relationship of the subject to the rest of the curriculum not least in his first book (Smart, 1968).

For the purposes of this present study therefore Smart is chronologically important but much more. The basic nature of his work and thinking makes him foundational in the development of the subject since its move into the educational world. This underlies the kind of thinking which would include religious education for all on the basis of its significance to life. Smart is also clear that this is a discipline which requires a proper understanding of its nature and philosophy, thus requiring serious, and not peripheral treatment if its contribution to the development of those engaging in it is to be realised. It will be important to measure the steps taken, and the emphases made by

HMI on entering the field of religious education, as also the work of the Central Committees of CCC, against the thinking of Ninian Smart. Last but far from least, the practice of local authorities and senior management of schools must be assessed against such a criterion.

The relationship of religious education and religious studies too, is important. Religious education relies upon religious studies, since that is where the basic academic integrity is established. The main difference lies in the fact that religious education is for all, and therefore covers a wider range of aims. Nor is it so narrowly academic in interest. It is the core element. Religious studies, on the other hand, is more specific in aim and is academically more demanding. Related to these two points is the other distinctive factor in religious studies, that it depends on choice on the part of the pupil. These two elements of depth and choice begin to define the difference between the two, which exists despite the common origin.

It would be problematic were it necessary to decide on the relative significance of the child-centred emphasis, and Smart, for the development of modern Religious Education. While the former was basic in terms of the relationship of the subject and the pupils, Smart's was, in a sense, even more fundamental in that it aimed at working towards establishing an academic integrity of the entire area of study. This was not immediately dealing with the curricular subject Religious Education, but it was entirely essential in the chain of development leading to a clear curricular rationale and defensible justification of the subject within education. That academic integrity of Smart along with the parallel psychological integrity offered by child-centred approaches, are key standards against which to measure the subject as it has developed, and the stimulus HMI has given to it. In this sense, therefore, the two strands of thought (represented by the child-centred dimension, and Smart) so far considered, are complementary. It is significant that the

writers produced their work in the sequence in which they did. Child-centred approaches and Smart were not dependent on each other. Both operated on an independent basis driven by the requirements of their own researches.

3.6 The Range of Philosophies of Religious Education

Discussion of this area starts with Michael Grimmitt, Reader in Religion in Education in the University of Birmingham. The facet of his thinking examined for this purpose is in the form of the book he edited entitled *Pedagogies of Religious Education* (Grimmitt, 2000), which discusses a variety of different types of pedagogies of religious education. This collection is included within the present review of relevant literature, as a means actively of having *pedagogical* comparators, against which to consider the work of HMI and CCC, in the same fashion as on a philosophical level with the thinking represented by Ninian Smart, and on a psychological level by for example, J W D Smith. The pedagogies, therefore, provide a context against which to view the developments which have taken place within Scotland because parallel fundamental research has not been undertaken into the Scottish scene. Rather matters have proceeded on the basis of the *Millar/Munn* reports, the work of the *Central Committees of the CCC*, the *National Guidelines* for Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland and in particular, *Religious and Moral Education 5-14* (SOED 1992) and the work of HMI as they introduced RE to inspection. Of these the latter two relied on the first (*Millar/Munn*) with an attempt to capitalise on the English research.

The basis, therefore, of curriculum thinking and development and the creation of appropriate pedagogies requires to be scrutinised to discover whether this attempt has been successful or whether an alternative has been devised. As editor Michael Grimmitt selected the writing team. Each

pedagogy is discussed by a practitioner. The authors together formed a project writing-team. Michael Grimmitt then provides a comprehensive introduction to the collection. He identifies a number of types of pedagogical model:

- the *Phenomenological, Undogmatic Model*, linked with the name of Ninian Smart,
- the *Human Development, Learning About, Learning From Models*, linked with Grimmitt himself, Read and the Westhill Project,
- the *Ethnographic, Interpretive, Multifaith Model*, linked with Jackson and the Warwick Project,
- the *Revelation-Centred Concept-Cracking Trinitarian Christian Realist Model*, associated with Cooling and the Stapleford RE Project,
- the *Literacy-Centred, Critical Realist Model*, associated with Wright,
- the *Constructivist Models of Learning and Teaching in RE*, associated with the Children and Worldviews Project and Clive and Jane Erricker.

From these pedagogies, along with Grimmitt's contribution as editor of the volume that written by Alan Brown, Andrew Wright, and Robert Jackson, will be discussed here. Alan Brown is from the Chichester Project (springing from the SHAP Working Party on World Religions in Education, 1989), and writes on *Teaching Christianity: A World Religions Approach*. Of Grimmitt's models above this fits into the Phenomenological, Undogmatic, Explicit category. Andrew Wright writes on *Cultivating Spiritual Literacy through a Critical Pedagogy of Religious Education*. In Grimmitt's classification, this falls into the the Literacy-centred Critical Realist Model. Last, Robert

Jackson writes on *The Interpretive Approach to Religious Education*, which falls into Grimmitt's Ethnographic Interpretive Multifaith Model. These three are selected because they represent a wide variety of approaches which may be of value for application to the Scottish scene in the discussion conducted in this study. All of these pedagogies derive from two broad and distinct types of rationale for the inclusion of religious education within the curriculum.

These rationales are first, the *Liberal Christian, Theological, Experiential, Implicit models*, associated with Harold Loukes and John Hull. This type of pedagogy attempted to show that *experientialism* could be separated from *confessionalism* while keeping its ability to help pupils understand religious concepts and beliefs and also contributing to their personal development. This may be an approach adopted by some in Scotland.

Second is the *Phenomenological, Undogmatic, Explicit models*, linked with Ninian Smart (discussed above), and the Chichester Project of which Alan Brown was a member. In this case, the guiding principle was that learning and teaching in RE should provide both academic and personal forms of knowledge and understanding. Each of the models is faced with three requirements. First, it has to indicate *what interaction is expected* of the pupil and the teaching/learning situation. Second, *how this is to be achieved* has to be shown, and last, *on what basis* these procedures are devised and content chosen.

Phenomenological, Undogmatic, Explicit model

The first pedagogy to be examined is described by Alan Brown. In the context of this study he was a member of the Chichester Project developing material for the teaching of Christianity as a world religion. This work was based on a number of principles. The first was that although Christianity would be dealt with as a world religion, yet it was recognised that it would

provide the greater part of most religious education syllabuses for cultural reasons. The next principle was that the material should be usable, without offence, irrespective of the faith-stance of the pupil since understanding is the aim. Last, the assumption is made that religious sensibility is an essential dimension of human development.

The Chichester project members adopted a phenomenological approach in their work. Those team members identified the need to take account of the *'quest for meaning'* as well as the *'phenomena of religion'*, but their approach emphasised the phenomenological. Grimmitt's judgement on this point is that *'the methodology serves the intention of promoting the pupils' understanding of the phenomena rather better than it serves to enable pupils to interpret their own experiences in the light of their studies'* (Grimmitt, 2000, p29). The Chichester Project team acknowledged that they had not dealt with this issue fully. The concern of the project was centred on Christianity, and a Project on *Teaching Christianity in English Secondary Schools* (PROCESS) was set up. The wider context of this project was the great interest which developed in the 1970s in the teaching of world religions.

Although the tension between what had been called the *'implicit'* approach and the *'explicit'* approach had been recognised, the greater issue of looking on Christianity as a world religion took precedence. In a joint paper written in 1976, Ninian Smart and Edward Humes identified a number of factors evident in the way Christianity was taught at the time. They noted that Christianity was often treated in a manner different from that used with other world religions, that approaches to Christianity were too selective and restrictive to allow a rounded picture to emerge. They also noted that questions of teacher commitment were more prominent and problematical than with other religions. Lastly, they noted that little suitable material was available for introducing a non-Christian child to Christianity. These are all

fundamental issues.

Despite the failure of the project to come to terms with the '*search for meaning*', it made a major contribution in applying strict phenomenological methodology to the study of Christianity. This was another aspect of the early concern that religious education be subject to the same educational criteria as other aspects of the curriculum. Christianity, as a part of religious education, must be subject to precisely the same criteria as any other religion under consideration. The project therefore in its time has made a valuable contribution towards advancing attitudes to both methodologies and content in religious education, particularly since Christianity remains a culturally significant presence in society. That being so, the distinctive way in which this project advanced the treatment of Christianity is a major factor in a developed, balanced way of approaching religious education in the round. The significance of this pedagogy is great in the current Scottish setting.

Literacy centred, critical realist model

The second of the pedagogies, is that of the Spiritual Education Project (1996-2000), the intention of which was to '*cultivate Spiritual and Religious Literacy through a Critical Pedagogy of Religious Education*' (Wright, in Grimmitt 2000, p170). The practitioner of the pedagogy is Andrew Wright. He directed the project which had a three-fold aim: to analyse and evaluate the nature of contemporary spiritual education in England and Wales, to develop an alternative critical rationale, and to present proposals for a new critical pedagogy. Dr Wright lectures in Religious and Theological Education at King's College, University of London, and the Project is closely allied to his wider efforts to develop a critical rationale for religious education.

A major factor in his work is his opposition to '*liberal*' religious education, which he sees as unable to produce effective learning. He

produces a stark comparison between 'liberal' approaches and his own, describing what he considers the position of the liberal camp: *'being a contented pig is preferable to being a discontented philosopher'* (Wright, in Grimmitt 2000, p171). At the heart of his criticism of liberal religious education is that he considers it to be centred on *'the autonomous individual'*. The major tension is put in the question, *'Is the primary aim of the subject to bring about an objective understanding of religion or a subjective understanding of an individual's own beliefs and attitudes?'* (Wright 1993, p28). He places in juxtaposition *'objectivity'* on one hand, and *'feeling and emotion'* on the other. His argument proceeds to state that liberal religious education places piety rather than truth-claims, as the key to religious doctrines. This leads, theologically, to a position where one regards all religious traditions ...*'as embodying equally valid expressions of a common religious experience'* (Wright, in Grimmitt, 2000, p172). Grimmitt sums up the juxtaposition in these terms:

Thus the particularities of each of the religions take their place alongside others as contingent and culturally relative traditions embracing a universal theology and a common universal religious experience. Wright is unable to reconcile this view with his critically realist position which contends that absolute truth is discernible within the traditional language of religion and not contingent upon personal experience (ibid, p43).

It is the case that critics of Wright's approach have suggested that his is essentially a neo-confessional position. He himself however, denies this in forthright manner, indicating he has no interest in confessional modes of teaching, rather using the path of critical realism and a commitment to reason. His case clearly denies much of the phenomenological approach contained within his catch-all tag *'liberal'*. His use of the term *'nurture'* describing the detail of his approach, *'effective spiritual education will combine a*

hermeneutic of nurture with a hermeneutic of criticism' (Wright, in Grimmitt, 2000, p176) highlights the criticism referred to above. His use of this kind of language owes much to theology. His statements are frequently theological rather than educational. To this degree the rationale behind the criticism that he is neo-confessional in approach is supported. His frequency of use of theological concepts and language flies in the face of major statements made from a number of religious education sources that the language which must be used in considering religious education has primarily to be educational. This has been discussed over the last thirty years and more.

Wright does not accept the basis on which the educational debate has been conducted. He notes that *'much educational debate is mesmerised by an unnecessary dualism between subject-centred education and child-centred education'* (Wright, in Grimmitt, 2000, p184). To this his reply is, that the basis of the educational debate needs to be re-cast in the light of his critical education, *'since understanding always proceeds from the forestructures of the interpreter, a genuinely child-centred religious education must begin with the principle that the child's pre-understanding is a vital component to the learning process'* (Wright 1998(b) p67, cited in Grimmitt, 2000, pp43-4). The question of language in the English legal context has been formalised in the 1988 Education Reform Act, in which, as always, Religious Education is given a place of honour, in this case with reference to *'instruction'* being replaced by reference to *'education'*. Yet it is not included in the English National Curriculum! He notes that the Act also retains reference to collective worship, and that content has *'in the main'* to be Christian, though other world religions must be covered also. For Wright, this presents an enigma.

Things are not identical in Scotland, but current thinking of the Scottish Executive, and the Minister of Education, raises the question of religious observance in the same sort of context as that used by Wright. The focus of

this present study, the introduction of formal inspection in Religious Education, indicates a different level of movement. Wright's position however is one which can be used as a measure for what is happening in Scottish RE in terms of the reports examined below, and in terms of the approach being adopted in practice by Her Majesty's Inspectorate. In the context of this study there appears to be a certain dissonance between Wright's key concepts '*a hermeneutic of nurture*', and '*a hermeneutic of criticism*'. His pedagogy sits ill with the key requirement to use educational concepts and rationale, particularly in considering matters of teaching and learning.

Ethnographic, Interpretive, Multi-faith Model

The last of the pedagogies is the Interpretive Approach to Religious Education which derives from the Warwick Religious Education Project. The chapter author is Professor Robert Jackson, Director of the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit in the Institute of Education at the University of Warwick. The approach arose from a number of strands of work undertaken by Professor Jackson.

The first related to studies of individuals from religious groupings in Britain. Next concerned the relationship of method to practice and theory. Last related to a critique of the way religions have been portrayed and interpreted conventionally in religious education. Jackson highlights key pedagogical principles by means of these sets of issues: issues of *representation*, issues of *interpretation*, and issues of *reflexivity*.

In the case of the issues of *representation* some of the assumptions of '*classical phenomenology*' are rejected. In particular the model of '*representing world religions as schematic belief-systems whose essence can be expressed through a series of propositions or doctrinal statements*' (Jackson, in Grimmitt, 2000, p133)

Rather, representing involves an *'exploration of a relationship between individuals in the context of their religio-cultural groups and the wider religious tradition to which they relate'* (ibid p133).

In the case of the issues of *Interpretation*, once again some of the assumptions of phenomenology are rejected, in particular the view that *'it is possible to lay aside one's presuppositions and that the use of skills of empathy is unproblematic'* (ibid, p133). There is provided, *an alternative requirement to the skill of empathy*. Learners are required to *compare and contrast their own concepts and 'conceptual schemes' with those of the insider*. And further, it is necessary for the learner to develop the skill which will enable her/him to *'oscillate'* between the insider's concepts and experiences and her/his own. Only when *'the grammar of the other's discourse has been assimilated is genuine empathy possible'* (ibid, p134).

Reflexivity, the last of the key issues, is related closely to the second, interpretation. Reflexivity is the relationship of the experience of the pupil to that of the insider of the religion being studied. Jackson lists three aspects of this relationship he regards as significant: *'the learner re-assessing her or his understanding of his or her own way of life (edification); making a constructive critique of the material studied at a distance; developing a running critique of the interpretive process'* (ibid, p134). This contribution of the learner and the part played by the teacher, join in *interactive relationship* to form the content of religious education. Reflexivity, in helping pupils to reflect on ways of life different from their own, is a major curricular contribution made by religious education.

In this respect Jackson notes the similarity between the concept of deepening one's self-understanding by studying other worldviews with Michael Grimmitt's idea of *'learning from religion'* (Grimmitt,1987, p225, Jackson 1997, pp131-2). He goes further, stressing the close link between this

kind of reflexive activity and interpretation, and thereby reaching his major conclusion *'Thus the activity of grasping another's way of life is inseparable in practice from that of pondering on the issues and questions raised by it'* (Jackson in Grimmitt, 2000, p135). Even more significant, to the verge of being threatening, he states that *'Pupils might change through taking part in the interpretive process'* (ibid, p137).

3.7 Religious Education and the Wider Curriculum

In discussing this area there are two possible starting points. First is to look at RE from the perspective of the broad educational picture of curriculum and policy formulation and secondly, to start with RE and to examine its possible contribution to the broader picture.

The first of these is in part discussed elsewhere. The Munn report for example, was part of a much wider process in operation. Essentially RE was being included in the wider view because it fitted in with what education was demanding. Similarly, the three SCCORE reports were in line with the sort of development taking place across the board. They were mirrored in all of the curricular areas then in use.

The same was true of policy development. RE as a subject had been in schools for many years without the benefit of inspection. The reasons for such a state of affairs is not clear, but may have been linked with the ecclesiastical stake in religious education. There had been no particular impetus for a change to be made given that there had never been inspection. A significant change occurred however when a positive interest was shown by the Roman Catholic church authorities expressing an interest, if it could be guaranteed that one of the inspectorate could be from the Roman Catholic sector. Policy development was therefore not particularly linked to the interests specific to education, even less of school religious education. It

was rather part of a wider set of interests on the part of the administration of government. This interpretation supports the views for example of Bryce and Humes, already discussed, suggesting central control of policy making as the rule of thumb.

The second possible starting point dealing with the contribution RE might make to the broad field of education, is focused by contemporary author, Robert Jackson. In addition to his being one of those selected from Michael Grimmitt's team of writers dealing with his own particular pedagogy, he is currently Professor of Education and Director of Graduate Studies at the Institute of Education at the University of Warwick. He is also editor of *The British Journal of Religious Education*.

The main focus, for the purpose of this study is on two of his areas of work. The first is that already discussed above as one of Grimmitt's Pedagogies, and which also receives more extended treatment from Jackson, in book form, under the same title. It was first published in 1997, as *Religious Education, an Interpretive Approach*. The basis for including this strand of work, is that it deals with Jackson's own pedagogical position, one which occupies a major place in current practice and research.

The second work by Jackson is entitled *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality*. It was published in April 2004, and is in a major field of research and debate, and is therefore one clear indicator of the direction which might be taken of further research in Scottish religious education. He has also written *Perspectives on World Religions* (1978), and has edited *Approaching World Religions* (1982). As can be seen from his most recent book Professor Jackson brings the chronology of this study right up to date. His research reviews developments in the religious, social and cultural changes of the past half century. His contribution assumes those of the previous authors considered in that he takes for granted that Religious Education has

gained a place in the curriculum on its educational merits. A strong case has been made out for this. Its academic foundations are well laid (by the efforts for example, of Ninian Smart). He then looks wider at the contribution religious education has to make to the education of every young person. He clearly occupies a particular locus in the range of views held on Religious Education. His hue is evident in the Introduction to *Religious Education an Interpretive Approach*, where referring to the work of Ninian Smart he states that '*it came as a breath of fresh air to me and to many other RE teachers*' (Jackson, 1997, p2). In a foreword to *Approaching World Religions*, Ninian Smart relates how:

Nowadays, typically in conversation on a train or plane about what I do, I claim to be involved in worldview analysis. The reply is: 'How interesting. And how do you go about that?' I reply, 'Suppose you want to explore the meaning of a worldview - let us suppose for the sake of argument it is Seventh Day Adventism - then what you need first of all is some structured empathy... Thereafter we can pursue a creative conversation', and so it is important that religious educators should demonstrate how without losing their integrity they can successfully bring out the human meaning and living force of ideas and practices often very different from their own (in Jackson, 1982, pp iii-iv).

Setting the British scene and contributing to the debate Professor Jackson points out that at least until the late 1950's, Religious Education was in fact a form of Christian Education. This was the assumption of the law, the professional practice, and it was the parental expectation. This is clear in the review of Goldman's work referred to above, as also that of some of the others who took up the child-centred emphasis. It was Goldman's own assumption. Despite this chance link, and despite the continuing use of the very term *Christian Education* by some, the child-centred or psychological emphasis made it possible to look beyond this view, by helping the process

of taking the pupil and the pupil's needs, however defined, into account. This emphasis made it clear that there were limits conceptually for children and pupils at their various stages, which if they were ignored, would mean failure in both teaching and learning. In this sense Jackson is behaving as a researcher. The data he has available, however, have changed and he has a sound grasp of the nature of modern religious education, and therefore, he reaches different conclusions from the earliest psychological approaches.

Jackson notes that '*Western democracies are increasingly plural*' (Jackson, 2004, p1). He highlights the two forms of plurality, '*traditional*' plurality, the migration and resettlement of peoples, which is currently an issue with the New Labour Government, and '*modern plurality, deriving from developments in information technology and media, resulting in the exposure of individuals to a flow of competing ideas and values*' (ibid, p1). He notes that '*this diversity of post-modernity affects all religions and ideologies*' (ibid, p1). This phrase '*modern plurality*' he borrows from Skeie (Skeie, 1995, p86). The main thrust of Professor Jackson's research, to date has been dealing with this area. His books on world religions are aimed at what Ninian Smart described as '*worldview analysis*'.

His latest writing similarly assumes that the major contribution religious education has to make towards meeting the needs of pupils lies in this colourful phrase '*worldview analysis*'. At the outset he identifies the existence of pedagogies in RE which acknowledge plurality in both of these forms and which are aware of the implications for religious education. Alongside these are pedagogies which aim to play down plurality. They attempt to isolate young people from plurality and religious diversity either by emphasising Christianity as the '*religion of British national culture*' (identifies the faith-based school movement as a major factor in this emphasis), or by the complete removal of religious education from state

funded schools. In chapter 1 of his most recent work, therefore he sets the scene from the 1950s, outlining how religious education has developed over the following years and the associated debate about plurality and pluralism, modernism and post-modernism.

In his review of the development of the subject Jackson makes particular mention of the major influence of Ninian Smart and his phenomenological approach and the effects it had in the 1970s and 1980s, when a number of researchers '*attempted to put the pupil at the centre, rather than the subject-matter of religion*' (Jackson, 2004, p6). He might have but does not mention Ronald Goldman at this point. He does not appear until the second chapter, and then, in the context of Working Paper 36, which describes Goldman as having a '*neo-confessionalist approach,*' which was regarded as '*unacceptable on educational grounds*' (Schools Council, 1971, p31). Working Paper 36, according to Professor Jackson, rather favoured a '*phenomenological approach for the subject in publicly funded schools*' (Jackson, 2004, p32). The first chapter is the basis of this latest book, and from there he names and discusses the views of a variety of people from differing educational perspectives to plurality. He sets this process off gently.

In relating religious education to plurality the first view concerns the question of secularism. It arises in chapter 2 and in particular, the way in which those opposed to a multi-faith approach link it closely to a move in the direction of secularism. He quotes Baroness Cox as an example of this in writing a foreword to the pamphlet *The Crisis in Religious Education*, '*Many of our children are in schools...where teaching about Christianity has either been diluted to a multifaith relativism or has become little more than a secularised discussion of social and political issues*' (Cox, C, 1988, p4, in Burn and Hart, 1988). That pamphlet (*Crisis in Religious Education*, Burn and Hart, 1988) appeared following the references to religious education in the 1988 Education Reform

Act and was in favour of '*predominantly Christian RE*' (Jackson, 2004, p23). It seemed to emanate from an extremely conservative theological position and it viewed '*Christian indoctrination as an educationally valid approach to religious education in the common school*' (ibid, p2). In reply to this major criticism Jackson refers back to the research of Loukes (1961 and 1965) which shows already a dissatisfaction with '*Bible-based RE which assumed the truth of Christianity*' (ibid, p24). He also refers to the work of Edwin Cox with sixth formers in the 1960s which '*revealed an antipathy towards an RE which made assumptions about the truth of Christianity*' (ibid, p24). Summing up his case he writes:

As noted in the previous chapter, (that is, Chapter 1) RE was shifting away from Christian instruction or nurture before the overt religious plurality of Britain had become a major issue and before movements to give education a more global perspective were showing any significant influence. To associate a 'multifaith' approach to religious education with secularism, especially by suggesting that the former has a causal relationship with the latter, distorts the history of religious education in England and Wales and is misleading (ibid, p25).

He discusses a variety of views on the relationship of religious education to plurality.

A second response to plurality is to recognise that it exists, and suggest that the way to deal with it is to permit state-funded schools to have a particular religious hue to them. This is the pattern followed in Scotland for the Roman Catholic sector, and in England also for the Church of England. The purpose of such provision is to provide a particular world-view for the children attending such schools. He indicates, again pointing to the actions of the New Labour Government, that since 1997 '*they have permitted a range of independent schools associated with various religious traditions to become*

Voluntary Aided.' This, he indicates, represents 'a complete about-turn from the Party's position in the 1980s when official Labour policy was opposed to the establishment of Voluntary Aided schools for religious minorities' (ibid, p41).

A third approach to pluralism and religious education which he discusses, he names 'the post-modernist stance' attempting 'to deconstruct the subject and to conceive it in relation to a radicalised view of education' (ibid, p58). This is to reject the study of religions as the imposition of oppressive constructions, and promoting faith and value through the exploration of 'personal narratives'. In this case the distinction between religious education and other forms of related education, for example spiritual education, becomes irrelevant. The significance of Jackson's discussion of this approach is highlighted in his raising of the question of the 'accommodation of children who hold views about religion and theology that are significantly different from those underpinning the approach itself' (ibid, p59). This approach is:

not just a challenge to religious educators, but to educators in general. It shows a deep concern for children and their spiritual, moral and emotional needs, seeking to centre education round their personal narratives rather than any pre-set curriculum, and arguing for the conflation of religious, spiritual, moral and cultural education (ibid, p59).

He acknowledges in particular the work of Erricker and Erricker in their book *Reconstructing Religious, Spiritual and Moral Education* (Erricker and Erricker, 2000a). There seem to be echoes of a pull in the direction of child-centred education. This research is in a sense a direct development from the stance of the *child-centrists*.

The fourth in Jackson's list of attitudes to plurality recognises it, but emphasises the integrity of religions as discrete systems of belief. This approach aims at the goal of 'religious literacy'. That term derives from the work of Andrew Wright where he makes the case for a form of neo-

modernism which rejects '*phenomenological and experiential approaches as embodying varying degrees of liberalism*' (cited in Jackson, 2004, p75). The aim of this approach is threefold:

- *to raise the student's awareness of his/her latent or partly articulated tradition or worldview,*
- *to help the student move from this pre-understanding to dialogue with the narratives and language of relevant primary religious traditions and key secular traditions that deny religious truth,*
- *to raise the student's awareness of the tension between their present world-view and challenges to it (developing both a hermeneutic of faith and of suspicion), exposing them directly to religious ambiguity, and to help students to develop their interpretive skills in order to engage with this (ibid, p77).*

The question of child-centred approaches has moved beyond the horizon here. Quoting Wright again, Jackson makes this point '*the aims of religious education need be no more complicated than the process of producing religiously literate individuals. This is an aim in itself that has intrinsic importance and has no further need of justification*' (Wright, in Jackson, *ibid*, p77).

Another response to plurality evaluated is the *interpretive approach*. It takes further the modernity / post-modernity debate, and it too recognises plurality and hopes to take account of it by '*helping children to find their own positions within the key debates about religious plurality*' (*ibid*, p87). This approach is '*essentially an approach to understanding the ways of life of others*' (*ibid*, p87). It is, therefore, in the tradition of Ninian Smart and his emphasis on '*standing in the shoes of the other*'.

A major proponent of this approach is Robert Jackson himself. He does so in his book *Religious Education: An Interpretive Approach* (Jackson, 1997). In discussion of this approach, Jackson presents a number of case-

studies by means of which he develops the discussion. In particular he develops methods of interpreting religious material:

Rather than expecting students to set aside their own presuppositions when studying other positions (as required by many phenomenological approaches) these methods made direct use of their concepts and past experiences. Since interpretation involves the learner in comparing currently understood concepts with those of others, the student's own perspective is an essential part of the learning process.

This matter is very important from the point of view of teaching since educators need to be sensitive to students' own positions in devising strategies for teaching and learning about the worldviews of others (Jackson 2004, p88).

An expectation of this is that 'this holistic approach to learning avoided the sharp distinction between 'learning about' and 'learning from' religion made in many syllabuses' (ibid, p104).

Elements of dialogical approaches to the relation of pluralism and religious education are already present in interpretive approaches but they have been further developed in their own right, and form the final listed approach discussed by Jackson. As the name implies it is a question of highlighting dialogue further. In these approaches *'students are the starting point as well as the key resources and actors. The 'dialogue' is not between child and child but between child and teaching material designed to present the internal diversity and dynamism of religions'* (ibid, p109). Also in common with the interpretive approach *'the three dialogical pedagogies discussed all emphasised 'reflexivity'. Through reflecting on difference and through comparison and contrast of their own and others' beliefs, values, assumptions and practices, students become more educated about otherness and more self-aware'* (ibid, p125). This is a major claim, and would be a major justification for any curricular element.

In summary, Professor Jackson's contribution to research in religious education is extensive. In the past, he has made a major contribution in the use of world religions in religious education. However, greater still is his contribution to the growth of the subject from being a sociological/ cultural element in the curriculum to an educational one at all stages. His contribution fits in well to the global picture of religious education over the past half century alongside widely differing emphases in research. He fits in well also with the pioneering work of professor Ninian Smart from whom, perhaps the major interest in his writings, that of religious education and plurality, has sprung. It may be too, that in uncovering this area, he has highlighted a greater curricular contribution which religious education has to make to the education of children and young people.

3.8 In Conclusion

The review of literature above in considering these researchers and writers has developed from the historical sketch preceding it, in Chapter 2. It has prepared the way for the detailed analysis and examination of the official documents of religious education, and the reports on the subject produced by HMI which follow, and also the analysis of the responses of HMI and teacher educators in their interviews. Lastly, the review is aimed at providing a context for considering the responses of local authorities, and schools, and their senior managers to the national survey of provision conducted for the study. The review has also specified and clarified and focused a number of issues which will guide some of the following discussion and will inform the main areas of enquiry in subsequent chapters.

Broadly the issues arising in this way have these centres: *psychology, academic rigour, and teaching and learning*. In more detail these become:

pupil needs: the psychology of learning and the

implications of applying the findings of developmental psychology within the sphere of teaching and learning in religious education, the place of religion within human experience, the place of religious education within the whole curriculum;

academic rigour: no one can understand mankind without understanding the faiths and ideologies of humanity. All religions are essentially one, including humanism, therefore religious education must be for all;

teaching and learning: what are the pedagogical bases of, e.g. HMI decisions, or of local authority policy statements for religious education, or of senior management decisions in schools on religious education, curriculum, and staffing provision?

CHAPTER FOUR

A Review of Reports with Implications for Religious Education

an analytical description of trends in religious education in documents and statements concerning it in the latter half of the twentieth century: (1) the **Durham Report - the Fourth R** (1970), (2) **Schools Council Working Paper 36** (1971), (3) the **Millar Report** (1972), (4) the **Munn Report** (1977), (5-7) **SCCORE Reports :1** (1978), **2** (1981), **3** (unpublished), (8) **Church and School in Scotland** (1988), (9) **The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum - 5-14** (2000), (10) **Religious Education 5-14** (1992), and, (11) **A Curriculum for Excellence from 3-18** (Scottish Executive, 2004).

4.1 Aim and Methodological Approach of this chapter

The aim of this chapter following as it does the review of the work of researchers and writers, is to consider that part of the literature of religious education which consists in official reports on the subject, or which have implications for it. Eleven such reports have been selected because of their significance for the purposes of this study. The intention in situating the chapter alongside the literature review is to place its subjects alongside the literature already considered. This chapter, the formal literature review (chapter three), and chapter five (a review of HMI reports on RE), together form the documentary analysis section.

The reports were selected because of their potential creative contribution to the development of the practice and philosophy of religious education as part of the curriculum. They were not merely recording that which had already been established. They were beating the track which was to lead towards the educational contribution to the curriculum, which was to become Religious Education. Each made a creative contribution. Each of

the reports will be considered on its own and they will be evaluated overall for their contribution to the process of educationalisation. As stated in the methodological strategy of the study (chapter 1) this chapter derives from methodological element 1 in the means of data generation used, that is documentary analysis. In this respect it accompanies chapters three and five, and with them is analysed on the basis of grounded theory. Such use of this type of analysis is doubly significant in the case of this particular chapter because of the nature of the documents concerned. All of them fit the term *pragmatic*, which is at the heart of grounded theory. The reports all deal with the implementation of the philosophy and of the theory on which religious education had developed. The list of the documents concerned shows that direct link from the Durham report in England, through the Millar and Munn reports and right up to the curriculum document SCCORE 3.

The first report is a significant document, produced by the Church of England Commission on Religious Education under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Durham, and is entitled *The Fourth R*. It set the tone for much of what was to follow, appearing as it did before any of the other reports considered here. It was called '*The Fourth R*' but also took on the title of the committee chairman, the Bishop of Durham. This report is included because as its title suggests it was an uncompromisingly educationalising report, which made the assumption throughout that the place of Religious Education within the curriculum was justified on educational grounds.

The second report, Working Paper 36, notes the state of development of religious education within the whole English educational scene at the period under consideration, and is included as an external comparator. It too presupposes an educational justification for the subject. Unlike the *Fourth R*, it was produced from within the educational world. Whereas Durham set the scene, the Working Paper made practical advances in the process of

educationalisation.

The third report, *The Millar Report*, is the basic statement for the Scottish scene of what is to be done in religious education as a curricular component. It is the manifesto of *educationalisation*. It is included as the foundational document of educational RE in the Scottish setting. It is the point from which educationalisation started in Scottish RE.

Report four, the Munn Report, is included because taking the lead from the Millar Report it was the first Scottish report to consider the whole curriculum (in S3 - S4) and in this context to deal with religious education as an important element.

Reports five to seven, *SCCORE 1*(1978), *SCCORE 2*(1981), *SCCORE 3*, (unpublished and undated) are the response of Scottish education (and derive from the CCC) to the basic statement which appeared in the Millar and Munn reports. They are working curricular documents, intended to take forward the latest thinking into classroom practice.

The eighth report is a '*cultural*' statement from the Church of Scotland (Report to the General Assembly, 1988) made when the major developmental documents had been written, and were influencing the practice of religious education within the education system.

Report nine is included because it is a continuation of the thinking of the Munn report in that it is an attempt to look at the entire curriculum across the board, seeing religious education as a necessary element in the learning process.

Document ten is included because it is the detailed working out of the broad ideas of the national 5-14 document, the outcome of which oversaw curriculum development in Religious Education on the same basis as all the other curricular areas.

The final document is included because it is another development in

the Munn 5-14 pattern. It is a move in the direction of a national pattern of curriculum planning and takes an overall look at the entire school experience of children and young people. That is of significance for this study because it means the active incorporation of religious education in national curricular developments, in this case covering the range 3-18.

Of these eleven reports, one emanates from each of the national churches of Scotland and England, one emanates from each of the national curriculum agencies of the two countries, three are national Scottish curriculum plans and detailed subject curriculum documents, and four detailed examples of suggestion of curriculum development in Religious Education.

All of the reports are relevant to religious education. However the broader context which sets the scene for consideration of education in general and therefore of religious education consists in three reports published by the Scottish Education Department in the nineteen-seventies. At the time they were colloquially referred to by a single word coined for the purpose, 'Munndunningpack'. They were *The Structure of the Curriculum in the Third and Fourth Years of the Scottish Secondary School* (SED/CCC, 1977, The Munn Report) *Assessment* (SOED/CCC, 1977, The Dunning Report) *Truancy and Indiscipline in Schools in Scotland* (SED/HMSO, 1977, The Pack Report). Because of the nature and content of these reports, it is the first which deals most directly with the curriculum, and therefore makes most specific reference to the place and purpose of religious education within the curriculum.

The Munn report was the first non-RE education document within the Scottish system to speak coherently about religious education, using only educational language and criteria. The report was a professional education document, with no claim to make statements on any other basis. The

committee had eighteen members, all hailing from the educational world: some from schools, some from Colleges of Education, some from FE, and one from HMI. This precision of language, and approach when discussing RE was made possible by the publication in 1972 of the SED report on RE - *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools*, Report of a Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland (The Millar Report) which clearly influenced Munn. That it spoke so strongly highlights the fact that, until then the educational world had no educationally founded statement on which to base its own thoughts about RE. Any thoughts therefore which were uttered were essentially not made on a particularly educational or specialist basis but rather in sociological terms. This was significant particularly when speaking of why religious education should be in the curriculum. It is included in fact because:

the study of religion has an important contribution to make to the education of all pupils. It draws upon a long tradition of enquiry into, and reflection upon, man's search for meaning and purpose in life, and pupils may be expected at least to take account of this tradition and of the central questions with which it is concerned, when making their own appraisal of the human condition (SED 1977, 4.18).

It was increasingly easier for educationists to examine the rational educational basis of religious education in Scotland because of the Millar report, as it was in England, because of Working Paper 36, or the Durham report.

4.2 The Durham Report, *The Fourth R*.

This report was produced by the Church of England Commission on Religious Education, chaired by the Bishop of Durham (SPCK, 1970). It derived from a Church of England context. In the setting of this study, its

publication date is of interest because it preceded all of the others, even *Working Paper 36*. It was therefore unable to reflect the ferment of thought which was to occur in religious education. It did however address many of the same issues as the other reports. Much of what it says presupposes a theological starting point. The second chapter bears the title *Theology and Education*. However the report acknowledges from the outset that much has changed in terms of institutional religion, and of theology in the previous century. It states this forcibly *'That the situation is radically different, whether in theology or social structure, is so obvious as scarcely to need emphasis. Education is now carried on in institutions for the most part provided, controlled and administered, by public authorities'* (SPCK, 1970, p57). It goes further, in the direction of liberal RE, in discussion of the nature of religious education, which it describes as *'exploratory'*. Religious Education, the report suggests, has a place in the educational scene *'on educational grounds, where education is understood as the enriching of a pupil's experience, the opening up of a pupil to all the influences which have coloured his environment'* (ibid, p59). It is therefore open to the inclusion of world religions, though it is clear that Christianity is the base for religious education in England.

At this point particularly though elsewhere also, the theological dimension is significant with the report anxious to explain the relationship of Christianity to other religions. It is at pains to highlight the distinctive nature of Christianity *'which derives from a unique event'* (ibid, p62). Despite this emphasis, the report shows sensitivity to the sorts of issues raised by, for example, Ninian Smart, or Robert Jackson, in his discussion of *'interpretation'* (see chapter 3 above) relating to the question of distinctiveness. It states, therefore, that what it really at base requires in the study of other religions is:

a willingness to explore the reason why Christians' claims and beliefs are considered to be distinctive, though naturally this exploration will take place

against a recognition that perhaps in the final analysis an individual may decide against the claims of the Christian faith as he has understood them (ibid, p62).

The report is in no doubt about its belief that RE is a function of education. Summing up all it says on this tack, it also recommends '*that the term religious instruction should be replaced forthwith by the term religious education*' (ibid, p277).

Despite this it is unable to separate religious education from school worship. Both should be experienced as part of the general education received by all pupils. Interestingly, the report is as detailed as to suggest a minimum time allocation to the subject of two periods a week, and to urge local authorities to appoint an advisor in Religious Education. Finally, the report also shows awareness of the need for continuous support and development for teachers, and makes many and detailed suggestions about how this might be done.

Overall, the Durham Report is (English) national in its perspective. It is not limited either by its ecclesiastical origin. It makes statements, and claims which are notable in their breadth of understanding. Most laudable of all, it effectively prepares the way for the reports discussed below, which originate from the educational, and specifically religious educational world, and which lead to the *educationalisation* of the subject. Notable amongst those in England, is the Schools Council *Working Paper* on religious education. Together with the final document in this list, the Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Durham Report demonstrates a willingness on the part of the national Christian Churches of Scotland and England to help religious education on its way to real educationalisation rather than attempting to keep alive ecclesiastical control or influence. However such a report could only pave the way for educationalisation. For

that process truly to be facilitated and taken forward it was necessary for basic thinking from within the educational world itself from a source which asked only educational questions. That process was taken forward by *Working Paper 36*.

4.3 **Working Paper 36** *Religious Education in Secondary Schools*.

The second of the reports on religious education under consideration is included because it is an education document. It is from outwith the Scottish educational scene. *Working Paper 36, Religious Education in Secondary Schools* was produced by the English Schools Council in 1971. It insists that it is a working paper and not a report. It does this because the context it says of RE in England, is that *'there are questions which need to be faced... if the many difficulties surrounding the teaching of religion in school are to be understood and the patterns for the future made plain'* (Schools Council, 1971, p5). On the cultural question the Working Paper acknowledges that it is working within an English setting, and that this will be a determining factor in its philosophy, rationale, methodology, and context of religious education. In reviewing the legislative context the Working Paper points out that the Cowper-Temple Clause (1870) *'prohibited by law the teaching of any catechism or formulary which is distinctive of any particular religious denomination'* (ibid, p8). The result of this was to make 'RE' effectively become 'scripture'. In the 1944 Education Act content was liberalised. The Working Paper is deeply influenced by the contexts in which it was operating. Summarising this effect, it lists six questions to guide its own thinking and that of those who have an interest in RE. These are:

- *What are the educational reasons for including any subject in the curriculum?*
- *Should religion have a place? If so, what place?*

- *If the term 'Religious Education' is used, what exactly is meant, and what is not meant, by it?*
- *How far should the religion be taught, or studied, from any one religious standpoint?*
- *Is there a unique contribution made by religious education that is not made, for example, by social education, or moral education?*
- *What is the difference between the task of the school in religious education, and that of the church, home, synagogue, or mosque? (ibid, pp8-9)*

In raising these particular questions, the Working Paper was clearly reflecting the English cultural scene, and it was also reflecting the ripples in the wider educational world about the possibilities of this curricular area.

Question 1 sets the entire RE debate within the educational context. It is interesting that no question is raised about possible religious reasons, or ecclesiastical reasons which might be cited for, or against, RE.

Question 2 Notably, the Working Paper uses the term '*religion*' rather than religious education or religious studies. It may therefore have in mind the possibility of practising religious observance. However the use of this term without explanation has possible implications for RE in the classroom, as well as the assembly hall. It frequently occurs in English documents, and epitomises a lack of definition between the ecclesiastical on one hand and educational on the other.

Question 3 keeps this issue going by offering an alternative phrase to '*religion*'. It may be that this term keeps open the discussion about whether in some sense religious observance should be included within religious education. It may also keep open the possibility that it might not so permit.

Question 4 raises at least two questions. First there is the question of

denominational schools. This issue was stronger in England than in Scotland, because the Church of England, as an established church, has a *legal* standing, and is the national established church, whereas the Church of Scotland maintains its strict independence of the state. In England the national church has its own schools alongside the Roman Catholic Church. In Scotland, of the two major Christian groupings, only the Roman Catholic Church has denominational schools. In neither country has the discussion moved very far, except in that RE in the denominational sector (if not RO) has been influenced by the broader development of RE nationally. This was so of English development, and more so in Scotland. Second this question prepared the way for the bigger question of the place of world religions in RE. The place of Christianity is an issue which arose only because of the possibility of spending time on other world religions. Before that development it had simply been assumed that Christianity was the content of RE. Now the debate was, what emphasis should be placed on Christianity?

Question 5 might have a link with question one if it were a matter of defining the curriculum and the place of RE within it in a way that, for example, the Munn Report subsequently did. But Working Paper 36 limits its interest to such specific areas as social and moral education. The possible link with social education would be open to treatment in relation to question 1, but it may well be that there is an area which the six questions do not cover. One might argue that they do so by implication. It would have been helpful to have an additional question which asked specifically about the contribution which religious education can make to the development of a child educationally, socially, spiritually, and in other ways, and whether failing that contribution there is a gap untouched by other parts of the curriculum.

The last of the Working Paper's six questions reflects English society. The different aspects of this question are entirely appropriate, in the sense that only part of the child's life is lived in school. However rather than dealing with the whole life of the child it might have been more helpful had the Working Paper asked at this point simply '*what is the contribution the school can make?*'

Underlying the problematic nature of this final question is the use made by the Working Paper of the term and concept '*religion*', rather than the broader '*religious education*'. If religious education is the subject the family contribution is similar to what might be expected in maths education, or language education, or any other part of the curriculum. If religion is the subject the family contribution will depend on family values, and practices. Whether religious or not, the family may make a contribution simply by talking about what has been happening in school. The Working Paper clearly did not have fixed in its mind the fairly defined view of religious education of the Munn Report (SED/HMSO 1977, 4.18. See also, the next two pages in this chapter) about the purpose of RE within the curriculum. In order to make the framing of questions helpful the Working Paper might have clearly distinguished between religious education and religious observance and the all-encompassing '*religion*'. When dealing with the justification for studying religion in schools the Working Paper uses the cultural argument. It indicates that most parents want it, that the cultural milieu is religious, and specifically Christian, that religion claims to discern the meaning and purpose of life, that religion is a distinctive way of interpreting experience. All of this indicates that it is a mode of understanding.

At this point, the Working Paper is using the work of the philosopher, Paul Hirst (1965, pp113-38). It is the same philosophical curricular base which

the Munn report used in making its case. In this sense the Munn committee benefited from the general teasing out of thought on religious education of which *Working Paper 36* was a major part. This is one of the many points of clarity of the Working Paper, which had it received more attention, might have made the document even more precise. Equally so is its use of the work of Ninian Smart. It quotes five aims of religious education worked out by Smart (Schools Council, 1971, p38). These are:

- *religion must transcend the informative.*
- *it should do so not in the direction of evangelising, but in the direction of initiating into understanding the meaning of, and into questions about the truth and worth of religion.*
- *religious studies do not exclude a committed approach, provided that it is open, and so does not artificially restrict understanding and choice.*
- *religious studies should provide a service in helping people to understand history and other cultures than our own. It can thus play a vital role in breaking the limits of European cultural tribalism.*
- *religious studies should emphasise the descriptive historical scale of religion, but needs thereby to enter into dialogue with the parahistorical claims of religious and anti-religious outlooks (Smart, 1968, pp105-6).*

It is noteworthy that Smart sometimes uses the term religion but unlike the Working Paper he does not use it as a catch-all word to include all that the word can mean. Rather he carefully defines it, scientifically, through his five aims.

A major contribution of the Working Paper lay in devising questions which it considered to be at the heart of good religious education. A

weakness in Working Paper 36 is that it failed to distinguish, in its own mind, between curricular religious education, and the broader term *religion*. It failed adequately to distinguish religious education from religious observance. This lack has hindered the development of both these areas. The effect has been felt as much in Scottish development as in English. HMI have failed adequately to differentiate between the two, and have further confused the issue. The Scottish position however has been potentially saved by the work of the Millar committee (SED/HMSO 1972), which has had a formative role to play. Even this however has been impeded by the civil service dimension to the input of HMI.

The interpretation of Millar made by subsequent committees has been largely negative because of this unhelpful aspect of the HMI input, by decisions which have been made on a basis which is other than educational. This was always so given that the place of RE relied on statute. Just at the point where RE was about to be freed from politico-religious influence to the comparative nirvana of education, these new forces were brought to bear. Those who would be about curriculum development were drawn away from the corner-stone which the Millar Report ought to have been. This will be further discussed below. The Millar report itself was very clear about what RE in Scotland needed. Working paper 36 for England performed in the same area that the Millar Report did in Scotland. Both followed on from the ecclesiastical support referred to above, and the political will to see RE fit in with the rest of the educational world. They pointed in a clear curricular direction.

4.4 The Millar Report *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools* (HMSO, 1972).

The Millar Committee was appointed by the Secretary of State for

Scotland of the day, with the following terms of reference,

Within the framework of the statutory provisions concerning the obligation to continue religious instruction, the responsibility for its content and the question of inspection, to review the current practice of Scottish schools (other than Roman Catholic schools) with regard to moral and religious education and to make recommendations for its improvement (HMSO, 1972, p2).

The Roman Catholic sector was excluded in the remit. The Roman Catholic church authorities declined to agree to their schools taking part in the work of the Millar committee because they were unwilling to permit denominational religious education to be thus investigated, perhaps judged, by those outwith that sector. The *faith-dimension* was central to their religious education as indeed to the ethos of the whole system of schooling. This would have been difficult to square with the '*educational considerations*' fundamental to the thinking of the Millar committee and which it regarded as determining factors in religious education. The existence of factors other than '*educational considerations*' in religious education would make it difficult for that subject to be treated like any other subject in the school curriculum. It therefore would mean that the process of educationalisation would be hampered.

In examining the existing state of RE Millar notes that the subject is not included within SED reports and that HMI may not examine it. Even at this point Millar is avoiding the built-in confusion of the English Working Paper 36, in that the basic assumption being made is that the subject matter is a curricular area. This is the significance of referring to failure of SED Reports, and HMI in collecting information about the practice of RE within schools. It is true that the remit refers to '*the statutory provision concerning the obligation to continue religious instruction*' (SED, 1972, p2). There is no specific

reference to religious observance and the term '*instruction*' is changed to '*education*' later within the remit.

Unlike Working Paper 36 the Millar Report does not use '*religion*' and '*religious education*' interchangeably. The report's findings were based on a four-level inquiry in order to make up for the absence of official data on RE in Scotland. The categories drawn upon were education authorities, head teachers, teachers, and pupils. It was therefore, a basic exercise in the collection of data. The document was quite different in remit purpose and outcome from Working Paper 36 which was a professional document from within an already existing RE set up. Millar was in fact about to provide the basis for a regular RE set up in Scotland and that not from a narrowly professional basis. The report cogently states what it is about brushing aside the confusions which appeared elsewhere:

We take the view that the place of moral and religious education (particularly the latter) in the school must be justified on educational grounds, and that the nature of moral and religious education must be determined by educational considerations (SED 1972, 4.1, 5.1, 5.26).

On its own this first statement was most radical, suggesting as it did a complete change in the rationale for religious education which had till then existed. '*The statutory provisions*' however were to give way to '*educational considerations*'. Like any official report however, Millar was unable, having made such a radical statement, to omit acknowledgement that some lack of clarity remained. In doing so it picked up the English lack of definition between *religion* and *religious education*: '*there is still confusion and uncertainty in the community about the nature and significance of religion in the school*' (SED 1972, 4.33). Yet it may well be that Millar is not following the English pattern, but at this point is using the word '*religion*' not intending religious education, but meaning rather the practice of religion, religious observance. This view

is supported by the fact that the report subsequently states in discussing opting out '*that we expect that fewer parents will wish their children withdrawn from the kind of religious education in the secondary school that we have proposed*' (SED, 1972, 6.18).

The clear implication is that religious education is the concern of the teacher and educationist rather than the church, and that it is not a subject suited any more to the religious than the non-religious. Its educational basis means it is equally appropriate for all. The way in which the Millar committee had to conduct its own research into the state of religious education gives its findings a basic authority, which it would not have had were it simply interpreting official statistics. It noted for example, that RE fell seriously short of achieving its aim. In terms of the administration side of this criticism it laid blame at the feet of head teachers, or rather the lack of interest of many head teachers to whom provision in RE was merely another problem, and one they felt they could fairly safely ignore. Therefore teachers were not always supported, time was very limited, RE departments were very small.

Education Authorities faced the same criticism from Millar. For them too RE was just one more problem and one which they felt they could ignore. Little provision was made for promoted posts in RE and there were not any Scottish certificate examinations. In terms of content, syllabus construction was not well based. That produced by the Scottish Joint Committee on RE for example, was extremely theological. It was a joint effort of Church and education. Following from this there were not good resources available. This was partly because educationists had not sat down to produce them and this was in turn, because schools and authorities had not allocated sufficient cash for the development of resources. This was in part caused by the absence of specialist teachers of the subject and therefore

of time in the weekly timetable.

Its researches made Millar conclude that a fundamental change of approach to the teaching of religious education was called for. Curricula needed to be completely rethought and had to take account of all the developments in education which were having such a profound influence on teaching and learning. Specifically and in terms of school organisation, the Millar report urged the appointment of specialist RE teachers rather than the use of other teachers who had spare time. It also urged the appointment of RE departments with principal teachers at their head. As part of that professionalisation the report also suggested a weekly slot of two hours for the subject, and pointed to the Ruthven Report (HMSO 1967) which dealt with SCE courses. Religious Studies should be an option.

The Millar research also led the report to suggest that RE be inspected like any other curricular area. These recommendations emanated directly from the major exercise of collecting data on religious education. They underscored the eminently practical nature of the report. It was clearly fulfilling its remit in stating how to improve this curricular area. It was therefore, a report radically different from Working Paper 36 in England. It could mould the pattern of development of RE in Scotland. It was a pattern which reflected what should happen in RE in Scotland. Fortunately it was a basic document. It was about laying down basic structures like the need for teachers of RE, qualified in the same way as teachers of any other subject. It was therefore about the inclusion of RE in the educational world in Scotland (even including inspectors). In a word, it was about RE in all ways being treated like all curricular areas.

When Millar moved from these areas of basic consideration it may have lost some of its power. It was vital that the need for the RE curriculum to be well founded be stated. Millar did this. However when it then went on

to make a detailed contribution to objectives for curriculum development and for suggestions about curriculum content the Millar report is less convincing. Its strength lay in its broad base. This task required a more focussed base. It is in fact possible to say that in its fundamental statements it has had a widespread positive effect on the development of RE in Scotland insofar as its advice has been followed. It is equally possible to say that the attempt to engage in detailed curriculum development was not notably successful, and is reflective of individual almost localised approaches. What was required was rather a continuing and well developed fundamental rethinking of approaches to the curriculum with both a philosophical and methodological foundation, planned and developed in advance. The Millar report opened the door in 1972, for RE to enter the educational world as a curricular area like all the other areas. It was therefore dealt with in this way in a review of the whole curriculum at S3-S4, in the report which is discussed below .

4.5 The Munn Report The Structure of the Curriculum in the Third and Fourth Years of the Scottish Secondary School (HMSO, 1977).

Five years after the publication of the Millar Report the CCC produced a report on the entire S3 and S4 curriculum. This was the first time such a national committee had had the opportunity to consider RE in an informed way. In its broad discussion it stated three sets of claims on the curriculum: social needs, epistemological needs, and psychological needs. These were to be the basis of curriculum planning. The report then sets out four sets of aims in curriculum design: development of knowledge and understanding, development of skills, affective development, and the demands of society. From these the committee suggest certain modes of activity *'which constitute for us distinctive ways of knowing and interpreting experience'* (HMSO 1977, p23).

These modes *'constitute essential areas of learning, which all pupils should be required to engage in throughout the period of compulsory schooling'* (ibid, p23). The modes are stated to be: *'linguistic and literary study, mathematical studies, scientific studies, creative and aesthetic activities, and religious studies'* (ibid pp23-26). In examples of pupil programmes religious studies are clearly placed in the core area. In order to implement such a curriculum the report indicates the following weighting would be a minimum requirement:

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Periods</u>
English	5
Maths	5
Physical Education	2
Religious and Moral Education	2
Science	4
Social Studies	4
Creative Arts	4

The significance of this report from the perspective of religious education is that it treats it like any other of the essential areas. It also set the scene for RE to be fully incorporated into the formal structures of Scottish education and in particular curriculum development. The year after the publication of the report the CCC set up a curriculum group for Religious Education and the work of the first Central Committee on RE started. The first such specialist committee, the Scottish Central Committee on Religious Education, produced in 1978 Bulletin 1, A Curricular Approach to Religious Education.

4.6 Bulletin 1 A Curricular Approach to Religious Education (CCC/SCCORE, 1978).

Up to this point, 1978, Working Paper 36 was the only purely RE and

specialist curriculum document. The Millar committee was made up of members from a wide range of interests including some from the world of RE, some from the wider educational world, some from the churches and the world of educational administration. The Munn Committee consisted of educationists and educational administrators none of whom were linked particularly to religious education. The Bulletin 1 Committee consisted of members who were directly involved in religious education in primary, secondary, the advisory service, teacher education, and the universities. All had an involvement or a direct interest in RE. Bulletin 1 also followed after the Millar Report most of whose positive recommendations were in the process of implementation. Where Millar had been weakest, in the field of curriculum development, Bulletin 1, consisting as it did, mainly of those professionally involved in RE as specialists was well equipped to work in this area.

The premise was that the school and the teacher have a duty, arising from their professional commitment, to meet pupil needs, to provide for these pupils an opportunity to explore the non-material and religious aspect of life. Accepting that they come to religious education from different starting points pupils should be helped to arrive at their own conclusions. Bulletin 1 differs from the Millar report in that it was strongly influenced by HMI. It also differed from Millar in that it included denominational representatives on its committee.

HMI were excluded in all matters related to RE when Millar was set up. The RC sector too had been specifically excluded from the Millar remit at its own request. These were significant exclusions from Millar. They produced some benefits and some difficulties. Exclusion of the RC sector did, for example produce some problem for the basic educational justification of Millar, which saw as its constituency the total community together.

The needs of the denominational sector pivot around the basic assumption that the school is part of the community of the church. Millar made the bigger assumption that the church and school, though they may be complementary, are not identical. Millar actually made provision therefore for those members of the community unconnected with institutional religion and on their own ground. Four distinct interpretations of religious education are offered in Bulletin 1:

<i>the study of religion</i>	<i>the religious experience of man</i>
<i>religious studies</i>	<i>religions of the world</i>
<i>the study of a religion</i>	<i>a way of life, an influence in culture,</i>
	<i>literature and social ethics, etc,</i>

and

the study of Christianity

(CCC 1978,p2).

As with any subject curriculum development in religious education rests on important factors among which are: *the pupil, the subject, the teacher, and the context* (CCC 1978, 6.1). This is to go beyond the Millar Report which did not get as far as '*the subject*', but it does not compare well with the parallel sections of Working Paper 36, which states,

not only objectives, but the teaching material that flows from them, must be derived from careful consideration of:

- (a) the psychological capacity of the pupils, their interests and need;*
- (b) the social conditions and problems which the pupils are likely to encounter;*
- (c) the nature of the subject matter and the types of learning that can arise from it.*

(Schools Council, 1971, p46).

The Bulletin One statement is bald, almost crude, suggesting at the

very least that not enough attention was paid to the implications of the statements. The Bulletin worked out four aims for religious education within the curriculum:

- (a) to identify with pupils the area of religion in human experience;*
- (b) to enable pupils to explore questions about the nature and meaning of existence and the answers that religions offer;*
- (c) to help pupils understand the nature and importance of commitment, whether within a secular or religious context, and to appreciate what it means to be committed in a particular way;*
- (d) to encourage in pupils an awareness of the wider social and cultural impact of religions.*

(CCC, 1978, p5).

The parallel section in Working Paper 36 (Schools Council, 1971, pp43-45), lists four aims. Once again the statement of aims in Bulletin 1 is less clear and convincing than in Working Paper 36. This is so for two reasons: the Working Paper conducted appropriate research before launching into its task of curriculum development. It looked further afield at other work being carried out.

One example of this is its consideration of *'the psychological capacity of the pupils, their interests and needs, the social conditions and problems which pupils are likely to encounter and the nature of the subject-matter and the types of learning that can arise from it'* (Schools Council, 1971, p46). In this context it takes account of *'a piece of careful research carried out in Sweden to ascertain the real interests of 15 year old pupils'* (ibid, p46). The conclusion of the research is quoted:

Questions which might be termed existential were regarded as important,

while questions expressed in traditional Christian terminology were regarded as unimportant. Important were questions about life and death (how life is created, the moral right to take life, life after death), about race and social equality, about war and peace, about suffering and evil, about solitude and companionship, about sex and family, about faith and reason.

Unimportant were questions about Jesus and salvation, about church and confession, about prayer and sacrament (Tonaringern och Livsfragorna (1969), reported by Sten Rodhe at Fifth Conference of Inter-European Commission on Church and School, July 1970, quoted in Schools Council, 1971, p46).

The second reason for this claim of greater clarity in the Working Paper, lies in Bulletin 1. The need to achieve consensus may have meant that possible clarity, guided by the Millar fundamental rationale has been more difficult to achieve with the addition of the denominational perspective which Millar did not include. Of the four aims the third in particular points back to pre-Millar religious education thinking. This sort of consideration of commitment is not quite what this 'new' area of the curriculum needed. To juxtapose 'religious' and 'secular', as if this explains all, sweeps away some of the roots of Millar. It has become progressively more unjustifiable as time has passed. It would have been interesting in this context, had the writers of Bulletin 1 been able to benefit from the work of J.W.D.Smith (Smith 1975), where the question of the sort of commitment appropriate to the teacher is discussed at length.

Smith first raises the issue in discussing the work of John Wilson (Wilson 1971) in which he questions the motives of those who encourage children to ask 'ultimate questions'. These questions he suggests, arise spontaneously and therefore sound teacher attitudes to these questions are important. *'Teachers should not be anxious to create a picture. They should be*

objective and emotionally disinterested. But they should be mindful about the feelings of their pupils' (Smith,1975, p6). Certainly Millar's insistence that pupils from a non-religious perspective should be able to come to religious education without becoming religious, is at stake here.

Within the context of RE the question of commitment needs to be discussed, because it is integral to religion itself. The way Bulletin 1 has stated it however ensures that it would not receive adequate treatment. The aims in general suffer from inadequate task analysis. Although they touch on important areas, they do not state clearly what treatment these areas must receive. Rather, they call forth again the old lack of definition left behind by Millar from the English tradition and the legal framework for religious education, between religious education and the practice of religion. Millar had cleared that away (as indeed had the Church of Scotland document - *Christianity in Scottish Schools* (Church of Scotland 1988). Millar was able to do this because its remit had excluded consideration of the denominational sector. Now that that sector had joined in the work of the Central Committee agreement was no longer possible, and lack of definition again gained a place.

Agreement was gained by consensus which meant a little from this view-point, a little from that view-point, to ensure that everyone was satisfied. Bulletin 1 set out as a thoroughly professional body of those with an interest in developing the RE curriculum. It seemed to be following in the footsteps not only of Munn and Millar, but also of Working Paper 36. However, it has become clear that its real task was to take the achievement of Munn, Millar, and Working Paper 36, and to combine them with a denominational perspective where aims and objectives are distinctively different. It has attempted this task, but only at the cost of throwing overboard the educational orientation, justification, and basis for RE which

had been steadily evolving from the beginning of the seventies. In doing so, it slowed down the development of purely educationally based RE to a very great extent.

On the other hand its positive effect has been to help those within the denominational sector in order to give greater emphasis to the educational justification and contribution of RE to the whole curriculum. Nonetheless curriculum development in religious education had been started. The first stage had thus been completed. The next stage would start by '*Building on the groundwork of, A Curricular Approach to Religious Education,*' (Bulletin No 1 in this series) prepared by its predecessor, the Scottish Central Committee on Religious Education, whose present remit is confined to secondary education' (CCC/SCCORE, 1981, piii). It was, therefore, to be a more focused piece of work.

4.7 Bulletin 2: Curriculum Guidelines for Religious Education (CCC / SCCORE 1981)

Some three years after the publication of Bulletin 1, the successor Central Committee on Religious Education produced Bulletin 2. This committee also had within its remit the need to consider RE within both denominational and non-denominational sectors. From these there were four representatives from the denominational sector (a representative of the Archdiocese, a senior lecturer from teacher education, a deputy head teacher, and a principal teacher of religious education). The total membership over the period 1979 to 1982 was eighteen. It too follows directly from Millar as also from Bulletin 1. Nonetheless it states its own position by highlighting three areas as the concern of RE. These are: *man's search for meaning, value and purpose in life, the religions of the world as expressions of this search, the pupil's search for meaning, value, and purpose in life* (CCC / SCCORE, 1981, p2).

The principal of these is the first one, the other two being effectively subsections.

They are worked out in three aims;

- *to help pupils to identify the areas of religion in terms of the phenomena of religion and the human experiences from which they arise.*
- *to enable pupils to explore the nature and meaning of existence in relation to the questions religions pose and the answers they propose.*
- *to encourage pupils to develop a consistent set of beliefs attitudes and practices which are a result of personal process of growth, search and discovery (CCC / SCCORE, 1981, p3).*

These aims neglect the broad area '*man's search*'. In so far as the area is covered it is in terms only of the phenomena of religion and in particular world religions. Even the last aim which does allow for the possibility of an approach other than through world religions, is effectively individualistic rather than dealing with the objective areas and questions which appear in the broader '*man's search*'. These aims are then translated by SCCORE 2 into *general objectives*. They are general in nature, and could not be described as age-specific. They are grouped under the three headings: *knowledge, understanding, and, evaluation*, with in each case a heading for objectives under both '*Religious and other Stances*', and under '*The pupils Search*'. The absence of *Man's Search* is evident at this point. There are gaps in coverage which neither '*Religions*' nor '*Pupils Search*' can deal with.

Overall the objectives are not particularly related to the school experience of pupils. They are rather aimed at total understanding without

regard to the stage of understanding. There is a significant expectation in the '*religions*' objective, where the pupil is asked to evaluate a tradition '*from his own point of view*'. Such evaluation is classically '*from within*', that is, from the perspective of a believer. Such assumption may be difficult to make. It would therefore be, inappropriate for the pupil to be asked to evaluate a tradition '*from the point of view of the personal significance or relevance*'. It would be difficult to assess that such an objective had been achieved or that the pupil had properly understood the tradition in question, or indeed his own experience.

The kind of approach implied in these objectives is one from a particular phase in the development of RE towards the late 1970s when the potential of world religions was being recognised and explored, but before it had been fitted in to an overall perspective of the discipline. It was a sort of market-economy set-up, with each religion on view and having to make its case in order to ensure selection by pupils. It was at this time that Robert Jackson was writing on the subject (Jackson 1978, and 1982). At this point, the Central Committee was failing to take account of the massive professional developments in the teaching of RE shown in *Millar and Munn*, and in *Working Paper 36*, and had been sidelined into a dead-end track on which previous attempts at development had been shunted back and forth. SCCORE 2 at this point, had effectively fallen down on the first and key principle of good curricular development. It had failed to identify its own specific role in the wider social/ cultural process which makes up curricular decision-making. That role consisted in implementing educational criteria in determining philosophy, content, and methodology, in the practice of learning and teaching of religious education, while taking the wider process fully into account.

To date CCC had provided a reasonable amount of resources for RE

to ensure adequate professional curricular development. One of the major criteria discussed in this study is that religious education be treated in the same fashion as any curricular component. This was happening. It was to continue. CCC set up a third central committee to conclude the work of the first two.

4.8 Working Document: Developing the Religious Education Curriculum (CCC/SCCORE, undated).

SCCORE produced a third and final document. The title appears above. It was never formally published, unlike Bulletins 1 and 2. Nor was it dated (though it is from the 80s, following on from Bulletin 2). However its preamble states that it *'aims to consolidate and expand the work of Bulletins 1 and 2 by offering further guidance to teachers and others actively involved in curriculum planning'* (SCCORE 3, Working Document, p3). It is not entirely clear why formal presentation was omitted, but there is no doubt, that the document was in fact produced by a central committee of the CCC. It may be that the process represented by the CCC was at this stage running down. The report however, was widely circulated to RE specialist teachers. Unlike Bulletins 1 and 2, no list of members of the working party is given. It was however a Central Committee document of the CCC of the time, and therefore it may be assumed that the membership would have been decided on the same basis as that for the first two central committees. There would therefore have been representatives from both of the denominational and non-denominational sectors within the committee.

In turn this suggests that the clear guidance of Munn and Millar, and indeed of *Working Paper 36*, would have to be altered somewhat to allow for criteria other than the purely professional educational areas suggested in those documents. That its aim is as broad as this is stated at the outset *'What*

is offered is a workable set of guidelines and checks against which curricula might be developed to suit any local situation or denominational requirement' (SCCORE Working Document, 1983, p4). This is a document determined by the need for consensus. It is not a document derived entirely from educational principles and practice. It is in particular aiming to meet the needs of non-denominational schools as well as denominational schools in terms of curricular RE, and this proves very difficult.

The document enlarges on the organising ideas of '*Meaning*', '*Value*', and '*Purpose*'. The emphasis here remains as it was in Bulletin 2 on the individualistic, the '*Pupils Search*' and suggestions of the broader '*Man's Search*', are allowed to appear only briefly. The more detailed discussion of these organising ideas therefore, still shows a mistrust of the whole area of world religions as did Bulletins 1 and 2. This is one of the factors in the withdrawal of SCCORE from the open view of religious education as a curricular area in need of no justification of any kind apart from the same educational criteria which might be employed in looking at any component of the curriculum. The Working Document explains this withdrawal from the narrowly educational basis by stressing the great diversity of material available. This diversity it says, rather than being focused primarily on the educational justification and criteria '*should be focused round objectives which relate to religious or other stances for living, and the pupils search for meaning, to avoid the danger of failing to contribute to the pupils' growing religious understanding*' (SCCORE Working Document, 1983, p7). In other words, rather than explicitly stating a philosophy by which to deal with the great diverse range of material, the Working Paper opts to take a short-cut by stating its own objectives with no philosophical rationale. These areas and objectives are taken over from Bulletins 1 and 2. It might have been helpful to revisit them in particular to square them with the '*intentions*' of Millar

and developing definitions of the interests of the best possible religious education.

This Working Document had the opportunity to re-examine the statements of Bulletins 1 and 2, but instead chose simply to adopt those bulletins despite the big question marks which must be placed at their rationale and their move away from Millar/ Munn. The Working Document proceeds to provide a structure for objectives in religious education and in particular gives three questions to be: *'a structure to frame curriculum development which could cover religion...and the personal search of pupils and teacher'* (Working Document, (1983 ,2.5). The questions are:

- *what is the human condition?*
- *what is the goal of life?*
- *how may that goal be achieved?*

These questions are given by the Working Document because they offer six criteria: *'comprehensiveness, simplicity, clarity, criteria in assigning priorities, a consistent approach to diversity, and, sixth, they enable teachers to map their own stance'* (ibid 2.6).

Objectives are then suggested by the Working Document arising from the structural framework, and from the questions: *what is the human condition? what is the goal of life? how may life's goal be achieved?*

The situation is organised round the idea of *'meaning', 'value', and 'purpose'*, and these are translated into objectives with the help of the three questions. It is only at this point that the document considers the place of the pupil in this discussion of structure. The pupil's own experience and social context must therefore be identified, and in the construction of a curriculum sequence it has a clear contribution to make towards content and methodology: *'The teacher must have flexibility to adapt and modify the sequence of any general curriculum to meet the needs of his pupils'* (Working Document,

4.10). Process in religious education consists, according to the Working Document, in the treatment of *'live issues for the pupils, in an open-ended way'*.

The Working Document takes time and space to address questions of curriculum interaction, in which it discusses appropriate sections of the Munn Report, and Bulletin 2. It considers Munn's discussion of aims (HMSO, 1977,p21) and those of Bulletin 2 (CCC/SCCORE, 1981, 4.5 and 4.9) in the context of its own section 3 (p11ff), *Objectives in RE'*. Even here however, it is conducting the discussion on false assumptions. SCCORE does not share the basic starting point of Munn. What it is discussing is the outcome of these basic starting points. Since Munn and SCCORE start from different points, it is not possible for the outcome to be rational or logical. The aims of both documents when considering religious education, are radically different. Instead of attempting to deal with this part of curriculum development, SCCORE might, for itself, have examined the findings of the *'foundational document'*, the Millar Report: its educational philosophy, and its philosophy of religious education. SCCORE 3, like its two predecessors, was attempting an advanced task in curriculum development, without being clear or open about its own philosophy of religious education. From this basic omission has developed the inability of religious education *easily* to enter the educational world.

The educational world still has reservations about the real purpose, and basis of religious education. SCCORE would have found the answer to suit the rest of the educational world, had it developed not only Millar, but the Munn Report, in its justification for including RE in the core place he gave it. It (RE) is included in fact because...

the study of religion has an important contribution to make to the education of all pupils. It draws upon a long tradition of enquiry into, and reflection upon, man's search for meaning and purpose in life, and pupils may be

expected to take account of this tradition and of the central questions with which it is concerned, when making their own appraisal of the human condition (HMSO, 1977, 4.18).

This justification is taken up and refined from the Millar report (HMSO 1972). It is discussed at length, and a developed rationale for religious education within the schools of Scotland for all pupils from the entire community is the product.

From the outset the SCCORE committee whose remit was a purely curricular one, chose to ignore and indeed reverse the deep consideration given to the rationale and philosophy of religious education produced by these two national reports Millar (1972) and Munn (1977). This it did despite the presence of the non-RE education professionals who helped make up the committee's membership and who might have performed the task of ensuring that the work of these national reports directed the thinking of the central committees rather than allowing them free rein. Religious education in Scotland began to experience a change in attitude and treatment on the part of the rest of the educational world starting from the publication of the Millar and Munn reports. The way was made clear by the understanding of the issues shown by the churches. The Church of England report, produced by its Commission on Religious Education, under the Bishop of Durham, was extremely helpful. In Scotland, the same supportive attitude was evident in the report made by the Education Committee to the General Assembly of 1988. This ecclesiastical support for educationalisation was immensely significant.

4.9 Christian Teaching in Scottish Schools Report to the General Assembly 1988

The next of the reports was published in 1988. It is interesting as a

comment from outwith the educational world produced some time later than the reports already dealt with. It is also interesting, in the light of the comments made above, about the treatment given to the Millar and Munn reports in their statements on RE by the Central Committee on RE set up by the CCC. This final report is entitled *Christian Teaching in Scottish Schools*, and is a Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland made in 1988 by its Education Committee. In the first two Bulletins produced by the SCCORE committees, quite specific reference is made to the place of Christianity within religious education. Bulletin 2 lists the study of Christianity as one of the ways in which religious education may be interpreted and it sets out to devise '*curricular principles capable of application in any of these interpretations (listed)*' (CCC/SCCORE, 1981, p vi). Bulletin One also makes specific reference to the place of Christianity. It gives a number of reasons for including it and sums up by stating '*It should therefore feature as a major component in the curriculum of all pupils*' (CCC/SCCORE, 1978, p3).

The Millar report had too made the basic assumption that Christianity would for good practical educational reasons be at the heart of religious education. This is the context of the report to the General Assembly of 1988. The remit of the Committee had been '*to investigate the provision of specifically Christian teaching in Scottish Schools, and to consult fully with the Catholic Education Commission - Scotland, regarding co-operation in these matters*' (CofS, 1988, p1). The Church of Scotland Education Committee, in deciding how to deal with the task set up an '*ad hoc*' Group to deal with this remit from the General Assembly. It also made specific reference to the recent guidelines issued by the regions and the publications of the CCC and the sub-committees (SCCORE). In a most significant and telling statement, the Education Committee '*agreed that the remit of the Group should not be extended to include worship and religious observance which would raise other and much*

wider issues' (CofS, 1988, 1, 4.2.1.2). The Group consulted with HMI and the Scottish Association of Advisors in RE. The report gave an historical perspective of religious education since the 1872 Act through Church eyes, and to the present.

The Group's findings have a marked consonance with the wishes and statements of the Millar Report. It noted that despite *'secularisation and changing attitudes only a small percentage express no interest in religion and spirituality'* (CofS 1988 3, 4.2.3.2). It argued nonetheless, for a major reappraisal of the way RE is represented in the educational system, listing changes in education, diverse cultural traditions, diverse religious traditions, inter-faith dialogue, and finally, and in direct line with the wishes of Millar *'a common humanity'*.

'The education system,' it argued, *'is the proper context in which to set this emphasis'* on *'a common humanity'* (CofS 1988, 4, 4.2.3.8). This is what Millar argued as the basis for religious education in the phrase *'for all pupils... on their own terms'*. The Group also acknowledged its indebtedness for the development of thought about religious education to the work of the Millar Report in the statement defining RE as *'a legitimate study with aims and objectives appropriate to each stage of a pupil's progress and which should occupy a distinctive place in the curriculum'* (CofS 1988, 5, 4.2.4.1). Also referring to Millar, the Group agreed with his view of the task of the RE teacher, as that of a teacher, and not that of an evangelist. The approach should be professional and not confessional (CofS, 1988, 5, 4.2.4.1).

The Group also made eloquently a case for world religions in RE provided it is not at the cost of *'one's own cultural identity'*. It is in this context that the ad hoc Group made the case for the *'Priority of Christianity'*. In doing so it quoted as above the statements about the centrality of Christianity made by the SCCORE Bulletins which were followed up in regional

guidelines. It also quoted the 1986 HMI publication *Learning and Teaching in Religious Education* which indicated that this emphasis can be seen in schools.

The Group then proceeded to evaluate this situation. It acknowledged that practice in regional guidelines as well as in classroom learning and teaching followed Millar and SCCORE. It did however, not appear to have recognised that SCCORE / CCC has in fact radically diverged from Millar, and this can be seen in the remit given by the General Assembly, requiring full co-operation with the Catholic Education Commission, as if these two were on one side of the fence and the educational world on the other. This is all the stranger given the emphasis by the Group on '*a common humanity*' as the basis for religious education rather than a common membership of a religious organisation. It is therefore not clear in the report what is intended, not least because it continues to follow the Millar line in stating: '*The pupil must be encouraged to adopt an open view, while at the same time being confronted with what religious commitment involves, and how such commitment has an effect on living and values for life*' (ibid,4.2.5.2).

This is nearly a Millar-style sentence. What differentiates it from a broadly educational statement however is the use of the word '*confronted*'. Education cannot simply be something '*done to*' the pupil by the teacher. She /he must be fully participative. And the social/cultural milieu has a major input. '*Explore*', '*investigate*' or just '*study*' are verbs which would better fit here were this to be a sufficiently broad-based statement.

The report of this ad hoc Group indicates clearly that the sympathies are already with education and the educational process, but at significant points it reverts to the *sacred/secular* model rather than the '*common humanity*' model. What the report has not perceived, is that what it implies by commitment is an integral part of any curricular RE programme. It is fundamental that pupils perceive what commitment means to the believer

with all its implications. Pupils have to be able to stand *in the shoes of the believer*, Muslim, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, etc., in order to discover this. The report however is balanced in its expectations. It follows its own intention in not suggesting that religions other than Christianity be ignored. Indeed, the general approach of the Report is educational and not confessional. The Report then proceeds to note areas where development is required, amongst which are:

- the need for the production of good resource material
- the need for the monitoring of progress in schools
- allocation of adequate time for RE
- the need for specialist teaching of the subject

Overall, the report of the *ad hoc* Group of the Education Committee of the Church of Scotland is clear and helpful to the continuing *educationalisation* of RE. In its own terms it is '*not evangelistic, but educational in emphasis*'. It may be however perhaps hasty in assuming that all of the official publications are of equal merit, and in particular, may not have differentiated the two key documents:

the Munn Report (HMSO, 1977),

and, the Millar Report (HMSO, 1972), as having national status
from those of the CCC:

SCCORE Bulletin 1 (CCC, 1978)

SCCORE Bulletin 2 (CCC, 1981)

SCCORE Bulletin 3 (Unpublished),

all three of which work on a distinctly different footing from Munn and Millar.

4.10 The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum : 5-14 (SOED, 1993, and Scottish Executive, 2000).

A major development in the nineties and the current decade was the *5-14 National Guidelines*. The overall title for the development was *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: Structure and Balance of the Curriculum 5-14*. The original report was revised and re-issued in 2000. It was, following the work of the Munn Committee, an attempt to look at the entire school experience of children between the ages of five and fourteen. Principles of the 5-14 curriculum which applied to all pupils were *'breadth, balance, coherence, continuity and progression'* (Scottish Executive 2000, p9). It listed five areas of the curriculum. These areas are, *language* (including a modern language), *mathematics, environmental studies* (society, science and technology), *expressive arts and physical education, religious and moral education*, with personal and social development, and health education (ibid, p11). In an explanatory note the guidelines add *'it is in and through each of these curriculum areas that pupils can gain the essential experience that helps them acquire different types of knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions'* (ibid, p11).

Referring to Religious Education specifically, it states, *'RME encompasses a significant area of human experience. All pupils should develop some understanding of this area as one of the main motivating factors behind human behaviour'* (ibid, p26). Guidance is given on time allocation in S1 and S2:

minimum time over the two years:	Language	20%
	Mathematics	10%
	Environmental Studies	30%
	Expressive Arts	15%
	RME	5%
	CORE	80%

4.11 Religious and Moral Education: 5-14 (SOED, 1992).

In the publication dealing solely with RME, the guidelines (SOED,1992) indicate that they are structured thus: '*knowledge and understanding, skills and attitudes in relation to Christianity, Other World Religions and Personal Search*' (ibid, p5). Strands are set for each of these:

Christianity and Other World Religions share the same strands:

Celebrations, festivals, ceremonies and customs

Sacred writings, stories, and key figures

Sacred places, worship and symbols

Moral values and attitudes (ibid, p6).

For Personal Search these strands are set:

The natural world

Relationships and moral values

Ultimate questions (ibid, p6).

Apart from the curricular detail, what was of particular significance in 5-14 for religious education was that educational procedures were to be applied to it in pursuit of the national guidelines. A development programme was established, the curriculum was defined, attainment targets and strands were stipulated, the strands were divided into five levels, progression was monitored, the curriculum implemented, assessment guidelines established. The structure was extremely detailed. The significance of the 5-14 National Guidelines for religious education was that the educational process had priority over the details of content. The learning process was planned and developed in religious education in precisely the same fashion as in the other four areas of the curriculum. It was this process which applied the principles of educationalisation to religious education.

4.12 A Curriculum for Excellence: 3-18 (Curriculum Review Group, Scottish Executive, 2004)

This document was the work of the Curriculum Review Group, and is a follow-on to the previous curriculum documents. In a foreword, the two Scottish Executive ministers state that their *'aspiration is to enable all children to develop their capacities as successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors to society'* (Curriculum for Excellence, p3). This aspiration, and indeed the document, is *'just the first stage'*. It is in no sense a completed piece of curriculum work, rather it is a road map for what it calls *'curriculum reform'*. It states itself to be fully in accord with the national priorities for education of the Education (Scotland) Act 2000:

'Achievement and Attainment, Framework of Learning, Inclusion and Equality, Values and Citizenship, Learning for Life'. Features of the existing curriculum which are valued are: *flexibility, the combination of breadth and depth offered by the curriculum, the quality of teaching, the quality of supporting material, the comprehensive principle'*.

Changes which were argued for are:

reduction in overcrowding of the curriculum, better connection between the stages, better balance between 'academic' and 'vocational' subjects with a wider range of experiences, equip young people with the skills they will need in tomorrow's workforce, ensure that assessment and certification, support learning, more choice to suit needs of individuals (ibid, p7).

The curriculum *'reflects what we value as a nation and what we seek for our young people'* (ibid, p9).

The document argues that :

It is one of the prime purposes of education to make our young people aware of the values on which Scottish society is based and so help them to establish their own stances on matters of social justice and personal and collective responsibility. Young people therefore need to learn about and develop these values (ibid, p11).

In order that this might be achieved the curriculum needs to fulfill certain criteria. The document lists a number of these. Summing up these requirements, it states *'In essence, it must be inclusive, be a stimulus for personal achievement and, through the broadening of pupils' experience of the world, be an encouragement towards informed and responsible citizenship'* (ibid, p11). The purposes of the curriculum are to ensure that all children and young people should be successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors. There are subsections under each of these four headings and in each case there is a clear contribution which religious education might make to the process.

The document concludes stating a number of principles of curriculum design. These are: *'challenge and enjoyment'* (to which RE can already be seen to contribute liberally, (see chapter 8); *'breadth,'* for which religious education is necessary following the rationale of both Munn and 5-14; *'progression,'* which is well demonstrated in 5-14 RE; *'Depth,'* which is evident from curricular work round the country, and the wide coverage of certificate Religious Studies; *'personalisation and choice'* which is a basic curricular principle of the *'open approach'* to religious education which is the subject of this study; *'coherence,'* which again for religious education had very much attention in the 5-14 development; as also *'relevance,'* which is clearly demonstrated in the great popularity of certificate courses in Religious Studies.

As the document itself says, and the ministerial response echoes *'this is only the beginning'*. A huge amount of development and *'reform'* will need to follow before the curriculum can take on a physical even if less prescriptive shape. However, the educationalising process which religious education has been undergoing during the last two decades or so fits it very well to enter the world of a curriculum for excellence. Indeed educationalisation may be a

rather awkward pseudonym for a curriculum for excellence, and it may place RE in an excellent position clearly to specify how it may contribute to such a curriculum.

4.13 In conclusion

Of the reports referred to above, two originated from the national Christian churches of Scotland and England, (Christian Teaching in Scotland, and the Durham Report). Both of these argue the case for religious *education* in their own country, both support what is called in this study the *educationalisation* of religious education. The next two are national religious education reports (Working Paper 36 and the Millar Report) intended to direct the development of religious education in each of the two countries. These are described as '*organising reports*', because they provide the basis on which the subjects would be developed. Three are general curriculum reports covering the whole curriculum (the Munn Report: The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum: S3 and S4, then Structure and Balance of the Curriculum: 5-14, and last A Curriculum for Excellence: 3-18), which deal with the whole curriculum for the age range under consideration. The final four reports (SCCORE 1-3, and 5-14 Religious Education), are subject-specific implementing the broad guidance of the general reports.

In earlier chapters consideration has been given to the roots of curricular religious education up to the point where the educational world began to accept the subject, or mode, into the fold and it made its appearance as a department in many schools. Considered also was some of the basic thinking which lies behind its philosophy and practice. This in turn, prepared the basis for examining the fundamental formal statements which derive from that philosophy of the subject. All of this has been setting the scene and is taken further along this line in a detailed examination of how this

basic thinking has influenced the work of HMI, as expressed in their formal reports, and subsequently in interviews with both inspectors and teacher educators. It is also a measure for the policies of local authorities as they make provision for religious education within the curriculum and the practice of their schools in implementing these national and local policies. It is on the basis of what '*the committees*' have said that the study will now proceed to examine the reports written by HMI since the time when they were given responsibility for inspecting religious education in 1983. This in turn is followed up by a more detailed encounter in interview-form with three HMIs, and with three teacher educators, all to be measured against what has gone before.

CHAPTER FIVE

A Review of HMI Reports on Religious Education

an analytical description of selected reports by HM Inspectorate of Schools.

5.1 Introduction and Methodological Approach

The inspectorate of schools in entering the field of religious education in 1983, was contributing to the process of the educationalisation of RE. The symbolism was powerful for the subject thus to be under the watchful eye of the inspectorate. It seemed to demonstrate in tangible form, that religious education was now being incorporated with the rest of the curriculum. For this reason, the involvement was of great significance, and the views of the Inspectorate influenced the development of the subject strongly. At least initially, this may not have been entirely appropriate, since, as indicated below, this new area of the curriculum was not one in which HMI 1 was at home, and it was not his primary area of academic or professional expertise. However, as soon as he took up the appointment, he started on a rigorous tour of duty, conducting many RE inspections. Also, as indicated above, he was soon joined by other RE inspectors who were subject specialists.

Between the years of 1986 and 2001 the inspectorate produced five national reports on Religious Education. These form the substance of the discussion which follows in an attempt to discover the basis from which HMI dealt with RE.

The reports will be considered thematically, using some of the main areas which they themselves identified as worthy of note.

The areas under discussion are four in number:

- the relationship of religious education and the inspectorate

- the HMI philosophy of religious education
- religious education in the curriculum: provision, staffing, and content
- management of religious education.

This present chapter is the final of the three chapters dealing with documentary analysis. Like the others it is analysed on the basis of grounded theory. The rationale in this case is the same as discussed in chapter three and four.

5.2 The Relationship of Religious Education and the Inspectorate

Because of its position within the school set-up, religious education, although it is required by statute, was not inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectorate before 1983. This was so because it was seen as an historical legacy rather than as a natural part of education. It was in fact included in the curriculum and in the work of schools, to show that the Church, original and sole provider of education, was seen still to have a role. Whether intended or not this special position ostracised this part of education and subjected it to the kind of isolation which, in modern times, as well as ensuring the non-interference of the inspectorate, also meant that it was not possible to gain a professional qualification to teach the subject from any of the Colleges of Education. It was regarded as '*set apart*' from other subjects and, although the intention may have been to ensure it continued to be valued, it increasingly became separated from the other activities of school life and did not receive the developmental help which has supported the other curricular areas in recent times. Not least this meant that there were no Scottish Certificate of Education courses at the upper end of the school for pupils with an academic bent (except those '*imported*' from other educational systems). For HMI to move into this area therefore, was a major step. The

statutory ban on the inspection of RE was removed by section 66(2) of the Education (Scotland) Act 1981, and inspection was introduced on 1 January 1983, when a commencement order brought into effect section 16 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1981, repealing section 66(2) of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 (HMI 1986, 1.1).

A major reason for the move to involve the inspectorate in the religious education of pupils, was that the educational world had shown a willingness to look afresh at this subject as an educational pursuit. In 1977 the Munn Report stated that religious education was a mode, a building block of the curriculum. This key report on the curriculum in Scotland was preceded in 1972 by the report of a committee, set up by the Secretary of State for Scotland. The Millar committee took thinking about religious education forward by leaps, thus preparing the way for the dramatic statements of Munn. Together, these two documents gelled a nascent small group of religious educationists to make the case for educationally based RE even more clearly than that made by Munn and Millar. The group was the Association of Teachers of RE (ATRES). In the mid seventies, there developed also an association of RE advisors (SAARE), and it also helped produce a great impetus for the development of RE within the normal curriculum, and a powerful focus for activity on the part of specialist RE teachers round the country. This was the background to the work of HMI of education.

The existence of such a body of enthusiasts, pushing an educational rather than statutory justification for RE, meant that the proposal to introduce RE to inspection was likely to be welcomed. It was seen as recognition by another part of the educational establishment that RE was being accepted for the educational contribution which it could make to the development of the young. Before the deed was done there was much

consultation by the inspectorate with all who had any interest in religious education (see SED, 1986, 1.2). In almost no case was there a negative response to the proposals. Scarcely could Her Majesty's Inspectorate have had such a welcome. When it came to the appointment of someone to start the process of inspecting religious education it was clear that there was no one in the ranks of the inspectorate who had teaching experience of RE, except perhaps as a non-specialist teacher, or indeed, of inspecting religious education. An experienced inspector was nonetheless appointed to this delicate task. His own academic training and professional experience of teaching was in History. He introduced RE to inspection, and was then joined on the RE team by a specialist inspector with experience of RE in England.

Therefore, once the initial task of ensuring that it was the Scottish educational system which would be the determining factor in the task, the Inspectorate were not slow to take advantage of the considerable amount of experience south of the Border. When that RE-based inspector was settled in post, yet another was appointed. This third inspector was from the Scottish scene, and again was a specialist RE teacher, a principal teacher in fact. Yet another inspector was appointed, again a principal teacher of RE. He was from the denominational sector, and therefore it was clear that an attempt was being made to incorporate the whole RE world of Scottish education. This still left the original inspector who had initiated the whole process, and with the appointment of this last inspector, he gradually moved on. He did, in fact move to a very high-ranking post suggesting that the man appointed to introduce RE to inspection had been of high ability and that his work of introducing RE to inspection was regarded as very successful.

This key figure is the subject of one of the interviews reprinted and discussed below, as are two others of the team. That left a team of three

specialist inspectors of religious education, one based in the west and centred in Glasgow, one in the east and centred in Edinburgh, and one based further north, looking after the vast tracts of the Highlands. The locations of the three HMIs of religious education was strategically significant. To make an appointment from the English educational scene ensured some experience in subject inspection for the team. To appoint the remaining two from the ranks of Scottish principal teachers of religious education also was significant in that it ensured good experience of the practice of religious education in schools for the new team. That one of these two was from the denominational sector also was significant in that it ensured that sector and emphasis had an input. The appointment of that member of the team to the Glasgow base meant that the great majority of Roman Catholic schools would have ready attention paid to their needs. It could be argued, in particular, if successive appointments to Glasgow continue to be from the denominational sector that the factors involved in such appointments are neither professional nor academic, but rather broader, including church and state politics. This appears to be politically balanced, but it weakens the basis for the advances made in modern RE, at any rate in Scotland. It seems to allow a greater weighting to factors outwith the educational, in considering religious education at a time when the educational emphasis is what is bringing religious education to new life. It operates directly against the main thrust of the key document in the development of Scottish religious education, the Millar Report, which was solely educational in its interest.

The expectation of the enthusiasts referred to above, was that the very fact of the involvement of HMI with religious education, would enhance, and develop the weighting given to educational criteria, in justifying the place of religious education within the curriculum. This would make appeals to statute progressively both unnecessary and beyond the

bounds of good educational practice.

5.3 The HMI philosophy of religious education

The philosophy of the subject which emerges from the HMI reports is one which seems to accord with current thought and practice, and which therefore appears to be entirely at home with the key documents in educational philosophy. The philosophy of religious education to which HMI worked had three strands: **the areas which they defined** as appropriate for their attention, and which therefore defined religious education for them, (SED, 1986,1.4), **three aims for religious education** which they would apply in inspecting it, (SED, 1986,1.6), and **a methodology of approach** to the inspection of religious education in schools (SED,1986, 1.5).

The areas (strand 1) which HMI thinking suggested as appropriate for their attention were core religious education, optional religious studies, religious observance, and any associated extra-mural activities (SED 1986, 1.4). In addition, and much more specifically, HMI considered it essential that schools would take account of the three SCCORE bulletins. Yet more specifically, HMI cite three aims (strand 2) for religious education, which would apply across the board in both the denominational and non-denominational sectors. These are:

to understand the place of religion in the development of the country's history, society, and culture;

to consider the questions which man poses about the meaning of existence and explore the answers proposed by major world religions, in particular Christianity;

to encourage pupils to develop a consistent set of beliefs (SED , 1986, 1.6).

This seems to be standard prescriptive procedures as adopted by HMI

in other fields. Yet there is in their consideration of religious education here, another strand, which again features in the 1986 Interim Report, where it is stated, (strand 3) HM Inspectors intended to approach the inspection of religious education within each school, without preconceived ideas of the form of provision which was most appropriate to it. It was essential to allow schools freedom to respond to the context in which they found themselves. The appropriate provision for religious education in any school depended on the community which it served, on the resources available, and on the extent to which its educational philosophy necessitated a separate, or an integrated programme (SED, 1986, 1.5). In these three strands of the thinking of HMI on RE, it is difficult to perceive a single thread which is common to them all.

The areas listed for consideration by HMI, which make up the first strand above, raise the core problem which has dogged many in updating the past of religious education to highlight its educational contribution, rather than to bring *religion* within education. In taking on religious observance in this context, HMI have shown that they are acting with a remit rather broader than that allowed by the narrower role of professional educators. Even on a simplistic level, the list of areas appears to be an attempt to include anything which includes the word *religion*, as if that were the criterion rather than *education*. To continue to link religious observance and religious education at such a crucial turning point for religious education may have done great damage to the developing subject, by confusing many about the nature and purpose of religious education within the curriculum. The insistence that schools must take account of the work of SCCORE seems entirely reasonable, since these committees were the national attempt to develop curricular thinking about religious education. Yet, as with similar committees of other subjects, SCCORE was dominated by HMI.

Given that, in this case, HMI was as new to RE as was the CCC, it may

be that it would have been a more balanced approach to curriculum development to allow a broader based approach than this. There was at this stage a goodly number of extremely experienced specialist teachers round the country. The philosophy of religious education to which HMI worked (see above) was at least, less than developed, and the aims also could have been further refined. They appeared in the HMI report which described itself as '*An Interim Report*' (SED 1986), yet it was on this basis that much subsequent development was allowed to proceed. If there was even the possibility that HMI, at the introduction of inspection did not deal fully with all the issues in the nature and content of religious education, their influence on the work of SCCORE might not have been the healthiest.

The third strand in HMI thinking on religious education is one which occurs throughout the reports being considered. It emphasises the openness with which HMI state they are approaching their new task. At the outset they consulted with as many interests as they could find, and in the Interim Report (SED, 1986) re-state their intention in affirming that it is essential for schools to have freedom to respond to the context in which they find themselves. They are clearly aware of the tension between this emphasis, and, for example, the requirement that all schools take account of SCCORE. They all deal with this problem head-on simply by placing the word '*nevertheless*' between the two opposites.

It seems that this freedom of which HMI speaks is to be operative only assuming that schools occupy the starting positions stipulated by HMI in advance, and that HMI define the context referred to immediately above. There was no pool of religious education experience within the Inspectorate before inspection of RE was introduced from 1983. There was no way in which HMI, pre-1983, could see RE teaching in progress at secondary. This was so, partly because of the small number of specialist teachers in schools

initially, but mainly because it was very well known in schools that HMI were not permitted to include RE on their visits. Primary was slightly different, since inspection was not as subject-specific as at secondary and therefore HMI might casually see some teaching taking place, or at least the results of work.

This being so, the whole idea of their having a philosophy of the subject was of even greater significance than it might otherwise have been. No doubt there was a great deal of agreement, in thinking about education in general within the Inspectorate. Sources, therefore, of philosophy of religious education were written sources from the work of curriculum developers as in the CCC and its subsidiaries, the SCCORE committees.

A second source of subject philosophy was other writings which made reference to religious education, including much of the writings of English academics. This is so in particular of the two national reports referred to above. The second of these two dealt with the curriculum as a whole. It spoke of religious education as a mode, essential to a balanced curriculum, and it stipulated what minimum weighting it should have in the timetable. Munn had immense influence on HMI thinking about religious education. Its modal status and its time requirements are two elements in particular which HMI used greatly, and urged upon all schools, headteachers and local authorities.

The other report was produced by a committee set up by the Secretary of State for Scotland, chaired by Professor W. Malcolm Millar. It reported five years before Munn. Millar was the basis on which the Munn case for RE in the curriculum was made. Within the HMI reports under consideration here, reference is frequently made to the Millar Report. It is evident that HMI intended their own reports to be seen as fully in accord with the basic work done by Millar, which was not only up-to-date, but

academically reliable, with a very impressive list of committee members and acceptable to the educational world.

The terms of reference of the Millar Committee, which was set up in 1968 were:

Within the framework of the statutory provisions concerning the obligation to continue religious instruction, the responsibility for its content, and questions of inspection, to review the current practice of Scottish schools (other than Roman Catholic schools) with regard to moral and religious education and to make recommendations for its improvement (SED, 1972, p2).

There was no reference to religious observance in the remit of the Millar Committee and the report itself was not supportive of considering religious education (or instruction) and religious observance together. For Millar, there was no question of other agendas in the wings. Millar expresses the point boldly:

the real question is the rather broader one of whether the school can or should have Christian worship as part of its normal activities as a school while at the same time maintaining that in the field of religious education it is not concerned to advocate Christian religious beliefs as the ones to be accepted. As a Committee we have found this a difficult dilemma to resolve in a more fruitful way than by simply saying that the statute requires the custom of religious observance to be continued (SED, 1972, 6.26).

Immediately following this section Millar continues,

while appreciating the force of the argument outlined above, we are also convinced that pupils cannot be said to be educated in religious matters if they have not come to some understanding of the experiences which give rise to religious worship (ibid).

Here he makes the crucial point which the statute does not make, and

therefore the HMI view is unable to deal with. He talks about *'understanding the experiences which give rise to religious worship'*. This is part of the function of religious education. It is an educational activity, not participation in an activity, which assumes one is a member of a faith community. Whether such a member or not, pupils are able to *'understand'* the experiences which give rise to religious worship, just as they will be able to understand the experiences which give rise to religious prayer, or any other aspect of the life of a follower of the religion being studied. It will be significant in the educational process for pupils to enter the experience of the practitioners of the religion in question, at all points. This was exemplified much after Millar in the 5-14 Religious Education National Guidelines, which in using attainment targets, produced strands for Christianity and other World Religions, one of which is *'Sacred places, worship and symbols'* (SOED, 1992, 5).

For Millar, religious education was merely a legitimate educational study with aims and objectives appropriate to each stage of a pupil's development. This is why the committee was eager to make it clear that the school should not advocate Christian (or any other particular) religious beliefs as the ones to be accepted. It made the case for religious education which stressed, *'the importance to a young person's development of studying objectively the religious and spiritual dimensions...'* The report quite explicitly states, *'we take the view that the place of religious and moral education must be justified on educational grounds and that its nature must be determined by educational considerations'* (HMSO, 1972, 4.1).

The HMI reports are at one in praising the Millar report. They are happy to accord it a place of honour in the development of religious education. They are prepared to use strong language in order to do so. They even acknowledge *'the seminal influence of the Millar Report on Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools'* (SOED, 1994, 6.2). Despite what they

write however, it is plain that they are not themselves seminally influenced by Millar, which is not regarded as tablets of stone. The most obvious point at which HMI take their own road is that concerning the linking of religious education and observance. This is a central point for HMI. It leads them into considerable difficulties, contradicting much which they have praised in the Millar Report, yet they cling to it. Equally significant is the emphasis of HMI in the selection of content in religious education. This will be discussed below.

In their report *Effective Learning and Teaching in Scottish Primary and Secondary Schools: RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* (HMI 1994a), the appendix is a copy of SOED Circular No 6/91, sent by the Scottish Office Education Department to The Chief Executive of all Regional or Island Councils, with a copy to Directors of Education. The heading of the Circular is *PROVISION OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS*. It is not clear whether HMI are using the Circular as an educational justification or not, but the document states plainly that: *'the Secretary of State considers that religious observance complements religious education and is an important contribution to pupils' spiritual development. It can also have a subsidiary role in promoting a corporate identity'* (HMI, 1994a, p42, Appendix).

No reason is given for the Secretary of State considering this to be so, unless it may in fact be the subsidiary role he sees for religious observance. If this is the case, it is no educational justification in Millar's terms. It is reversion to reliance on statute. The reports under consideration seem to offer a philosophy of religious education, which may rely more on factors outwith the area of religious education, perhaps including political considerations as well as the particular skills which the inspectors who introduced inspection to religious education themselves possessed.

5.4 Religious education in the curriculum, provision, staffing and content

The 1970s and 80s saw a movement towards further incorporation of religious education within mainstream educational thought and practice, which is evident in retrospect (see discussion of census figures below). It was in the 1970's that both the Millar and Munn reports were produced. Even apart from their detailed content, these two reports were of significance. One concerned itself with the curricular justification and internal rationale and philosophy of religious education, while the other was about a philosophy of the entire school curriculum. Within that context they made plain that religious education was a central component, a distinctive mode of knowledge. It was also in that decade that specialist teachers of religious education were increasingly appointed, that principal teachers and assistant principal teachers of the subject were appointed, and that progressive schools had RE departments of two or three specialist teachers. It was then too, that the two specialist professional associations referred to above flourished, ATRES and SAARE. This latter association is of interest in that it reflected the rise of the subject-based advisory service. When appointing their advisory services local authorities paid due heed to the needs of religious education.

In the hey-day of the advisory service, throughout the 80's and into the 90's, all but the very smallest authorities had an advisor whose responsibility was the support, and development, of religious education. Millar and Munn therefore, were a focus for intensive action, to ensure the clear educational rather than statutory justification and rationale of religious education, and for its development as part of the wider curriculum. This hive of activity and enthusiasm presented a daunting picture to HMI about to enter the field of religious education for the first time, and without specialist

subject skills to back them up. It is not clear how far HMI wished to keep themselves apart from practitioners of religious education, in the tradition built up by themselves over decades of inspection. Yet, by doing so, they would limit their own possibilities of professional development, given their own complete lack of experience in the field. This factor, of the need for HMI to become totally immersed, and expert in RE which was a totally new area to them, meant that they required considerable opportunity for development of their skills and knowledge. It was not adequate for an HMI, however experienced as an HMI in other aspects of inspection, simply to burn the midnight oil to bring himself up to scratch in this new field.

Direct and specific input was required to make up for this clear lack of specialism. Otherwise it was a fast replay of the school experience of the past, which meant that religious education was conducted by non-specialist teachers. Many of these teachers were extremely well-motivated and worked very hard indeed. Some of them had good results in that pupils benefitted. At the end of the day however, reliance on non-specialists meant that the true function, purpose and approach of religious education, was interpreted by criteria other than hard-headed professional specialist in-depth judgement about what this curricular area has to offer to developing children and adolescents. The danger of using criteria other than educational ones derived from deep reflection of professional specialism, led in the past, despite the many good factors which emerged, to fundamental confusion about what was, and was not educationally and professionally possible for religious education as a curricular area. *'Non-specialist'* in practice had meant *'of limited understanding of the philosophy of the subject'*, because, by definition *'non-specialist'* implied that someone who because she/he was a specialist elsewhere was fully engaged there, in pursuit of her/his specialism, and therefore able to allow only *spare time* to this second field.

The conclusions of the last section point to the occurrence of such a misunderstanding. While willing to acknowledge that the two key reports referred to above were important, HMI did in fact proceed to draw their own interpretation of these reports, which, technically and administratively, were reasonable (as in their use of Munn), but which were fundamentally flawed in their use of the specialist document. So much so is this the case, that the reason for the HMI interpretation of Millar is difficult to find. It is indeed difficult to avoid concluding that finding themselves in the midst of a sea of educational thought about religious education, which by the time they came on the scene was quite clearly on the ascendant, they could only accept it. Yet at many points in the various reports, it is to statutory religious education, and statutory justification, that HMI makes reference. It is a statement of the Secretary of State's policy (Circular No. 6/91) which is included as an appendix in the major HMI report on the state of learning and teaching in RE (HMI, 1994a).

There is no evidence from their reports that HMI looked to the pre-existent professional literature of RE, to which they had been unable to contribute, as their main guide. This being the case, they may have felt they were not bound by it. It may be argued that by the time of publication of this major HMI report, the early '*non-specialist*' days of inspection of religious education had given way to a highly specialist team. By then however, major decisions had been made, and attitudes for example, to the Millar Report had been formed. It was not possible to back-track, because subsequent documents, not least of which were the three SCCORE reports, had been produced which relied on the earlier responses to Millar. Indeed, HMI had indicated that they considered it was '*reasonable that schools would take account of the recommendations of the Scottish Central Committee on Religious Education*' (SED, 1986, 1.6). The great interest which HMI shows in religious

observance and their insistence on dealing with it in the same breath as curricular religious education, suggests that they might still be wearing their civil servant cap rather than their educational guise. They are talking 'statute' and not 'education'.

The significance of the 'education' case at this point is highlighted even more than it might be, because religious education was at the time of the introduction of inspection, in a period of re-constitution from being a left-over from the past, to a vital, active and creative part of the curriculum. For HMI, in the midst of this phase of reconstitution still to cling in any measure to the statutory justification, was at best to lead to confusion, at worst, to lead to the danger of derailing the entire process. It certainly was an attempt to control development by keeping the statutory skeleton in the cupboard.

Paradoxically, it is in the SED Circular referred to above (6.91) that it is suggested that there may be a place for religious observance unrelated to religious education as a whole-school activity, linked to ethos. This pursuit of observance as part of religious development is one which springs from both of these sources, the civil servant method, which sees the need to ensure that policies be followed rather than that consistent, balanced approaches to the whole-school experience of pupils be worked out and implemented, and also from a basis of insufficient depth at an early enough stage of specialist knowledge and experience. On the purely practical question of its physical presence in the curricular timetable, HMI took their lead directly from Munn. Indeed, there is wide and broad agreement on the Munn basis in the various documents and groups from CCC to the *5-14 Curriculum Design for the Secondary Stages*. The curriculum is divided into eight modes, one of which is religious education. The allocation of time to this mode is:

10% of curricular time in primary,
5% of curricular time in S1-S2, with

80 hours in S3-S4, and
a continuing element for all pupils in S5-S6.
(HMI, 1994, 2.2 and 2.4).

Indeed, this set of figures also appears in SOED Circular No 6/91, (8-10). The Munn Report's figures for RE coverage were welcomed by the religious education lobby from the outset. Most educationists recognised that to allocate less time would be to treat the mode as a joke. It would have in any case been difficult to suggest a smaller allocation of time if RE were in fact to be considered one of eight curricular modes, each of which, because of its distinctive contribution, was essential to a balanced curriculum. That curricular analysis demanded sufficient time for the distinctive element of the mode to be delivered. To offer less than the minimum allocation deriving from Munn therefore, in fact it meant rejection of this analysis of the curriculum.

In 1986, figures showed that since HMI started their tour of inspection in 1983,

in S1-S2	about 60% of non-denominational schools included religious education in the curriculum for all pupils.
In S3-S4,	religious education was provided for a proportion of pupils.
In S5-S6	religious education was offered beyond S4 in a minority of schools.

These figures reflect the 1983 Census figures, which indicated that at S1-S2, about 60% of non-denominational schools offered religious education in the curriculum, S3-S4-about 50%, S5-S6-about 30%, with the time allocation usually one period per week (SED,1986, 4.1).

In 1991, census figures showed further development:

S1-S2	93% of schools included religious education in their curriculum (82% in 1983).
-------	--

In non-denominational schools there were significant variations in time-allocation. Over the year it varied between 2.5 and 4% of time, depending on the length of period.

S3-S4 88% of all schools included religious education in the curriculum (73% in 1983).

The same pattern of total time allocation operated here as at S1-S2.

S5-S6 53% of all schools included religious education (56% in 1983).

Given this, the figures of the actual coverage of RE found by HMI in schools is of some interest. Over the years 1995-2000, 76 RME departments were inspected. Of this sample:

in S1-S2, in all but one of the schools, RE was part of the course for all S1-S2 pupils. Time allocation varied from 30 -110 minutes per week. About half of the schools allocated less than the advised time to RME.

in S3-S4, 15% of schools did not provide RME for all pupils in S3-S4, or only did so in S3-S4. Almost half the schools gave the pupils in S3-S4 less than the 80 hours recommended.

in S5-S6, provision varied widely.

Just over half the schools did not include RME as an element of the PSD programme at S5-S6. Almost half offered courses leading to SQA, Higher, or a programme of National Units. Around 2% of pupils nationally in S5-S6 took the SQA Higher (HMI,2001,9). This was a survey using a limited number of schools. It was however extremely detailed, and as well as considering statistics, it also examined quality.

The Millar report indicated that in all respects, religious education should occupy the same sort of position in the curriculum as any other subject. This included the staffing of the subject. Before religious education

was drawn into the mainstream, any religious education which took place in secondary schools was carried out by non-specialist teachers, since it was not possible to obtain a teaching qualification in the subject at any of the teacher training institutions. There was in each of them a department of religious education, but its activities were limited to providing some content for primary trainees, and interest courses for secondary trainees, alongside their specialist subject course. There were, in some schools, teachers who had an academic qualification in theology, but that was as close as staffing came to academic training. This however began to change with Millar and Munn.

The colleges of education offered proper professional qualification in religious education, as with all other academic subjects. The universities with departments of Religious Studies found student numbers increasing. The universities which did not have such a department started to introduce them, either as a distinctive department within the faculty of theology, or more usually within the faculty of arts. These two developments regularised the position of religious education within the school context. Specialist religious education staffing could now be produced to meet whatever demands schools might make. The school census of 1984 showed that there were 529 qualified teachers of religious education in secondary schools (HMI 1986b, 5.1). They were not all involved in teaching the subject. Only 281 of these were engaged in teaching RE as their main subject. Of these 84 were principal teachers, (18 of whom had at least one assistant) and 34 were assistant principal teachers (HMI 1986b, 5.1). Nonetheless, the pattern over the two decades is clear. Non-specialist teaching of religious education at secondary stages became no more acceptable than non-specialist teaching of mathematics or any other curricular subject. Schools gradually were recognising that curricular balance was in danger if they were without any of the stated modes. They were even reaching the practical conclusion, that to

ensure the best development recognisable departments had to be produced, and management structures within these had to match those common throughout the school. In terms of content, HMI used the same statement of aims for religious education consistently. For secondary education these are stated thus:

to understand the place of religion in the development of the country's history, society and culture,
to consider the questions which man poses about the meaning of existence, and explore the answers proposed by major world religions, in particular Christianity;
to encourage pupils to develop a consistent set of beliefs (HMI 1994a, 2.12).

These aims are those passed on from the outset of inspection when they were published in the Interim Report of 1986. They compare interestingly with the more detailed aims for the content of religious education which appear in the national Guidelines of 5-14 *Religious Education*, which gently nudge the narrow HMI statement into a more comprehensive form. The 5-14 aims are:

to develop a knowledge and understanding of Christianity and other world religions, and to recognise religion as an important expression of human experience;
to appreciate moral values such as honesty, liberty, justice, fairness and concern for others;
to investigate and understand the questions and answers that religions can offer about the nature and meaning of life;
to develop their own beliefs, attitudes, moral values and practices through a process of personal search, discovery and critical evaluation (quoted in HMI, 1994a, 2.7).

The origins of HMI first thoughts on aims and content are evident in a comparison of these two sets of aims. In 5-14, all reference to the country's history, society and culture, vanishes. This is stated in more obviously cultural terms by reference to Christianity. Throughout the HMI reports there is a constant intensive reference to the need to ensure coverage of Christianity. Indeed, it sometimes appears as if this interest is directed by the all-pervasive statute to which they pay heed at every turn, rather than by educational requirements and criteria. This may be the reason for stipulating Christianity in particular, rather than using the all-encompassing phrase world religions. It may even be unnecessary to mention Christianity in particular at the stage of general aims, rather than of detailed aims and objectives and content. It is also significant that, at the outset, the term '*human experience*' is used. This pinpoints that it is of the essence of religion to engage the '*big questions*' of life and death, which form the core of human experience. Elsewhere, in attacking the '*implicit*' approach as an element of curriculum design in religious education, HMI have failed to identify this as an attempt to concentrate on the personal search by starting from the experiential rather than the explicitly religious, which in the past had become so over-emphasised as to lead to the entire subject being entitled '*scripture*' (see HMI, 1994a, 4.6). This attempt to get behind the phenomena and artefacts is at the heart of the example above from the Millar report of how pupils: '*cannot be said to be educated in religious matters if they have not come to some understanding of the experiences which give rise to religious worship*' (HMSO,1972, 5.26).

The inclusion of specific moral values reflects the development of religious education into religious and moral education. This extension had not occurred when the 1986 HMI report was written, but the 1994 report, though it is much larger and more comprehensive, still continues with these

original aims. The third 5-14 aim continues development of experience, linking religion directly with questions about the nature and meaning of life. The HMI aims do this too but in a much less well-developed or contextual fashion. The problematic fourth aim continues with the area of human experience. Even currently its definition is not totally agreed. HMI feel that more detail is required for this aim, at least at primary: *'more specific advice will be necessary to ensure adequate coverage of the Personal Search outcome in the 5-14 Guidelines'* (HMI, 1994a, 4.2).

It is a development of the final version of the HMI aims. It has however moved on, refined and extended the terse statement of HMI into a comprehensive aim which is still causing quite a bit of debate. In moving from the blandness of the HMI aims, these 5-14 aims in general have met with much support. Some argue that it is less appropriate to single out Christianity as fundamentally separate, and that simply using the term *'world religions'* would more nearly cover the subject area of religious education. In practical terms, most would want to ensure that for the reasons given in the HMI's first aim, Christianity would, and should, be well covered, but it may be that there is a danger in conducting the subject as if Christianity were different in kind from the other world religions. By extension, it is also a danger, that with this first 5-14 aim as it stands, it would be possible to underplay world religions other than Christianity, and that, therefore, if the name *Christianity* is to remain a feature, some degree of balance of effort between the world religions might be suggested. HMI were of this opinion. The National Guidelines have in some measure considered this question of the relationship between Christianity and other world religions. There is a common framework of strands for Christianity and Other World Religions:

Celebrations, festivals, ceremonies and customs;

Sacred writings, stories and key figures;

Beliefs;

Sacred places, worship and symbols;

Moral values and attitudes Religious and Moral Education (SOED, November 1992, 5).

However, HMI are either sticking to their own aims because they prefer them, or have failed to accept 5-14 aims as appropriate. In their 1994 report they maintain the same approach to the place of Christianity as they laid out in the 1986 report, where they emphasise the country's history, society, and culture as key reasons for an emphasis on Christianity:

'Content should ensure a balanced and broad experience that has a particular focus on Christianity as the major religious tradition of this country, but which also develops the pupils' awareness of important features of other world religions' (HMI, 1994a, 4.11).

As with their interpretation of the Millar report, HMI here too have taken the 5-14 *Religious Education Guidelines*, and then by the skilful use of civil-service language, have created inadvertently, or intentionally, an actual position which is quite at odds with the document. In the meantime, diplomatic language has made it appear that HMI statements are supportive of the guidelines.

5.5 Management of religious education

As noted by HMI, management structures for religious education in schools have, in the past, been very loose, with departments operating on their own and without very great reference, except in the last analysis, to senior management. In the case of those schools with a religious education specialist teacher at that time, it was easy for them to fit into this loose set-up. Formally, such individual specialists were linked to a principal teacher to enable administrative matters like ordering resources, to take place. The link

was not particularly curriculum based. It might be with the principal teacher of English, of History, or of Business Studies. In some cases the religious education specialist would be allowed to attend the meeting of principal teachers, should a matter of significance to his subject arise. Normally however, he would be represented by his link PT.

This early state of affairs was evident at the beginning of the 70's, in the first stages of incorporation of religious education within the curriculum and school structures. However, it quickly changed by the end of that decade as religious education became a regular specialist subject, with principal teachers and assistant principal teachers. In those schools where no promoted post in religious education existed, a link might be established via a member of the senior management team of the school, the depute head or one of the assistant head teachers. HMI report a rapid growth of religious education departments with a principal teacher, or assistant principal teacher, and often with one or two specialist assistant teachers. By the 1984 census there were 118 secondary schools in this category. HMI note that in management terms: *'Religious education is most successful in schools where there is a clearly accountable management responsibility for the subject at principal teacher or assistant principal teacher level'* (HMI, 1994a, 6.7).

Between the years 1995-2000, HMI inspected 76 departments of RME, and of the schools covered, in 39 there was a principal teacher, and in 37, the overall responsibility for religious education rested with a member of the senior management team. This was to cover for the failure to appoint a principal teacher of religious education in these schools. Instead, there was an assistant principal teacher, or an unpromoted teacher.

The principal teachers were judged :

to be very good	in 45% of cases
to have more strengths than weaknesses	in 35%

to have important weaknesses in 20%.

Departments without a principal teacher were judged :

to have important weaknesses: in 65% (HMIE 2001,18).

In general discussion within their reports, HMI are clear that where there is someone with responsibility management is better. This tends to be borne out by these figures in general but there may be additional factors of significance also. In some cases the assistant principal teachers and the unpromoted teachers were short on experience. Indeed, had they been a bit more experienced they might well have moved from their existing post to a promoted one. Within schools at department level, therefore, management was improving with experience, and insofar as the headteachers were willing to appoint a principal teacher as the head of their religious education department. This was almost inevitably the case given the fact of the struggle of RE to have itself recognised, and the consequent awareness of those who chose to enter this part of the curriculum. Because it was an early stage of development enthusiasm was rife, and staff were, by and large, very young. This had at least one drawback, which is described above, but it was undoubtedly helpful in settings where the environment was not settled or established.

There are two further levels at which the management of religious education was of particular significance: at local authority level, and at headteacher level.

In the case of authorities, in the main they were able to take a detached view of the development of religious education. Because of their distance from schools, the directorate was able to exercise management functions in this area, given that national government and their own Councils, were providing the finances. Thus, it was, for example, that in the era of regional local government from 1975 to 1996, the great majority of the

reasonably sized regions and even some sub-regions, appointed an advisor with responsibility for religious education. In most cases too, at least initially, this appointee was responsible only for religious education. As well as managing general support, not least for sole teachers of religious education, the advisor was able to arrange staff development in his area and curriculum development, and also to mount a programme to persuade schools, in particular head teachers, that they should have an RME department. The management function of local authorities was in large measure executed through the advisory service. When that service began to wither, local authorities were less able or willing to be actively engaged in management of religious education. They had however, ensured that curriculum guidelines had been circulated to schools, and this they continued to do.

Authorities which had not been able to appoint their own advisor were able to circulate to their schools the publications produced in other authorities. In the case of headteachers, the situation was quite different. Each was responsible for his own school only, and was able within his complement to make judgements about where school strengths should lie. HMI reports do not refer in detail to the management role of head teachers in their development of religious education, except insofar as they refer to the increased number of schools which appointed specialist teachers of religious education, and indeed specialist departments of religious education, often with a principal teacher in charge.

The HMI reports did not attempt to analyse the tasks heads were performing in making these appointments. Often, it was a straight exercise in the deployment of resources: could the school afford a department of one, two or even three specialist teachers? Could it afford a promoted post? The question which headteachers did not always ask was whether their school curriculum required religious education in order to achieve the kind of

curricular balance referred to in the Munn report. Often the decisions about the presence of religious education were indeed taken on the pragmatic level, rather than on the philosophical. It may be that the philosophical was taken care of by the general educational milieu of the day, with Millar, Munn, and Dunning (SOED, 1977) dealing with assessment and standing alongside the Munn Report (in contributing to this general milieu) and the religious education input of HMI. If this is the case, it would be interesting, were it possible, to discover whether the more significant influence was the educational thinking of Millar and Munn, or the statutory thinking of SOED and Her Majesty's Inspectorate.

5.6 In Conclusion

As the HMI consultation process which preceded the introduction of inspection indicated, the time was ripe for action. There was little opposition from any source. Those involved in the practice of religious education had but one goal, to normalise the subject within the curriculum in order to have all the special conditions and caveats associated with it removed. The reason for this, was that what they regarded as a central part of the balanced curriculum might be made effective, rather than the limp affair which its position in law had made it. When it came to taking action however, the Scottish Office preferred to ask an existing inspector, experienced in the skills of inspection, but by definition, inexperienced, and non-specialist in terms of the subject, to undertake the task of introducing the subject to inspection. This ensured that the technical task of inspection would be well done. It did, however, not take account of the immense influence which HMI can exercise on the development of any subject and its growth within the curriculum. It is essential, given this influence, that anyone appointed to the inspectorate should be academically and professionally extremely well prepared in his

subject, in order to provide a rich stimulus to the great number of teachers of the subject, who also are extremely well equipped in their field, academically and professionally, and to be able to deal with them on an equal footing. This is in fact what normally happens in the appointment of inspectors.

Given this situation and the difficulties of the task presented when HMI started on the task of inspecting religious education, it was not surprising that their emphasis here was towards statute and statutory requirements, rather than to beating the educational drum for religious education, or to squaring every statement they made with the educational case for religious education made in Millar, and in the other literature. This influenced the work of the three SCCORE committees in terms of their conclusions about aims for religious education, and even of the content of religious education.

It is difficult at this stage in the development of religious education to see how this can change dramatically, or fast, but if the curricular subject is to demonstrate fundamentally and radically its educational purpose and scope, the task remains to be done in the longer term. Failing that, it will remain at best a semi-statutory creation, with educational potential as yet unfulfilled.

One factor which has appeared with the new millenium is the *McCrone Report and agreement*. One of its elements for teachers is a complete restructuring of the system of promoted posts within schools. The existence of a principal, or assistant principal teacher of each subject will no longer be automatic. Promoted posts will therefore be less firmly subject-related. Departments too will be less clearly defined. Exactly how this radical restructuring will affect small departments like religious education is not yet very clear. However, given these judgements of Her Majesty's Inspectorate, which was evident in a number of reports about the management of religious education, it will be necessary to ensure that the conditions required

for effective departments which they found are effectively substituted when the McCrone agreement is implemented. HMI in their national reports are quite unequivocal about what has worked, *'Religious Education is most successful in schools where there is a clearly accountable management responsibility for the subject at principal teacher or assistant principal teacher level'* (SOED, 1994,6.7).

The HMI reports included in this survey, where they comment on the quality of work in religious education, consistently refer to the centrality of the good communication clearly identifiable within the sort of group implied in the quotation above. Here, the existence of the promoted post is regarded as crucial. If that is no longer to be as easily possible, either an alternative way of creating the same conditions must be found, or it must be accepted that the quality of the work will fall.

5.7 Scope of the literature review chapters

The justification for including all three of these chapters within the review section is the context in which the developments took place. As already suggested, although the area of educationalisation was a well-worn path within the wider field of curriculum development and policy-making, it had remained until the sixties and seventies a relatively untouched area as far as the subject of religious education was concerned. Yet because of these wider movements within curriculum development and policy making generally, such a move was likely within religious education too. In practice, although some work had been undertaken by some researchers, it had not, amongst them, been the highest, and certainly not the only priority. The surge of development which was introducing educationalisation therefore involved researchers and practitioners equally in a *'hands-on'* approach to the exciting development which was taking place. This involved researchers,

but also a variety of others working in religious education who were called together to form committees to thrash out their experience and produce developments in accord with the most recent thinking and practice. The final pool of specialists available, the national Inspectorate of Schools, also were involved as soon as they had members specialising in the subject. The emerging picture, therefore, is a viable one of extremely close co-operation between all types of specialist in the area, committed to the central aim of bringing their curricular area totally within the educational fold.

CHAPTER SIX

An Analysis of the Interviews of Three Heads of RE in University faculties of Education

6.1 Introduction and Methodological Approach to the Interviews

The interview approach was chosen as one means amongst a number of other methodological means of data-collection in the study, because of the nature of the variety of data to be collected and the sources of the data. It is used in this chapter, and in chapter seven. Two types of interviewee were envisaged: teacher educators (this chapter), and HMI (chapter seven). In each case the sample of interviewees was restricted and therefore, it was feasible to achieve an interview with each. Also, in each case the setting and environment was distinctive, with a particular outcome expected from each. The questionnaire form was therefore considered less appropriate because although it would have allowed great precision, it would also have detracted from the distinctiveness of each contribution, would have limited the potential for flexibility, and would have reduced the in-depth possibilities of the interview approach. In addition, there existed much documentary evidence, discussed in a number of other chapters.

The interview form used does not fit precisely into any single of the four standard categories of: structured interview, unstructured interview, non-directive interview, or focused interview. It is related to the first. It is qualitative, and semi-structured interviewing. This was of importance with reference to the freedom left to the interviewer to make modifications and departures within each interview from the previously

devised guide schedule. The semi-structured nature of the interviews meant that a variety of avenues might be explored, which, had the questionnaire approach been used, would have been restricted, or at least, less flexible. This flexibility of the interviewer however, has the disadvantage of opening the way to the possible charge of subjectivity and bias. However, the nature of the responses sought also suggest the questionnaire approach would have been too restrictive. The data in question involved facts, opinions, as well as attitudes. Although an outcome might have been possible in these areas, using the questionnaire format, it was considered, not least in the light of the above discussion, to pursue the interview approach despite the drawbacks in terms of reliability and error factors. In all six interviews therefore, a semi-structured format was used. The questions devised were varied in type from open to closed, direct to indirect, and specific to non-specific. This is done using the variables dealt with in the study, and derived from the detailed objectives which in turn are derived from the general goals of the study and its theoretical basis.

The three research questions formed the first source of the questions put to the interviewees. These three questions were extended into four mini-research questions each of which further refined the area to be covered. The research questions and their mini-research questions are reproduced as appendix 6.4. Both sets of questions were used to work out the areas and questions for the schedule of questions which formed the structure followed in the interviews.

The interview approach therefore, is used as an enrichment of the wider review approach, of which the literature review is one facet. It has been suggested that *'it might be used to follow up unexpected results for example, or to validate other methods, or to go deeper into the motivations of the respondents and their reasons for responding as they do'* (Cohen and Manion, 1994,p 273).

This is its purpose in the study. It operates here on the basis that knowledge and evidence are '*contextual, situational and interactive*' (Mason, 2002, p64). In analysing the transcripts conversation analysis is used:

'In seeking participants' knowledge of their own everyday circumstances, conversation analysis attempts to discover how particular aspects of conversation are viewed by the speakers themselves. Behaviour is therefore analysed, and from this analysis, units, patterns and rules are derived and formulated' (Schriffen 1994, p236, quoted in Titscher et al, 2000, p107).

The interviews were semi-structured. Only the interviewer and the interviewee were involved. They were both involved in the interview itself, and the interviewer consulted the interviewees in advance about the issues and areas to be raised. The areas and issues which formed the schedules of questions, were derived from the three research questions which appear at the head of the Introduction to the study, in conjunction with mini-research questions linked to each of the three. The transcript in each case was produced by the interviewer. The pre-discussion of the schedule along with the tapes of the interviews contributed to the context and background of the transcripts, as did the official reports on RE produced by HMI, and discussed above in chapter five.

An attempt has been made to utilise carefully the '*black-market understandings*' which Charles Hull, of the University of East Anglia, quoting Stenhouse refers to, as a '*second record*' of understandings during his time in the field. He may be in a privileged position as analyst, able to interpret what appears *on the record* of the transcripts in the light of his accumulated knowledge of participants meaning systems. The corollary to this privilege however, is that these black-market understandings may even put the fieldworker/ analyst in a rather more powerful position than researchers should perhaps aspire to. His interpretations are not accountable to what is

available to others as *'project data'* but contingent on understandings unique to him as participant in the live situation from which the data are distilled (Hull, C., 1985, p28). Hull's definition of interview as *'a conversation, but of a particular kind, where actors talk to a specific and conscious purpose'* (ibid, p30), is followed in the study, and also his more detailed note describing it as *'a context of interaction, rather than as an opportunity to elicit 'off-guard' comments.'* It leads to his statement that *'My task as analyst of transcript data was to disclose significances in the transcripts. A critical task'* (ibid, p31). Nonetheless, analysis is undertaken by deriving data in literal, interpretive, and reflexive manner (Mason, 2002, p78). Here the emphasis is perhaps on the literal, followed closely by the interpretive.

6.2 Introduction

Two distinct groupings of subjects were used to make the sample of interviewees. The first was Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools, and the other was lecturers in Religious Education within Education Faculties of universities. In each of these cases a sample of three was taken. From the inspectorate, the HMI who was given the task of introducing Religious Education to inspection was invited, because he set the ball rolling and therefore played a major part in deciding direction. He was joined by the first national specialist in RE to be appointed, and the third member of the sample was the HMI who was subsequent national specialist at the time of the interview. The second group also consisted of three members. In this case it was made up of a lecturer from the universities in the two major conurbations, with the third from a smaller university. This selection was made to attempt to avoid any particular viewpoint predominating. The two sets of interviews in chapters 6 and 7, not least because, as *'conversation'*, they are, by definition live and therefore current, were regarded as having

particular significance. They are highlighted because the subjects in each case are leaders in the field of religious education. Both sets are included, because they both fulfil the criterion of leader, but in quite different ways. They do, therefore, cover areas of religious education thought and practice which no other of the subjects of the study does, and therefore, the emphasis they receive is regarded as necessary.

The aims of this chapter are to make a comparative '*conversation*' analysis of the three sets of responses of the teacher educators to the schedule of questions on which their interviews were conducted, and critically to evaluate those responses. This will be done in thematic form using the five main areas detailed in the schedules. The five areas are:

- Key Documents in RE
- The Place of RE in Educational Thinking
- Provision of RE within the three Teacher Education Institutions
- Provision of RE in Secondary Education
- The General State of RE in Secondary Schools.

The schedules (and the five areas) are reproduced as appendices (in volume 2) with the transcripts of the interviews. These areas are those which guided the study throughout. Each is developed in detail, to direct the interview discussions to produce as much detailed information from the standpoint of the interviewee as possible. The main areas were derived from the rationale of the study. That done, the interviewees were shown the schedules and invited to comment on them, making suggestions for amendment. When the interviews took place therefore, the interviewees had had the opportunity to help in the formation of the schedules. They had too, the possibility of reflecting on the areas to be raised.

Three heads of RE were interviewed and were therefore involved in this chapter. The sample included a representative from the two major

centres of population, TEI 1, and TEI 2, (TEI 2 was newly in post, and had come from furth of Scotland. He was invited to take part initially to ensure that Teacher education as represented in *both* major connurbations would be represented in the interviews. This was done on the basis that Institution policy and ethos would have a contribution to make, quite apart from the individual concerned. This was verified in the pre-meeting held before interviews took place. In addition to the above, it seemed in fact attractive to have someone involved who would have a perspective from furth of Scotland. He was therefore invited as representing one of the two major teacher education centres in Scotland, given that, in preliminary discussion, he indicated his happiness to take part). The third head was representative of the smaller centres (TEI 3). The interviews took place in their respective universities, and were recorded for transcription by the interviewer. The critical '*conversation*' analysis consists in identifying individual viewpoints, comparing and contrasting these with the views of the others, and finally, extracting pointers for the future of religious education in the curriculum made by the interviewees.

6.3 Key Documents in RE

The purpose of this section of the schedule of questions was to elicit from the participants which documents they regarded as significant in the recent development of the subject, and in what way they were important for each department. In order to do this, some documents were listed, but the way was left open for others to be added or substituted.

The reports contained in the schedule dated from 1970 to 1994. The Millar Report (SED,1972) produced a strong response from both TEI 1 and TEI 3. The latter located Millar at the foundation of modern approaches to RE by indicating that '*the Report stated that the aim of RE was not to give assent*

to any particular faith, indeed the aims of RE were the same as the aims for education in general' (Appendix 6.3.2, p402). TEI 3 also suggested that major developments dependent on Millar had been evident in both the teaching and management of RE. Taking this further, he identified *'breadth, balance, progression and coherence in RE from P1 right through to S4, S5 and S6'* (App 6.3.2, p403) which had flowed from Millar. TEI 1, while suggesting that Millar *'was perhaps less central in curricular terms'* (than SCCORE), (App 6.1.2, p353), emphasised *'its importance in educational structure and organisation'* and in particular he cited *'the recommendations that it (RE) should be the concern of the CCC, and that the Advisory Service be set up'* (App 6.1.2, p353). Nonetheless, he was prepared to describe Millar as *'the BC / AD type of document, which sets the scene'* (App 6.1.2, p353). Both of the above therefore, recognise Millar as crucial to the development of RE, and indeed hint at the reason for this centrality.

Until this report appeared, there was no articulate voice of RE in the educational world. Indeed, this was verified in 1965 in the major document, *Primary Education in Scotland* (SED 1965), or as it came better to be known, the *Primary Memorandum*, because the Secretary of State, the Rt Hon William Ross, used that description at the beginning of his introduction. It dealt with the Primary curriculum nationally, and discussed detailed methodological questions, as well as the curricular areas of Language Arts, Environmental Studies, Art and Craft Activities, Music, Physical Education, Health Education, Handwriting, Gaelic and Modern Languages. It did indeed, cover the entire curriculum, with the exception of RE. The reason for this omission is explained in the Preface to the Memorandum:

It will be noted that there is no chapter on religious education. While the Committee were aware that religious education does not come within the responsibility of the Secretary of State, they did not feel debarred on this

account from considering its place and purpose within the curriculum.

They were conscious, however, that the composition of the Committee was such that they could not deal adequately with the principles and issues involved, and they believe that the consideration of religious education should be undertaken by an ad hoc body on which both teachers and denominational interests are represented (SED, 1965, p ix).

This was so, although the committee was nineteen strong. That number was made up of a Chief Inspector, seven other Inspectors, three lecturers from Colleges of Education, seven Primary Head Teachers and one First Assistant. The members felt they were not the right group to speak authoritatively on RE, yet in their statement about how this should be done, they suggested that a designated ad hoc group should be set up consisting of *teachers and denominational interests* (Primary Memorandum, SED, 1965, p ix). This statement may have taken such a form because there was one member from the denominational sector on the committee. It is not the sort of emphasis made in either Millar or in the Durham Report (the report produced in 1970, by the Church of England Commission on Religious Education, chaired by the Bishop of Durham). The '*open enquiry dimension*' of RE adopted by Durham, Millar, and practically, in SCCORE. A detailed extension of this Millar/Durham emphasis is made by John Hull in his four curricular criteria for RE which he summarises thus, '*Religious Education should offer personal development through ideological criticism*' (Hull, 1990, BJEdSt, Vol xxxviii, No 4, Nov 1990, p338). This overall approach would not fit in with a denominational emphasis. This is one of the facets of the point made above, when Millar's aims of RE were described as '*the same as the aims for education in general*'. No additional layer is required for RE than for French, English or Maths, or any other strand of the curriculum.

The Primary Memorandum therefore, demonstrated in its otherwise

generalist piece of advice, that when it ventured within the confines of the subject, it was as it claimed, not well enough informed to speak. It was in fact talking about RI and not about RE. Despite the legal arrangements requiring that RE be taught, it was clear to the Committee members that none of them was professionally qualified to speak on RE, in the same way that they were able to contribute to curricular discussion of the other nine aspects of the primary experience of pupils.

This inability of the educational world was the spark which set in motion the movement which recognised the need for clarification to be produced within education, of what the implications of considering RE as a part of the curriculum were. It took such a situation for it to become clear that committees like the one which produced the Primary Memorandum were engaged on an educational task, and more specifically a curricular task rather than a sociological task, and that appropriate knowledge, and experience of the curricular area in question, were pre-requisites. This they were able to do by virtue of being professional educators. If it was required that RE be part of the curriculum, then the way in which this might be done was clear, as also was the question of who might undertake the task and what the appropriate training for such people might be. These issues, which till this point had not been recognised to exist, were the basic reasons why the Millar Report was important. It identified the fact that if RE was to be undertaken in schools, it had to be on precisely the same footing as every other part of the curriculum. Otherwise, the school was not an institution concerned primarily with education, it was taking on a greater social dimension. This point was well made in Millar, as it was also made in the Durham Report.

This report had a very great deal to commend it, not least its serious approach to educational religious education. There is clear evidence in its

pages that Millar was deeply influenced by it. The phrase, repeated in Millar, and which is foundational in ensuing curricular documents in Scotland, *'meaning, purpose and value'*, first appears even if in this slightly different order, in Durham. TEI 3 cites Durham for a more basic reason however, and it links to the real significance of Millar, detailed above. He quotes in his interview from Durham, section 217:

If the teacher is to press for any conversion it is conversion from a shallow and unreflective attitude to life. If he is to press for commitment it is commitment to the religious quest, to that search for meaning, purpose and value which is open to all men (App 6.3.2, p415).

This idea of the direction in which RE is going is fully explained in Millar. It is stated by Durham, but is crystallised by TEI 3 tersely, when he sums up the meaning of Durham that *'the Church of England is committed to this open enquiry dimension of RE'* (App 6.3.2, p415). In turn, this statement hints at the development in thinking about education, which has tended to make children the focus of the entire process. Already methodology had led the way with a much better understanding of child development, and now curriculum was following with the needs of children helping decide content. Durham was bold enough to accept that the content of RE should be determined by the needs of children. Millar followed the same tack. Both of them were part of the much larger movement within education, away from instruction in received wisdom, to exploration of ideas and life. This is summed up by TEI 3, with reference to Millar, when he places the old traditional view against the wider educational revolution taking place, *'the Millar Report was a watershed in transforming RI into RE'* (App 6.3.2, p413).

This wider picture is what made the interviewees acknowledge the role of the Munn Report (1977) in the development of RE. It was not a document about RE. It dealt with RE along with the rest of the curriculum.

In defining RE as a mode, it fell in with educational thinking of the time, not least of Michael Hirst, who influenced both Millar and Munn. TEI 2 is somewhat uncertain about Hirst's contribution to RE (App 6.2.2, p387) but his judgement may be based on experience of Hirst's *early* thinking. His comments in for example, the article *Morals and Religion in the Maintained School* were very influential. However transient the use of the concept 'mode', what was of significance for RE was that this national report, the subject of which was the secondary schooling process, for S3 and S4, dealt with RE as the Millar Report said it should, as a part of the curriculum like all the others. TEI 1 expressess it thus, '*So far as helping to bed RE into mainstream education is concerned, it (Munn) was very helpful*' (App 6.1.2, p353). The SCCORE bulletins bring the focus back directly on to RE.

There is broad agreement between TEI 1 and TEI 3. Both regard the two published bulletins and the third unpublished one, to be the foundation on which curricular RE in Scotland is based. It is SCCORE which develops the framework of meaning, value and purpose, first mentioned in Durham, then in Millar, and from which curriculum development in Scotland has sprung.

TEI 1 links SCCORE and Millar. Of SCCORE he says, '*I think it took forward the thinking of Millar as far as the curricular element of RE is concerned*' (App 6.1.2, p354). These documents did not hold centre-stage in the interview with TEI 2. He moved in choice to HMI. There is an additional difference. With TEI 2, the term '*Key Documents*' loses its positive hue. TEI 1 and TEI 3 saw the documents to which they referred as constructive and helpful to them and teachers in their daily task. This is not the rationale behind the choice made by TEI 2. A definite change in tone appears in this interview. TEI 2 makes the intriguing comment '*in the nature of things it is true that HMI reports tend to be bland. So my view is that they are often being*

completed for reasons other than the reasons publicly given' (App 6.2.2, p381).

Sticking with HMI reports, TEI 1 said he does not make much reference to them, but that he finds HMI reports helpful, as was Munn, in putting *'RE in the mainstream of developments in education'* (App 6.1.2, p355). TEI 3 is the most positive of the three on the question of HMI. He notes the *'leverage'* which HMI publications are able to exert *'on head teachers, senior management teams in schools, directorates'* who *'are required to take note and act on them'* (App 6.3.2, p414). He also suggests that the HMI Report *Effective Learning and Teaching*:

was good for setting out bench marks not only for good teaching practice but also good management of RME in schools, and the individual HMI school reports localised this indication of good practice for particular schools, and HMI make a return visit to ensure that any areas requiring development are acted upon (App 6.3.2, p415).

Certainly the influence of HMI was significant from the beginning of the process of ensuring the inclusion of RE within the curricular fold, given that of the total of nineteen members of the committee of the Primary Memorandum, eight were inspectors. Their influence in suggesting an ad hoc group to consider and develop RE, must have been sizable. There seemed therefore, to be broad agreement between TEI 3 and TEI 1 on the significance of the key documents, and that they were indeed central to the development of RE. They were however, less clear about the role of HMI. They were certainly regarded as external to the general educational structure, but this was considered appropriate because of the relative independence which it gave to HMI.

It was not clear from the interviews whether HMI were regarded as fulfilling a positive role in fostering the sort of change in provision of RE in schools, or a change in attitude on the part of senior management in schools,

and among the directorate. The role of HMI is discussed further in the following chapter, which deals with the HMI interviews.

6.4 The Place of RE in Educational Thinking

This section involves consideration of RE as a discrete area of the curriculum, whether it should be compulsory, its relationship to other named curricular areas, and the curriculum philosophy of the interviewees. All agreed that RE should be a free-standing discrete area of the curriculum. This position is justifiable on the pragmatic basis of the existing structure of the curriculum in schools. From Millar through Munn, the case is clearly made that RE is distinctive. It has its own rationale and content and methodology, and makes a contribution to the educational development of children which is not attempted in the same way elsewhere. The constant flux of the curriculum produces in all areas possible duplications and link-ups. Having looked at a number of these, it remained the case that the interviewees felt that if RE were not continued as a discrete area, that a whole dimension would be missing from the education being offered children and young people.

The list of areas considered included Personal and Social Education, Health Education, Sex Education, and Guidance. Links between some of these were recognised, and it was clear that the rationale for suggesting links with RE was not curricular, but rather social in emphasis. Nonetheless, the rise of these and other new areas which have possible overlap with RE and other properly curricular areas if they were to be retained at all, needed to be considered. TEI 1 made the positive point that, given that these external areas were beginning to impinge on the curriculum, a national body should examine the implications:

I think the SCCC or LTS and their raft of publications on PSE, Health

Education, and Sex Education, have muddied the waters greatly and there is a considerable amount of overlap in terms of attainment targets across a whole range of national guidelines, and much which had been traditionally tackled by RE is now appearing in these non-curricular areas which are being taught by non-subject specialists. At the end of the day, I think...there is a need nationally for a group to take together these different related documents and to identify how the similar concerns can be addressed without a considerable amount of pointless duplication (App 6.1.2 p357).

TEI 1's point about curricular / non-curricular and subject specialists / non specialist might well be challenged, but at the time of writing, Peter Peacock, Minister of Education in the Scottish Executive, had, significantly, announced a new broad review of the 3-18 curriculum. TEI 1's suggestion points to the existence of two questions:

- the first concerns the status of RE within the curriculum. Millar, Durham and Munn, along with other key documents make the case forcefully that RE is a distinct area of knowledge and experience. Given existing curricular principles this is not seriously questioned by many. The associated question which arises is the major one of what this practically means in the management of the curriculum,
- the second of these two questions is, by what criteria would decisions be made about the relationship of curricular areas (modes), to these other areas whose documents LTS has published, and which are not strictly curricular? The immediate criterion is that of content. Yet the same content may lead in dramatically different directions, depending on the context in which it is being examined.

RE must argue its case as any other area of the curriculum. So long as the school curriculum is managed in the way it presently is, that is on the basis of discrete subject areas, this is how RE must be managed. The case for

treatment of religious education as a straightforward curriculum element is one which has to be made, and its logic followed to the end, rather than being left dangling just at the point where RE is left without its protected status. However, were the basis of curriculum management to change, the treatment of RE likewise would change, as would all curriculum areas, to accord with the altered approach, whatever that might be. RE has in the past been treated as compulsory. This was not for reasons of curriculum. It was rather for social and political reasons. If any compulsory element is to continue, it has to be on a different footing from formerly. If change were to take place in this sense, it would be necessary as well as removing statutory requirements to ensure that any judgements made at local authority level, or at school management level concerning the place of RE in the curriculum, were made on the grounds of curriculum criteria alone. In the past this has not always been the case.

TEI 1 is happy that RE be compulsory, or essential for all from S1-S4. Thereafter he is less willing, because pupils themselves should be more involved in deciding which areas to study. TEI 2 clarifies the curricular basis on which he argues that RE is an essential curricular element when he points out that *'since we are not teaching children what to think but how to think, I can see no justification for allowing children to withdraw'* (App 6.2.2, p382). TEI 3 combines argument for both the discrete nature of RE and its essential nature:

It's an essential element because there's a characteristic way of thinking, distinctive of the religious and moral mode which combines rationality with feeling, with imagination and symbolic thinking. It's a sort of holistic way of seeing things and it deals with questions which it is the birthright of everybody to think about (App 6.3.2, pp416-7).

There were introduced into the discussion three areas which are not

part of the LTS '*raft of publications*'.

The first is Spirituality. The scope of this non-curricular area is well put in the discussion paper *Spiritual, Moral, Social And Cultural Development*, (OFSTED, 1994), which states that '*development is closely related to the ideas of growth and maturing*', though clearly not limited to spirituality (OFSTED 1994, 6). The discussion paper defines spiritual development thus:

Spiritual development then, is concerned with how an individual acquires personal beliefs and values, especially on questions about religion, whether life has purpose, and the basis for personal and social behaviour - questions which are 'at the heart and root of existence' (OFSTED, 1994, 8).

In fact the broad area of concern of Spirituality, as defined by OFSTED, is taken further and specifically developed in the *5-14 National Guidelines, Religious and Moral Education* (SOED 1992) under the heading of Personal Search, which is sub-divided into three strands, *The Natural World, Relationships and Moral Values, Ultimate Questions*. Each of these in turn is split into five levels of pupil attainment targets. It does therefore, deal with the concerns of Spirituality and gives them a curricular context. Nonetheless, given that Spirituality is non-curricular, it cannot be subsumed into a single curricular area like RE. For it to achieve its aims, it has to penetrate the other curricular areas too, making them sensitive to its wider concerns.

The second such area is Citizenship. It is not unlike Spirituality in that it is trying to fill a perceived gap. It may well be indeed, that in the main, the concerns of Citizenship might be contextualised within the Social Subject area, just as Spirituality in the RE mode. As with Spirituality, it cannot be subsumed, but rather operates by influencing the existing curricular areas, making them execute their own aims in the light of the broader aims of Citizenship.

The third of the areas is that of Philosophy. Already there is a link, in

that Religious Moral and Philosophical Studies is an area in which senior pupils may opt to follow a certificate course. This is so, in that there are clear curricular links between the area covered by Philosophy and that covered by RE, just as there are specific links between the Religious and the Moral areas. TEI 3 sees a curricular link with RE and Philosophy, particularly with the development of work on the area of ultimate questions in Personal Search. TEI 1 also sees Personal Search as a link. He suggests that *'there are elements of philosophical enquiry which are appropriate within religion, but the whole history of religious traditions contains a richness which is not covered within the context of Philosophy'* (App 6.1.2, p 359).

Almost on an escalating scale, the views of TEI 2 on this matter differ somewhat. Philosophy is the key to his approach with student teachers:

...the kind of RE which we encourage is one which moves away from the World Religions model, to one which is specifically philosophical, and here we encourage students to engage with Moral Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion, and the reason is that we believe that this focusses more sharply on issues which are important to children and which encourage critical thinking (App 6.2.2, p 383).

It is clear from other statements of TEI 2 that Philosophy, and what he calls *'the philosophical approach to RE'* is at the heart of his thinking. He is not simply importing another curricular area to make up for the bad public image he considers RE to have, despite the fact that he says where terminology is unhelpful, one should change it. The basis for his position is his response to the big debate within RE between the phenomenological approach and the other emphases, in this case the philosophical. He considers the former approaches to be mere *'description'* of religion, boring to both pupil and teacher, and therefore *'not a worthwhile pursuit for the growing mind, not educational, and certainly not a fruitful one'* (ibid). He regards

the aims one might have within a phenomenological approach, not to be worthwhile. In his case, the alternative to the phenomenological is the philosophical, in which, as he says above, he is interested in teaching children *'how to think...'* (ibid). This he regards as a worthwhile, even useful facility, rather than simply to provide them with factual information. It is however, widely accepted that the study of religions is helpful within RE. The national *5-14 Guidelines for RE* include the study of religions as two of their three-point analysis of the content of RE. They stipulate the specific study of Christianity for historical, sociological and cultural reasons, and they also include the study of other world religions. However it is significant that the guidelines do not stop there. They also include that area, Personal Search, which covers the experiential in religious education. This three-fold division of the 5-14 Guidelines is made in order to cover the wide area of the mode, and to attempt to achieve a balance of coverage of the different strands in the possible content. Despite this inclusion of the Personal Search in the guidelines, TEI 2 cannot accept them. He says *'the 5-14 document is not for me an authoritative document'* (App 6.2.2, p364). So strong is his feeling that he has to tell his students that *'they should not feel bound by it'* (App 6.2.2, p399).

This part of the discussion was concluded with the broader question of curriculum philosophy. TEI 3 listed some key principles which he regarded as important across the curriculum, and with particular reference to RE. The first of these was the existence of different traditions of enquiry, or *modes, of which RME was one*. Following directly from this, he regarded it as a *right of pupils* to experience each of the modes. RE therefore, is *'an entitlement of all pupils'* (App 6.3.2 p420) as is the experience of the mathematical mode, the scientific mode, and the others. A second principle was that of *relevance*. The modes are the core framework. It is then essential to select content which is directly relevant to those at whom it is aimed. In the case of RE, this means a

balanced selection of areas based on knowledge and understanding on the one hand, and on the experiential, dealing with the questions of meaning that young people are asking. His third principle was *developmentalism*. This is to say, that the curriculum must specifically take account of the traditional *ages and stages* approach, but must also pay heed to the social, emotional and spiritual development of pupils. TEI 2's contribution to this part of the discussion was simply to state that RE should be approached from a philosophical perspective, with the aim of ensuring that pupils '*learn to philosophise*'. One of his reasons for making this emphasis is related to the TEI 3 '*relevance principle*'. TEI 2's view was that the phenomenological, or world religions approach to RE was both boring and non-relevant.

The place of philosophy, therefore, may be similar to Spirituality or Citizenship, above, if it is taken as non-curricular. It might be an emphasis which curricular areas might use to improve achievement of their own aims. However, Philosophy may also be seen as curricular. As TEI 1 suggested above, it really is a distinct curricular area, with aims which are quite distinct from those of RE. There is in fact, a debate about which of these two models should be used, in considering the relationship of RE and Philosophy. In most Teacher Education Institutions, Philosophy is regarded as curricular, and quite distinct from RE, whereas elsewhere Philosophy is regarded as non-curricular, and worthy of having a major influence on curricular RE. It is not clear from the interview whether Philosophy has taken over the curricular driving seat from RE, or whether it is simply being used in the same way as described above in relation to Spirituality and Citizenship, to help crystallise the aims of RE which derive from the mode itself, as well as to help in the selection of content, and indeed of methodology.

What is clear in the responses of TEI 2, is that he considers the phenomenological approach to religious education as worthless '*description of*

religion', the mere presentation of inert factual information. This is to say that, for him, there is no value in the study of world religions if done in a phenomenological way. In discussing this matter he opts to use evocative language, describing '*boredom as a necessary concomitant of teaching of world religions*'. His argument too, cites his experience to suggest that only those RE departments which adopt a philosophical approach are flourishing:

There is some important research in this area, by Dr Wallace, of Lothian Region, who amongst others discovered first of all that the phenomenological approach, the World Religions approach, bores not just children but teachers. Secondly, the children who are engaged in that kind of RME see no relationship whatsoever between it and life. Now, if it is being perceived as having no relevance whatsoever to life, then I think as a discrete area it will just wither, and I'm very concerned to produce a model of RME which tries to establish the importance of showing children that there is a possible relationship between this subject, and life itself. If that cannot be established, then it will quickly disappear as a discrete area (App 6.2.2, 406).

He also links the move from the phenomenological approach with child centred approaches:

I think there is a general recognition that it (the phenomenological approach) doesn't work... So I think that in the schools I visit, there tends to be a child-centred approach, to use an old sixties term, rather than a subject-centred approach. In other words, the subject fits into the child. The child does not fit into the subject (App 6.2.2, 406).

He may in the interview, be making a case, rather than following a logical and rational line of argument in balanced and fair fashion. The concrete evidence he points to no doubt could be equalled by the same sort of evidence on the other side of the phenomenological fence. He may therefore, be using the existence of good teaching skills, rather than the

analysis of the quality of the methodology and content being employed. He feels he has a case, but he does not make it in this context. He may not be just to the case for the phenomenological approach in all its forms. He equates it with boredom and irrelevance. This seems to imply that all that is needed to ensure pupil motivation is to avoid the word religion, to use the word philosophy, and to use the '*philosophical approach*' and above all, to avoid world religions. He makes no reference to quality of teaching, or to pupil-teacher relationships.

If the emphasis made by TEI 2 were to be pursued, it would need to be done at a fundamental level, going back to the philosophical as well as social, sociological and religious roots of religious education and the place it might have in the curriculum. It would be inadequate to consider it on the basis merely of methodological and content analysis of the subject. It would for example, be instructive to lay the thinking of TEI 2 alongside that of others involved in the development of religious education for example, Ninian Smart, or indeed closer to curricular RE and the present day, Robert Jackson.

TEI 3 takes a different view from that of TEI 2 on the place of phenomenology and the place of personal search. Describing how he deals with the SCCORE Framework, he refers to:

the different models of RE offered in SCCORE. Model A begins with the religious traditions, and moves on towards ultimate questions, the area of Personal Search. Model B begins with the experience of the pupils, with their search for meaning, value and purpose, and then moves towards the religious traditions. So we look at both models and try to explore their implications. Its not our principal role in teacher education to teach students about the religions, because they already come with a degree, and in the 60 hours we don't have the time to do that. Nevertheless, we refer to the

religions, Christianity, and other religions as exemplars of ways of teaching RME. So we try to cover all six major religions in the exemplars we use.

And we try to integrate personal search with the religious traditions

(App 6.3.2, p 432).

Subsequently he continues:

We certainly make it clear that study of religions without personal search is not RE at all, because being education, it must be relevant to the needs and interests of the pupils as they develop. Like many aspects of RME, personal search is a problematic term. Just what does it refer to? Whose questions are being answered? What are ultimate questions? For many teachers that's quite difficult. My own view is, that while we are leading pupils towards asking ultimate questions, we shouldn't be burdening them with ultimate questions all the time. Many of the questions that pupils ask are more proximate questions, like, where can I find happiness, or what should I do next? Perhaps these are the best places to start, and then look towards the ultimate questions (ibid, p432).

TEI 1 has a slightly different angle. Replying to a question about the emphasis encouraged for the different elements of the RE curriculum, he indicated that :

We make it quite clear that any unit, any module, any course should be firmly centred on the pupil. It may not always start from the pupil's experience, but there should always be a reference and reflection on the pupil's experience. So we would put Personal Search, and the pupils themselves, at the very heart of the RE curriculum (App 6.1.2, p370).

The case has already been well made for the place of religious education in the curriculum. Sufficient general statements have been worked through within the literature to allow of the progress which has already been made. The issue which now is on the horizon is, has development along the

lines argued proceeded rationally and far enough? In other words, has application of the findings of the debate been successful? The next section takes up this point in a particular instance.

6.5 Provision of RE within the three Teacher Education Faculties

This section follows on by looking at the provision for Religious Education in the three institutions, its function, locus and staffing. To do this the following points will be discussed:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| staffing: | qualifications required, and the number
employed in RE, |
| status: | the place of RE within the structure of the
institution, |
| courses: | on offer, and the time allocated to them,
qualifications required for entry to the
courses. |

Staffing

The qualifications for staff in RE, in TEI 2's colourful description are *'What they require, I think is a kind of philosopher warrior, using the platonic view of society. They want you to be a researcher, but also somebody who has been at the front line and has taught'* (App 6.2.2, p392), or as TEI 3 more precisely puts it, *'the basic preparation is the possession of a degree and a teaching qualification'* (App 6.3.2, p421). Both of these elements are necessary, since the main aim of the educators is to prepare students vocationally to be able to teach RE as it presently exists in the schools, and in the *5-14 National Guidelines*. This is to say, that what is required for a teacher educator in RE is the same as that which is required for any of the school subjects offering teacher qualifying courses to students. In none of the faculties is RE a department on its own. This is so, because the practice of having multiple departments has proven

too expensive, and larger groupings therefore, have been made.

Status of the subject

In TEI 3, at the time of the interview, RE, which is not a department on its own, is within the School of Education which is within the Faculty of Education and Media. As in other subjects RE has a co-ordinator in charge. The RE staffing complement is fixed at one.

In TEI 1, similarly RE is not a separate department. Again, larger groupings have been formed, and RE is within the Social Studies Department. This does not make a philosophical or educational point. RE is not thereby a social subject nor is it seen as such. Its positioning is a matter of administrative convenience. There are two permanent members of staff in RE, and a third lecturer is employed from time to time on a part-time basis.

In TEI 2, RE is within the Arts and Humanities Department. There is one permanent member of staff, and a second works two days per week.

Courses

In all three institutions, the goal of the lecturers is to enable their students, primary or secondary specialist teachers, to be able to cope with teaching, and to be able to deal with the national guidelines for RE 5-14. In the case of secondary specialists, attention is also paid to managing Religious Studies courses. Again, like other subject areas, they offer the same range of courses. Within the primary sector they contribute to the university degree course B.Ed., which extends over four years, and they also offer a one year course for Primary post graduate students. At secondary they offer the one year post-graduate course for secondary specialist students. In the main, no course is offered like that which was formerly available for non-specialist teachers. At a time when non-specialists were widely used in schools to provide RE cover in the curriculum, Colleges felt it wise to provide teachers

in training with as much help as they could. This was done within the one-year course for secondary students by offering a short course to introduce them to what they might encounter, should they be asked by their head teacher to teach RE. It was in no sense a professional qualification, rather a help for those who might be asked, as well as teaching their own specialist subject, to be non-specialist teachers of RE.

Now, however, TEI 1 is planning perhaps to offer an APD (Area of Professional Development) in RE. Some are already provided in other areas. It is however important to note TEI 1's statement '*An APD is not a teaching qualification. It is just an added area of interest which students are required to follow depending on whether they pursue one or two teaching subjects*' (App6.1.2, p332). It took a number of years before it was possible to stop the practice of schools relying on the use of non-specialist volunteers to teach RE. That they had undergone a non-specialist course for which they were awarded a certificate, made no difference to the fact that their education and training were both inadequate for the task of teaching RE. APDs therefore, are not designed to enable teachers to teach the content of the course.

The very title of this type of course indicates that professional development is the aim. The range of courses on offer is quite extensive. Fourteen of them were available in session 2003-4, with additional courses to be offered in 2004-5, including that mentioned by TEI 1 above. They are not designed to raise academic standards. It is not intended that an APD should equip a student to teach the material in the course. It may well be however, that a major contribution of the APD system is that, while not aiming directly at making a contribution to raising academic standards, it may be able to perform the equally vital task of ensuring that '*specialist*' does not imply '*isolated*'. It may therefore, contribute to ensuring that the secondary teacher is able to look beyond her/his own specialism, and to have a greater

appreciation of the entire curriculum, rather than simply her/his own academic contribution to it.

APDs therefore, are unrelated to the current interest in raising academic standards. In this respect, as part of this interest, the GTC upgraded entry-requirements for all secondary subjects. (This was, however, later reversed in order to help reach teacher recruitment goals. Entry requirements were then downgraded for all specialist subjects to 80 points). For entry to the secondary specialist course in RE on the GTC upgrading, candidates needed to have three degree-level passes in the area of Religious Studies or Theology. Given this intensification of the academic requirements it seemed that a similar improvement in the professional support and training should be offered, rather than an unrelated type of professional development.

Such support however, given the constraints of the PGCE course, were virtually impossible. This was the broad pattern of course provision across the three faculties. However, there were significant variations which need to be highlighted. In TEI 3, and in TEI 2, RE were pressed because of the paucity of staffing provision. The sort of picture which presented itself at these two universities was somewhat reminiscent of the head teachers in the 1970s, with a roll of well over 1000 pupils who, nonetheless, insisted that a single full-time member of staff was entirely sufficient to cover all the needs of RE in the school. TEI 3 is perhaps a good example to look at in detail.

The single-person RE team in the year of the interview had to provide a course in RE for :

- around eighty in each of the B.Ed. four years. RE is part of their core in all years.
The total time allocation for RE in B.Ed. is sixty hours.
- He had also to provide a course for thirty-one Post-Graduate Primary students, and,

- four secondary specialist students, for whom contact time is seventy-two hours

In addition to being the sole RE person he also had responsibility for Equal Opportunities and Personal and Social Development, in which mode he contributes to the BA Childhood Studies degree at level 2, one module. This timetable appears to be very full. If so, it clearly is at a cost. In this case the cost has to be in a certain richness of provision, where for example, research would be more easily undertaken. In TEI 3, the case has already been made that their provision of time and staff resources to RE are too meagre, and that the professional benefit to students would be greater were it to be upgraded. The case was strongly made by the external examiner. No movement in this direction took place. Indeed, the degree structure is currently under revision, and provision of RE within the degree B.Ed. is to be radically changed if the proposals proceed. Its new shape will be for core RE to be provided in years one and four. The considered view of the RE department is:

Now B.Ed.1 of course is a pivotal time to receive RE, as is B.Ed. 4, before students begin their teaching career. However, there is quite a gap there. Students receive no formal RE input between these years, and I think there is a difficulty there which will require to be addressed (App6.3.2, p425).

The University was advised by its own external examiner, that it was providing inadequate time and manpower to allow the co-ordinator in RE best to do his job. It failed to take that advice and is now moving in the opposite direction. It appears to be a case of educational unclear thinking in operation. The University seems to be too meagre in its provision to allow the task of preparation of students for classroom work in RE to be done. Specific advice about how to achieve the goal of ensuring that the best possible provision be made for students may be required. The intention of

cutting provision of what is widely accepted as a core modal area, and one which has undergone massive development over the last twenty years in all education sectors, is not an option which readily recommends itself. When students enter schools they will encounter the sort of RE which has developed over the past twenty years, not least that in which HMI now have the same interest as they have in all areas of the curriculum

Universities, traditionally, have been accustomed to great freedom of action. The incorporation of colleges of teacher education within their bounds however, has given them additional responsibilities. One of these is to see as a major goal the best possible preparation and support of student teachers for the profession of teaching. This responsibility needs to be evident in the procedures and management of the universities and the degrees which they offer. Given that RE is a core area of both primary and secondary school curricula, this fact needs to be taken fully into account by the universities.

The 1.6 members of staff of RE in TEI 2 have some factors in common with the situation in TEI 3. This TEI, as with the other two, has been subsumed within a nearby university. Provision of RE for the degree B.Ed. before the absorption of the college, was to have the subject as core provision for all, in all four years. This was done on the basis of two-hour lecture seminars (combining both of these functions at one meeting) for ten weeks in each year. Under the auspices of the new University B.Ed. degree that position is changed. B.Ed. students now receive ten lectures/seminars of two hours in total over the four years. There is however, provision for elective courses. One of the stated guiding principles in this decision has been that of a reduction in contact time. RE therefore, loses three quarters of its time slot. Would-be primary teachers lose the support and academic development in a subject which the reports of the past twenty years indicate

they need. The ghost of the Primary Memorandum walks again!

This university looks as if, like that already discussed, it is in danger of weakening the provision made by this TEI in one of the core modal areas of the school curriculum. It may simply be a question of the two needs, academic/ university and professional/ vocational/ college not quite yet meeting. That seems not unreasonable, given the magnitude and recent nature of the change. However, it does not seem as if sufficient sensitivity is on tap, if a core area of the curriculum no less, can be threatened in this manner. The core nature of modern RE what is more, has been extensively researched, supported by the Secretary of State for Scotland of his day, Her Majesty's Senior Chief Inspector of Education, specialist inspectors of Religious Education, and a whole series of curricular developments instituted since 1983. To confirm this, what was formerly a forbidden area is now regularly and formally inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectorate. The RE lecturer in place has taken the action he may: *'Obviously I've made formal objections, and the external examiner...has written quite a direct report which has been sent not only to the Chair of the Examination Board, but also to the Principal of the University'* (App 6.2.2, p395).

The content of the secondary course in the institutions is related closely to the different stages of a pupil's school experience. In TEI 3, this is closely linked with the student's school practice. It starts with the upper school, and covers what the student will find on placement. Much emphasis is given to Religious Studies, and in particular Higher Still at this point. For the S3-S4 placement, attention is paid to Short Courses and Standard Grade. The final placement sees students working with S1-S2, and for this there has been a greater focus on 5-14 and *Primary/Secondary liaison*. Generally, other significant areas are covered, including *the aims of RE, changes in RE in recent decades, differentiation, assessment, and learning and teaching methods*. All this is

done, in addition to taking in for example worksheets, artefacts, field-trips. The main focus of assessment in RE is in relation to the whole-school experience of students, not simply teaching. There is however, another written assessment for RE.

In TEI 1, the pattern of the specialist course (secondary) tends to be *consideration of rationale and aims, past and present. Religious and Moral Development* follows, and the principles and practice of the *5-14 National Guidelines* and their development into the *Strathclyde Framework* of the 1990's. Thereafter, it is a question of practical preparation for the classroom, dealing with lesson preparation techniques, use of discussion, use of artefacts, literacy across the curriculum, differentiation, development of worksheets, use of stories, games, simulations and ICT. In the second semester certificate courses (*Religious Studies*) are included. Covered also is the *primary/secondary interface*, and also the *multi-faith nature of society*. Finally, work is done on *religion on the ground*, in the form of visits to local places of worship, and the St Mungo Museum of Religion, relating these to the work of a school RE department. Assessment is conducted on a faculty basis, with elements relating to the particular subject and also to the students performance while on school placement.

In TEI 2, the specialist course covers consideration of the relationship between religion and morality, and the difference between education, indoctrination and initiation. The main issues dealt with are linked directly with the management of children, the production of professional-looking worksheets, which are differentiated, and which use language enabling children to gain access to the skills of teaching. The *5-14* document is covered in that it is recognised to be the *National Guidelines for RE*, although as indicated above, they are not regarded as authoritative. Students are made aware that the Guidelines exist, but that they should not be allowed to stifle

creativity. Nonetheless the three dimensions, Christianity, World Religions, Personal Search, are studied in the course. Personal Search is highlighted as the key area. There are three school placements for students in TEI 2, and the three formal assessments of the course are based on these placements.

Provision within these three faculties therefore, is rather varied. Staffing is clearly the biggest problem. This is of interest because the reason is unclear. It does not reflect national thinking on the curriculum. It may be that administrative requirements are at least one of the roots of the matter. There is a long tradition of religious education in teacher education, an even longer study of Theology in universities, and in more recent times, a strong development of Religious Studies within universities. The direction of an explanation for the inadequate provision in at least two of the faculties is difficult to find. Certainly the provision is inadequate. One of the factors emerging from the detail of provision of RE in the faculties is the GTC action referred to, which was intended to raise the standards of teaching, by requiring entrants to possess three degree passes in their subject. From this has come a debate among the faculties, but more widespread, about the relationship of philosophy and religious education. In the main, the GTC action simply meant a wider selection for most students from their religious studies or theology courses. However, one faculty department opted to allow philosophy to be the additional subject. To the other two departments this seemed inappropriate, because philosophy is regarded as quite distinct from religious and moral, and was not to be confused with the modal area. At the point of the interviews the debate was in full swing.

One of the components which might, or might not, have some influence was the existence of the certificate exam bearing that name, Religious, Moral, and Philosophical Studies (RMPS), Higher Still. This debate indicates well the energy and life which is integral to the presentation of

religious education in the faculties of education. However, it is clear that provision is not as it ought to be. Students are coming with better initial training than ever. The academic activity of those responsible for students within RE is impressive. The kind of provision which the universities are seeing fit to make for the subject within the training of would-be primary teachers is less than adequate, and does not live up to the curricular and management developments of RE in school education. The only sure basis on which to make decisions about such matters is curricular. If a curricular criterion is applied to either school or university provision, it might be done by using first principles, rather than existing provision. This would mean identifying the needs which one wishes to meet in the curriculum, and then allocating for example, time to achieve this. This would be done using the same sorts of economic criteria in reverse employed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in allocating rates at which income tax might be levied on each individual.

The main concern of the above discussion is to make the point that an effective curriculum must be planned. Presently, the curriculum and the distribution of provision in subject, like Topsy, *'has just grown'*. The fact that the increase in academic requirements for entry to the course of teacher education referred to above has been reversed, and now stands at two degree-passes rather than three, says nothing about the professional education which these candidates should receive. The criterion which might be applied in making decisions about such education remains the same. It is, *'what will produce the best prepared teachers'*?

6.6 Provision of RE in Secondary Education

Pursuing the thematic approach, this fourth topic is discussed using the sub-headings of, specialist RE staff, the departmental status of RE, the

promoted post in use, the status of the subject within the curriculum, time allocation, content of the courses, religious studies, relationship with school management, RE as core element of the curriculum and its relationship with RS in the senior school, and finally, an overall impression and looking ahead. The nature of this section was described to the interviewees as being *impressionistic*. Its importance therefore, is not as a detailed statistical analysis of the situation in the provision of the subject in Scottish secondary schools. Rather it is to get a reflection of the experience of these teacher educators in their involvement with secondary schools. As they themselves indicate, they are not involved with all the secondaries of their area, but only with a selection, chosen because they can meet the needs of the TEI for placements for students. The schools they visit therefore, are centres of good practice. No school is invited to take students unless it is known to be able to provide a useful input to the student's training. This limits the first-hand experience of the interviewees, but these questions were not put on the basis only of schools visited, but on knowledge gradually gathered over a long period of time, by working in a defined educational and geographical area.

Precision of fact and figures is not the object of this section. In all three cases, though TEI 2 was somewhat less certain than the others, it was agreed that RE staffing is now almost entirely specialist in training, and over almost all schools. TEI 3 estimated that in his area around 5% of secondaries were without specialist staff, while TEI 1 ventured that he was unaware of any school within the bounds of his catchment area without specialist RE staff, now that the last secondary in the city without an RE specialist was currently advertising for one. The view of the strength of departments was also quite upbeat, with an estimated 60% of schools in his area having more than one member in the RE department, and '*the majority*' being the impression of TEI 1 for the secondaries of his area. Departmental status in

schools seemed to be on somewhat the same basis as in the TEIs themselves. The subject was clearly distinctive. There was therefore, a job to be done, and those responsible for doing it had to be able to work alongside the management of the institution, whether college or school.

In the case of promoted posts however, the picture painted was varied. TEI 1 was of the view that numbers of principal teachers of RE were diminishing in favour of assistant principal teachers, whereas the view of TEI 3 was that where there is a promoted post it is normally at principal teacher level, though there is a large percentage of assistant principal teacherships too. TEI 2 was less hopeful about promoted posts, and it was he who referred to the restructuring of the teaching profession, embodied in the proposals of the Howie Committee (Upper Secondary Education In Scotland, SED, 1992) the implications of which will affect the use of principal teacherships across the board. In practical timetable terms, TEI 1 drew a reasonable picture of three periods per week at S1-S2, between two and three hours at S3-S4, with the situation in S5-S6 being quite varied, though with the majority of schools offering some form of core RE in S5-S6. In the TEI 3 area, the picture is of 50-55 minutes per week at S1-S2, and also at S3-S4, with greatly differing provision at S5-S6. In all cases, both TEI 1 and TEI 3 found that RE was an essential element of the curriculum of all pupils from S1-S4. Beyond that there was great variety of provision. Core RE is that dimension of the subject to be experienced by all pupils.

The context of 'core' had already been suggested in 5-14. It tends in the areas represented to reflect the 5-14 *National Guidelines*, and in particular the three strands, *Personal Search, Christianity and World Religions*. In the TEI 3 area, the religious traditions are approached through Personal Search. Christianity has the emphasis, but World Religions is catching up. The moral area too, is covered in relation to Personal Search. TEI 1 noted that in his

area '*at times the critical thinking and key questions associated with Personal Search do not always penetrate through the study of Christianity and other world religions*' (App 6.1.2 p370). The emphasis in the schools of the TEI 2 area appears also to be on Personal Search. Whether making a personal point or reflecting the practice in the schools of his area, TEI 2 suggested that the phenomenological approach does not work because it bores both teachers and children, and is not child-centred. It is not clear whether he includes the two sections of the guidelines dealing with religions as phenomenology.

Closely linked is the area of Religious Studies. There is however, one link here between TEI 2 and TEI 1. The latter recognises that schools find *Personal Search* problematic. It may be that what is a relatively rigid distinction between the three dimensions in the National Guidelines needs considerably to be softened, certainly when it comes to the question of teaching content. Religious Studies ought to be optional, if it follows the general pattern. In the words of TEI 1 '*I regard Religious Studies as an optional extra for youngsters who have a particular interest in this area*' (App 6.1.2., p371). However, there seems to be a debate about the locus of RS.

The above is a debate fuelled by HM Inspectorate. HMI 2 is quoted below as regarding in particular, Short Courses '*as an excellent substitute for core RE*'. One suspects he may be making negative comment about some of the core provision he has seen in some schools. However, at least two of the teacher educators making a cold analytical and clinical educational judgement are of the view that a Short Course does not provide a balanced educational experience of RE for pupils, if that is the total experience. TEI 3 is of the view that two such courses would still not be balanced in a curricular sense. It is important that this is not a critical comment on Short Courses, but on the use of one such course as the sole RE experience for pupils. Diplomatically, TEI 1 is clear about the relationship of RS and core '*I regard Religious Studies as an*

optional extra for youngsters who have a particular interest in this area, and my own priority and emphasis would always be in sound, core religious education' (App 6.1.2, p371). He suggests that so potentially important is this case of the use of Short Courses as core that *'we need an exploration of these issues at national level'* (ibid). TEI 3 also pinpoints the use of Short Courses for core RE in the senior school. He is of the view that *'The Short Courses are restricted in terms of the learning outcomes, the instruments of assessment which teachers may use, and what exactly is to be assessed...Even two short courses would not provide a proper balance'* (App 6.3.2, p434). He makes the point that although this example of RS is used, it is allocated timetable time as for core RE. However, it does happen that more balanced courses of RS are used instead of core provision of RE. TEI 3 cited two schools in his area which follow Standard Grade throughout S3 and S4 as core RE (App 6.3.2, p433). They also do this on the basis of core time allocation, one period per week. One cohort sat the Standard Grade exam the year before the interview. It seems to be the pattern, that in the case of Standard Grade or of Short Courses, where it replaces core RE, it does so for all pupils in the cohort. In the case of Standard Grade the numbers of schools involved seems to be relatively small, though since this was an impressionistic session, no precise count has been taken.

The issues raised by this practice are not basic but detailed. Certificate courses in schools are, in the main, optional, as TEI 1's definition quoted above suggests. There are however, several courses which schools or the Exam Board, tend to assume all pupils will follow for example, English. If RE is included within this essential group, it is reasonable that the entire cohort should follow such a course. The same justification as that used for English would not apply to RS. On the other hand, the basic justification offered by TEI 2 *'since we are not teaching children what to think but how to think, I can see*

no justification for allowing children to withdraw' (App 6.2.2, p382) is entirely within reason, particularly when linked to the experiential emphasis in RE/RS, as defined in the *5-14 Guidelines* heading of *Personal Search*. A major objection to the use of even a balanced RS course at S3-S4 (whether it be Standard Grade, or more than one Short Course) instead of core RE, is the time factor. It does indeed highlight the problem.

The time allocation given in the official publications are in all cases, minimum figures. They are in no sense given with a balanced certificate course in mind. To try to meet the requirements of such a course in a single period per week is demonstration of the most incredible optimism on the part of the RE staff, and perhaps of some level of cynicism on the part of school management. It is astonishing that in those cases the results have proven to be so favourable. However, the results are reasonable and this may make a case for a more fundamental examination of the place of RE/RS within the curriculum, given TEI 2's justification, and the OFSTED quotation made above (OFSTED, 1994, 8), and the obvious interest-factor which is present for RS. It is perhaps, the moment to look more realistically at the statement of aims for RE given in Durham, Hull, Millar, and all of the succeeding Scottish reports which have addressed the question, and the benefits which accrue to pupils. It may be that core RE has simply proven the case for RE/RS as a core, and essential, part of the curriculum of all pupils. The time may now have come for the youthful experience of a beginner subject to be replaced by a serious grown-up experience of this vital field of study for all pupils. The level required would be to ensure maximum benefit for all pupils as they enter adult life.

6.7 General State of RE in Secondary Schools

The impressions given by the interviewees reflect a very great deal of

progress over the years since Millar *'in relation to the curriculum, learning and teaching approaches, development planning, certificated courses, staffing in RE departments, resourcing of RE departments, different forms of assessment, differentiation'* (App 6.3.2, p413). TEI 1 is clear *'My general impression is that we have made great strides over the last twenty to thirty years'* (App 6.1.2, p373). If there is any degree of general accuracy in what they say, it would be unacceptable not to capitalise on this curricular area. In the past it has been badly under-supported and little understood. Now it is only just on the threshold of realising the contribution it can make to the educational development of the young. It is not yet making that contribution.

6.8 In Conclusion

The interviewees were more modest in their look to the future. Their attempt at viewing what might be was limited to consolidating what is already well underway. This was aimed at ensuring S1-S2 RE ties in with 5-14, and that the minimum time allocations of 5% in S1-S2, and 80 hours in S3-S4 is fully realised, and that the Higher Still reforms be developed with a view to ensuring their attractiveness as fields of study. It is educational and practical realism which has clearly singled out the vital areas of Language, Mathematics, Science, to be experienced by all pupils. Religious Education / Studies, properly understood, is in this same category, essential to all educated people for the reasons given above and below. It may be time to move on and perceive that the contribution that RE/RS can make to the quality of life of the balanced adult is, at least, as great as that offered by English, Mathematics and Science. If this is so, a more realistic evaluation of how to ensure that this contribution can be realised is required.

6.9 Structure of the Areas covered in the Schedule of Questions

Key Documents in Religious Education

Place of Religious Education in Educational Thinking

Place of Religious Education within the Institution

Place of Religious Education within Secondary Education.

CHAPTER SEVEN

An Analysis of the Interviews of HMIs of Schools with responsibility for Religious Education

7.1 Methodological Approach to Chapter Seven

This chapter stands alongside chapter six as indicated. The same methodological principles apply in both cases. They are explored by means of *conversation analysis*. In both cases reflexive context-orientation is key to the method, and this is reflected in the transcripts, and indeed in the selection of interviewees. One of the main reasons for the use of conversation analysis is the point that, '*conversation analysis seeks only to discover the generative procedures used by participants and does not seek to influence or change those procedures*' (Titscher et al, 2000, p119). The anonymity of the interviewees is protected. Both chapters consist of interviews of significant and influential, participants in the evolving *educationalisation* of Religious Education.

Both sets of interviewees merit particular attention because of the distinctive position which they occupied, and the individual perspectives they were able to bring to the information, views and data, which they offered, because of the position they occupied in the educational world. Both sets of interviewees were regarded as significant. In one sense HMI were so, partly because they were newcomers to the scene. Of the three HMIs invited to contribute, the first (HMI 1) was the HMI who introduced RE to inspection. The second subject (HMI 2) was the first National Specialist HMI in RE,

and the third (HMI 3) was the following National Specialist HMI in RE (at the time of the interviews). These three were invited because their contribution to the development of the subject was specific, and determined by the post they held. The study has identified the moment of the introduction of inspection as an event of high symbolic importance in the process of educationalisation. In addition, since it was a new development, there was a great surge of energy to ensure the success of its effect and influence on this new curricular element.

The questions devised for the schedules relate directly to the task of the Inspectorate. Those for HMI 1 (appendix 7.1.1) are particular to him, because his task was quite different from that of those who followed him. As the introducer of inspection he had a broad remit, a formative role, and his interview explores that. The level of context orientation here is high. The schedules aimed at the remaining two inspectors, HMI 2 and HMI 3 (Appendices 7.2.1 and 7.3.1), are related to their particular task and location, in order to discover their contribution to the process of inspection of religious education, and their contribution to the wider *educationalisation* of religious education. It is for this reason that HMI have been considered in two separate sections. In the first is the person designated to introduce the subject area religious education, to inspection. In the second section the interviews of two professionally specialist RE HMIs are considered. In both cases however, they are examined critically, by studying the context in which they were introduced to their task of inspection and how that task was continued. The contributions of all three inspectors are compared critically, to identify the contribution of each, and the background against which they operated. It is in this comparison that it is possible to see something of the nature of the symbolism of the role of inspection in the educationalisation of religious education. It is the fact that this major institution in school

education, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, was for the first time being permitted to work within Religious Education, which made it a particularly significant element for consideration at this juncture.

Reference throughout this present chapter is to HMI 1, the HMI who introduced RE to inspection and the first HMI interviewed. The second interviewee is given the title HMI 2. He was the first *specialist* RE HMI appointed. HMI 3 is the third interviewee. He was the third specialist RE HMI to be appointed. The second specialist RE HMI to be appointed is referred to throughout as '*the other specialist inspector*'. He was not one of the interviewees. Those specialists interviewed were operating in the two major conurbations, and were responsible for RE in two of the HMI Divisions.

Three interviewees from each of the two groups seemed a reasonable number to gain an acceptable view of the situation in each case, particularly in view of the fact that this method of data generation was one amongst a number of others.

7.2 Introduction

The methodological note preceding chapter six applies here too. The aims of this chapter are to make a comparative analysis and critical evaluation of the three HMI interview responses. The inspectors were each interviewed at their work base. The interviews were recorded for transcription. The analysis of the transcriptions consisted in identifying individual positions of the interviewees, comparing and contrasting these with the positions and attitudes of the others.

The HMI interviews fall into two *groupings* determined by the nature of the remit of those concerned. The first *grouping* is in fact a single interview, that of HMI 1. This stands alone, because his remit was unique. The second *grouping* consists of interviews with two of the specialist

inspectors of religious education who followed on from HMI 1's introduction of the subject to inspection. The schedule of questions used with HMI 1 is significantly different from that of these others. The analysis of the first interview will however, as appropriate, be linked to that of the other two. The three schedules and the three transcripts of the interviews appear as appendices, in Volume 2. That of HMI 1 is significantly different from the other two. This is so because his remit was also quite different. At the time of the interview he was in a senior position, but before that he had been given the specific task of preparing the way for RE to be inspected like the other subjects of the curriculum. He was to set it up, and then to effect the introduction. In this case, the questions put at the interview simply ask about the nature of RE, to cover why it had not previously been inspected. It then asks about what was the purpose in introducing the subject to inspection, what HMI 1 found '*on the ground*', and finally what contribution RE might make to the curriculum. As with the teacher educators, all three HMIs were consulted about the proposed schedules of questions, and given the opportunity to suggest changes if they so wished.

The schedules of the other two HMIs were different in content from that of HMI 1. This was so, because the context and remit were different. In their case the questions were devised in order to find out what specialist inspection of RE involved. This area was covered in some detail. The answers were pursued in the follow-up questions to find out how HMI perceived what was happening in the RE taught in non-denominational schools. Thereafter, every aspect of how RE was faring within the educational world since the introduction of inspection was the substance of the remaining questions. The schedules of questions used with HMI 2 and HMI 3, though not identical, are sufficiently similar to each other to allow of a common analysis.

7.3 Interview of HMI 1

HMI 1 was delegated the task of introducing RE to inspection. This task involved a broad consultation of interested bodies and setting up inspection procedures. The process leading up to this major development will be discussed under six heads. These are:

- making the choice
- the nature of the remit
- what was involved in introducing RE to inspection
- developments and the pattern for the future
- relationships with management
- content of RE.

7.3.1 Making The Choice

It was during the period of office of George Younger, Secretary of State for Scotland in 1980, that the process of starting the formal inspection of RE took shape. Having the lowly status of RE drawn to his attention, it seemed to the Secretary that the least that could be done, given that the reasons for its omission from the attentions of the Inspectorate were not clear, was to consult with those most closely involved, and assuming a consensus, to introduce inspection to RE. The consultation had to be organised, and HMI 1 was chosen to take on that task. At that point in his career, he was an inspector *on the move*, having just completed a secondment with another Government department. He was, therefore, in his own word '*available*'. Explaining his selection he indicates:

Why me? Well maybe just because I was available. I had just returned from a secondment to another Government department as part of my career progression, and I think they were looking for things to develop my career. I happened also to have, although I had never used it, a Diploma in RE, which I

had taken at Moray House, so I suppose all these things came together. I was given the job just of introducing it, of undertaking the consultation and negotiations, and setting up the inspection procedures at the beginning, with a clear understanding that people who were real specialists, with experience of RE would be appointed, and they would then take it over, and I would do something else, which of course is what happened (App 7.1.2, p445).

Although in his own words he ‘*happened to have, although I had never used it, a Diploma in RE*’ (App 7.1.2, p445), he made no claim to be a specialist teacher of the subject. The diploma did not constitute a specialist qualification. HMI 1 himself was not slow to make it clear that he made no claims to being a specialist in the subject :

‘I hadn’t taught RE. I was willing to do it (introduce inspection of RE).

It is not all that often in this business that you get a chance to do something new, and that seemed an interesting thing to do...It was made absolutely clear at the time that I wasn’t pretending to be an RE specialist (App 7.1.2, p410).

HMI 2, in his interview, also points out that HMI 1 was not a specialist in RE. HMI 2 makes this point in his interview:

WH *HMI 1 was simply appointed national specialist, but that did not imply in any sense that he had academic or professional training in religious education.*

HMI 2 *That’s right. Obviously the ground had to be prepared to allow RE to be inspected, and therefore, someone currently in post had to do this and there wasn’t anyone in post with a theological background (App 7.2.2 pp486).*

This highlighted a problem faced by the authorities. Their intention was to start the inspection of RE. There had not previously been inspection in the subject at either primary or secondary stage. This meant that either someone with the academic and professional training of a specialist would be appointed to the inspectorate, and would then have to be trained in the ways

of HMI or, an existing inspector, even if with no professional or academic training in the subject, would be appointed to lead the way in preparing for the introduction of inspection to RE. The decision arrived at indicated that it was considered more important that the person appointed should know about inspection rather than about RE, that is the *inspectorial* task would take precedence over the *subject / content*. That decision meant that the task could be started more quickly, because as well as taking into account the need for someone coming into the inspectorate to be trained in the arts of inspection, s/he would have had to become well established before being able to enter the intricate and delicate world of consultation and negotiation. Whoever made the decision clearly felt that a practised, and highly experienced member of the existing inspectorate would be more appropriate than someone who was primarily well informed in the content matter of the subject and able therefore, to make considered, detailed, professional judgements in that area.

HMI 1 was the man of the moment and he seemed to be a man of his time. He accepted the curricular documents which were then generally current, the Munn Report, and with specific reference to RE, the Millar Report. The fact that he made a u-turn on some of the key elements of Munn subsequently may be ascribed to further reflection, although for him to suggest that the Munn modes '*never had an intellectually respectable rationale*' (TESS, 31.10.03), was a sweeping judgement.

HMI 2 wrote to the letters section of TESS replying:

I hesitate to take issue with my former boss, but he was wrong when he wrote last week that the Munn modes 'never had an intellectually respectable rationale'. The rationale can be found in the work of the 'London School' of Educational Philosophy in the 1960s (TESS, 7.11.03).

The decision to appoint HMI 1 to undertake this task had the advantage of

using existing inspectorial skills and experience to guide this new venture of introducing RE to inspection. It also had the advantage of using someone with the political know-how required in negotiating the system and winning support.

On the other hand, it was to entrust the delicate issues of a new subject area to the hands of someone who had no reason whatever to be aware of the important fine points and subtleties of interpretation and meaning, which only one well-versed in the subject, professionally and academically and practically, could possibly be expected to appreciate, or even to be aware of. In introducing RE to inspection it was, above all else necessary for the person concerned to know what questions to ask, how to direct the discussion, how to interpret the language in use, how to anticipate the implications of decisions taken. The person to fill such a role would require negotiating skills as well as knowledge of the area. Detached objectivity in this matter was not the only factor. Active, involved, awareness of the issues on the other hand, was a basis on which informed progress could be made. Lack here could lead the consultation and the negotiations in the wrong direction.

The potential dangers involved could be paralleled to the treatment RE had been receiving in schools, given the absence of specialist teachers on the staff. Rather than appoint specialist teachers, head teachers used experienced, but non-specialist members of their existing staff, people who were willing to help, but who had not the expertise to do so professionally. They were trained teachers, indeed often experienced teachers, but in their own discipline, not in this subject which they were being invited to teach. They could not be expected to, nor did they expect to attain the same professional standards which they could reach in their own field. They might not perceive the right questions to put. They might not be able

to direct the discussion along fruitful lines. They might not understand the language of the subject, because they had not had the opportunity to reflect on it at depth before helping pupils to do so. They did not have the opportunity to consider the type of methodology which might be best suited to this *new* subject, and they were not always aware of the implications of general statements in particular cases.

It might be argued that the management of learning is the same, whatever the subject being taught. This seems logical, but teaching in a secondary context cannot thus be divorced from what is taught. It is of significance that pupils be, and remain, motivated, if learning is to take place, and this in some measure is directly related to their being interested in the subject matter concerned. It is extremely difficult to ensure the interest of pupils in a subject in which one is not at home or specialist. The history of the use of non-specialist staff is well enough documented. For example the numbers of specialist teachers in the subject during the 1950s and 1960s were extremely small, as is shown in the census figures of the time. The era of RE being taught by anyone who happened to be free at that period is part of the mythology of the subject. The status of RE in the eyes of pupils and other staff also is well enough documented, and the links to the use of non-specialist staff are, by and large, evident. The links are negative. The use of non-specialist teachers in staffing the RE programme in schools was one of the features identified by those within the RE community as individuals, and through the medium of ATRES, as also by the wider educational and professional world, which had to go. This was one of the factors, which made it plain to the Secretary of State that it was necessary to appoint Professor Millar to chair a committee, to decide what action was required to rectify matters in religious education.

The problem of the low status of RE was longstanding. The action of

the appointment of a member of the existing inspectorate to introduce the inspection of the subject, could invite the problems already experienced by using non-specialist teachers to teach the subject to children to feature again. It might lay the way open to mistakes which might be caused by the lack of experience of the appointee in teaching and learning in RE, and lack of awareness of the fundamental issues in the subject. To appoint someone to this post because of his administrative, general inspectorial abilities, might be at the cost of professional breadth of vision. Such an appointment might mean loss of professional imagination and the possibility of fresh thinking was not the top priority, and was giving way to a careful, conserving approach. Such an approach was peculiarly out of tune with the aspirations of the subject as it had been developing, particularly since the publication of the Millar Report (HMSO, 1972) and the Munn Report (HMSO, 1977). It was to go in the opposite direction from that taken by the *educationalisation* movement. A specialist was required but there was no history of RE specialists on the staff of HMI. Yet there were problems to be resolved. There were advantages to using someone with experience of inspection, for the post. These become clearer in the light of the remit.

7.3.2 The Nature of the Remit

The introduction of RE to inspection was initiated by the much larger process of *educationalisation* of religious education. It was part of the direction mapped out by the Millar Report, to incorporate religious education fully, and exclusively, within the educational world. It was to be measured against this aim. The origins of the interest of the Secretary of State in the problems of RE, including the absence of inspection, lie in the Millar Report of 1972, and more immediately in his meeting with the Catholic Education Commission of 1980, when according to HMI 1:

As I understand it, and I am only relying on what I was told at the time that I became involved, there was a meeting between the Secretary of State for Scotland, who was then George Younger, and representatives of the Catholic Education Commission, at which the low rating given to RE in provision across the Catholic sector and the non-denominational sector were discussed, and reference was made to the fact that it wasn't subject to inspection. Those who were at the meeting thought that that would assist its status, and I understand that the Secretary of State asked his officials why it was not subject to inspection, and nobody was terribly clear as to why it had been excluded. I think we can come quite easily to reasons why it was originally excluded, but they felt there were no contemporary reasons for continuing the exclusion, and so the Secretary of State undertook to investigate the matter and to consult with interested bodies (App 7.1.2 , p444).

The 1980 stimulus came from the perspective of the denominational sector, and not from the 'more open approach' represented by that of the Millar Report or the Durham Report. The Millar Report had by this time been published for some eight years. It had been produced by a committee appointed by the then Secretary of State for Scotland, and was addressed to the holder of that post in 1971, The Rt Hon Gordon Campbell. In that report the question of the introduction of inspection was discussed within the context of suggesting: '*that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum take over responsibility for curriculum development in the field of moral and religious education*' (HMSO ,1972, 8.5). The report stopped short of recommending that HMI be involved in order to avoid embarrassing the Secretary of State, who was excluded by existing legislation from exercising control over RE. There are clues in HMI 1's interview, that the Secretary of State, George Younger, was impressed by what he heard from the Commission, and this

surfaces in some of the comments made by HMI 1. For example, despite its absence from the questions put to him, since Religious Observance does not form part of this study, HMI 1 systematically includes reference to religious observance at every opportunity. The clear evidence that the Secretary of State was impressed by the Commission is that he decided RE should be inspected, and appointed HMI 1 to carry out that task. Given the source of that stimulus to action, the reasons for deciding to appoint someone from outwith the established RE world become clearer.

The kind of remit the new appointee was to be given was not a simple educational remit. The task to be done was not a simple educational task. It was a question of producing an outcome, which, though not totally ignoring the latest educational thought, as represented in the Millar Report and the other literature on religious education, would include in serious fashion the special concerns of denominational schooling. The remit firstly required the undertaking of a consultative process, to discover views on the suggestion that the law might be changed to allow RE to be subject to inspection. This meant writing to all interested bodies *'teachers, unions, parents' bodies, churches, non-church groups, and they were all invited to attend meetings'* (App 7.1.2, p 447).

Secondly, visits to schools which demonstrated good practice in the provision of RE and in its teaching and learning had to be undertaken, not least to provide some current information on the subject. Others involved with RE were also contacted:

I talked to a whole range of people, both specialists in the subject, but also importantly, people who could influence the subject through being headteachers, directors of education, college of education staff, faculties of divinity, just to make sure that I knew as much as it was possible to know about the subject and also to make sure that the inspection arrangements were sensitive and sympathetic

to what was there (App 7.1.2, p448).

The purpose was to hear *'how they saw RE, what its problems were, what solutions they might put forward, how inspection might work. So I did my own sort of personal networking of visits to prepare myself for all of this'* (App 7.1.2, p447 ff). This strand of the remit therefore, was an attempt to provide information for HMI 1 on this curricular area on which he made *'no pretence to being a specialist'*.

All of this was done in the latter part of 1981 and the early part of 1982. Happily, HMI 1 refers to this part of his remit as being *'the honeymoon period'*. It included preliminary inspections on the basis of seeing RE as it was without at this stage being too demanding of how quickly schools which fell short, should catch up. Inspection started in January 1983, when the new legislation came into force. This *honeymoon period*, of general familiarisation with RE, he used to gather impressions, and data, and fundamental information about good practice in the subject, in order to prepare for the writing of the report *Learning and Teaching in RE* in 1986. This was an early interim view of provision for religious education in primary and secondary schools. The task therefore, is characterised as one conducted from the outside looking in with the need to make judgements on this basis.

Thirdly, the preparation and writing of inspection procedures to guide the future permanent and specialist team of inspectors of RE who would replace HMI 1, had to be undertaken. The rationale of appointing an experienced inspector was particularly evident at this point in the remit. Here too the weakness of having someone in charge who had not studied in depth the subject and philosophy of the curricular area in question was most clear. Lack of experience of the problems associated with teaching and learning in religious education was at this point most evident too. An objective outside observer could be useful but might also be very limiting.

This was doubly evident because he had responsibility for writing the report *Learning and Teaching in RE*. The first set of inspections was used for the purpose of testing the new inspection guidelines, and for this purpose inspection was initially limited to schools which had specialist RE in operation.

The last major strand of HMI 1's remit involved negotiating with various bodies with particular interest in RE, prominent among which was the Catholic Education Commission. In that *consensus* was reached, HMI 1 was totally successful. The concern was the relationship HMI would have with denominational schools and their RE and '*the extent to which it was possible for RE specialist HMI who did not come from a Catholic background to inspect RE in Catholic schools*' (App 7.1.2, p454). It was not even only a question of the content or teaching of RE itself. Ethos in a denominational setting is extremely important, and HMI would already comment on the ethos of any school. Inspectors would be brought '*up-to-speed to be able to comment on the religious aspects of that as well*' (App 7.1.2, p454). The core of the discussions however, did concentrate on the question of RE itself. HMI 1 clearly states the conclusions of the negotiations.

The gains made by HMI, he states thus:

We agreed that in the formal teaching of RE in Catholic schools we would inspect in the same way as we would inspect learning and teaching in any other subject, so we were not actually inspecting the faith content. We were inspecting the ability of the teacher to use the prescribed content effectively in improving the learning and teaching of children. So in a sense, you could actually, I suppose you could have had someone whose background was English doing that kind of inspection in RE because we were looking at the quality of the teaching, the quality of the learning, the supply of the resources, the management of the lessons, the extent to which improvement

and understanding was taking place, but not commenting on the Catholic content (App 7.1.2, p454).

He sums up the position reached thus: *'we had a very good relationship with them on that, but there was a clear understanding that it did not necessarily have to be a Catholic who inspected RE in Catholic schools'* (App 7.1.2, p455). The establishment of that good relationship was of primary importance, and he therefore prized it highly. It does seem odd to suggest, as HMI 1 seems to, that it is somehow possible to separate out *'the ability of the teacher to use the prescribed content effectively in improving the learning and teaching of children'* (App 7.1.2, p454), from the aim of the exercise and the attainment targets in mind. On a practical level, of the specialist RE inspectors who succeeded HMI 1, the two interviewed for this study insist emphatically that only they are involved in the inspection of secondary RE, and yet here HMI1 is suggesting that an English specialist could inspect RE in a denominational school, without doing violence to the nature of inspection. Either that statement weakens the specialist basis of secondary education as it presently exists in Scottish schools, or the kind of inspection of RE within denominational schools, agreed in these negotiations, was sufficiently tailored to fit effectively not touching the heart of the matter, and able therefore, to be done by someone with no specialism in the subject at all. This position was reached in negotiation.

The Commission was prepared to move its stance on this vital matter. Having pressed for the introduction of inspection they realised in the discussions which took place that the inspectorate would not agree to *'distort the process by having a Catholic HMI'* (App 7.1.2, p455). However, *'the Inspectorate did commit itself to appointing an HMI who was also a Catholic, when the time came that the best person at our interview board happened to be a Catholic'* (App 7.1.2, p455). Real consensus reached?

The advantages of appointing a person experienced in the practice and procedures of HMI in a negotiation situation appear evident. Such an appointee was able to ensure that, as far as was possible, the intentions of the Secretary of State were realised. He also had skills of negotiation. On the other hand the other negotiators were well-versed in religious education, and all that was implied in their particular view of it. The ability of a new-comer to the field therefore, to appreciate and cope with the intricacies of the argument and the implications of decisions reached, must, at least be raised. To have a *honeymoon period* of discovery might not have been adequate to prepare the way for intricate bargaining. Such a new-comer to the field could not be expected to have accumulated a sufficiently in-depth understanding of the academic area of religious education, to perceive the differences, fundamental as they are, between the two approaches represented: schools for the whole community, and those aimed at one faith group. HMI 1 had already well described the denominational in his interview. TEI 3 described the non-denominational (whole community) approach as '*the open enquiry dimension of RE*' (App 6.3.2, p415). In explanation of this he quotes The Fourth R, the Durham Report:

If the teacher is to press for any conversion, it is conversion from a shallow and unreflective attitude to life. If he is to press for commitment, it is commitment to the religious quest, to that search for meaning, purpose and value which is open to all men (quoted in App 6.3.2 p415, from the

Durham Report, SPCK 1970, Section 217). And to this he might have added John Hull's four criteria for the RE curriculum, discussed in the study.

The consensus which may have allowed this potential difficulty to arise, is made evident in the undertaking given by HMI 1 that '*the inspectorate did commit itself to appointing a Catholic HMI when the time came that the best person at our interview board happened to be a Catholic*'. '*The best person*' was

not defined. Would it be 'the be'*the best person*' within the criterion of the kind of approach represented by the Millar Report '*the open, investigative dimension of RE*' referred to by TEI 3 above, interpreting the Durham Report? Or would it be '*the best person*' within the criterion of the *faith approach* of denominational schools? It would not be possible to have one '*best person*' given that the approaches are quite different, distinctive, and intended to achieve quite different outcomes. Or was the criterion quite open?

7.3.3 What was involved in introducing RE to inspection

Assuming the legislation was passed, the task of introducing RE to inspection involved the meetings and consultations and negotiations referred to above, and the creation of an RE data-base. Primarily, this involved the establishment of a relationship with schools. Formerly, such a relationship in RE did not exist.

Her Majesty's inspectorate had previously made a point of non-involvement in RE. In primary, for example, should they be present when work on RE occurred, they left the room. At secondary, it was easier simply to avoid the RE department. In order for a rational approach therefore, it was necessary to build up a data base of subject information, since this had not till then existed. This is why the great number of inspections of RE departments took place after HMI 1's appointment, and the introduction of the legislation in January 1983. As well as using these visits to form the data-base, he saw them as of considerable significance in the creative development of the subject. Before inspection, RE was assured (though perhaps not very effectively), by statute. With inspection, the emphasis was to change dramatically. On being asked this precise question his response was:

The legal requirements were always something that I felt ought not to be

emphasised, because RE had to be seen as a legitimate part of the curriculum alongside English, Mathematics, Music or anything else. It had to be accountable in terms of its quality on the same basis as any other subject...So we wanted to shift the whole provision of RE within the curriculum with the expectation that it played the same part as any other subject, and had to be held to account against the same criteria, as any other subject (App 7.1.2, pp449).

The significance of these factors in what was involved in introducing inspection, is the weighting given to work which was specifically oriented toward the subject matter of RE. A data base on RE was to be provided since none existed before. It seemed appropriate that such a task be undertaken by one already professionally and academically equipped in the subject itself, a specialist in the normal curricular meaning of that term. There was no such HMI. The task was done by HMI 1.

7.3.4 Developments and the Pattern For the Future

HMI 1 had been responsible for RE for only a year when HMI 2, a specialist in RE, was appointed to work alongside him on 1 September 1983. He came from a TEI in England. They worked together, HMI 2 being trained in the work of the inspectorate, and becoming the national specialist in RE. HMI 1 left post to become District Inspector elsewhere. On 1 April 1985 a principal teacher of RE, was appointed as a second specialist, (not interviewed for this study, and referred to in the text as '*the other Specialist*' HMI) and yet another principal teacher of RE was appointed as a third specialist inspector on 1 September 1992 (HMI 3 of the interviewees). Developments till that date were evolutionary. The end goal was to have a complement of two specialist RE inspectors to cover the country.

Beyond the appointment of specialist inspectors, HMI 1 was clear in

his expectations of developments from the introduction of inspection:

Well, there certainly was an assumption that RE would begin to get the whole network of support that other subjects would get. It became, for example, at the same time, a legitimate part of the interests of the Consultative Council on the Curriculum, as it was called then, the CCC. The CCC, up till then had not given high priority to RE. Now because the CCC was funded by government and so on, development work on RE became a much higher priority within the work of the CCC. It meant that we talked to Directors of Education and Head Teachers about the subject. So there was clearly a long term developmental intent (App 7.1.2, p450).

7.3.5 Relationships with Management

Because he was setting the scene and had to be sure that his purpose was understood, HMI 1 adopted a fairly definite line on the question of schools following his lead. Asked about the tendency of some schools to go slow in making adequate provision for RE his answer was:

I suspect that in some schools, it might be historical, that if you have not had a strong place for RE in staffing and in time allocation, something else has to suffer to create it. That is a management issue for head teachers. They have to face up to that (App 7.1.2, p469).

He also makes the throw-away comment about the effect of heads on their school, 'A school is only as good as its head' (ibid). There is, in these comments, the impression that where RE is behind in development in a school, this is likely to be because of the failure of will on the part of senior management. Where a school is behind in any field, this is, at least in large measure, caused by the open opposition or the failure to offer positive support on the part of senior management. Summing up the effect of inspection, first on management, he says:

It brought about a number of important changes. One was, of course, strictly in legal terms. There was now a body which could make sure that schools did actually observe the law...Previously there was nobody to actually apply the statutory requirements, or to enforce them. Beyond that, it made sure that head teachers in schools looked carefully to their provision in RE, and to its quality, and to its staffing, which was something they could allow to lie dormant previously, knowing that it would not be looked at in any kind of rigorous way. Now it would be subject to inspection. So I think head teachers looked to their laurels, as it were, in terms of what they were providing in RE. It gave status and confidence to teachers of RE, because they were now accountable in the same kind of way as their colleagues (App 7.1.2 p443).

In order better to achieve progress, a discussion paper was produced by SCCORE, and issued by the CCC in 1987. The paper was entitled *Management Issues in Religious Education in Secondary Schools*. Both HMI 1 and HMI 2 were members of SCCORE at the time, as also was a principal teacher of RE in the north, soon to become a member of Her Majesty's Inspectorate (the other specialist HMI). Sister Maire Gallagher, Chairperson of the Committee of Secondary Education (COSE), prefaced the document by describing its purpose : *'to provide interim advice and help to school managers and teachers of religious education in evolving guidelines for individual schools on a range of management issues related to the subject'* (Management Issues in RE, Preface, CCC, 1987). The document referred its readers to the Millar Report and the Munn Report, to the SCCORE bulletins, and reminded them that a specialist teaching qualification had been introduced in the subject in 1974, followed by inspection in 1983, O-Grade RS in 1984, and Higher RS in 1986, and an RS module in the 16-Plus Action Plan.

Last, it indicated that most local authorities had appointed an advisor

in religious education, and were beginning to produce policy statements. It was in fact, suggesting that everything was now in place for the developing subject and pointing to the need to apply these advances to individual schools, a job which had to be undertaken by teachers of religious education and by senior managers.

7.3.6 Content of RE

HMI 1 is clear that as with any area of the curriculum *'I would make no apologies for holding RE or anything else in the school curriculum to account to justify the contribution it makes to the learning of young people or to their personal development'* (App 7.1.2, p463). This being so, he is happy to see RE as *'a free-standing curricular area,'* and he distinguishes it on that count from personal and social education, and for example, from Citizenship. Referring to the emphasis in TEI 2 on Philosophy, his comment is that *'well I think we have to be careful to call things what they are, and that we don't try to re-invent subjects with different names and supposedly different missions in order to try and meet some passing fashion'* (App 7.1.2, p464). Still speaking generally, but more positively, he describes RE as *'about the generic business of religion within society and learning about specific and different religions'* (App 7.1.2, p470). In discussing this area of content, HMI 1 seemed thus to acknowledge that his task had been the introduction of the idea of inspecting RE, and the detailed and subsequent working out of the practicalities of for example, content, he was happy to leave to his successors.

7.3.7 In conclusion

HMI 1's interview has been considered on its own because his was a unique position, setting in motion the process of inspection of religious education. He was in a position which required decisions to be made as

matters progressed. It is for this reason that so much time has been spent considering the decision to ask an inspector with no previous experience of religious education, to perform this task. This has meant reaching some difficult conclusions, which may seem to have been possible only with the benefit of hindsight. However, the conclusions have also been made on the basis of the wider, and longer experience of the subject religious education itself, and its treatment and fate in schools, and the solutions to its problems as indicated in the Millar Report. Much of the argument therefore, relies on the assumption that had the decision-makers examined the history of RE, they might have decided to proceed more on the basis of preparing the appointee well to be able to undertake what was certain to be a complicated task, rather than appointing someone with little experience of the curricular area. This is supported by the origin of action being the Millar Report, and the strong move to incorporate RE fully into the educational world. This may not have been the agenda which led to the appointment of HMI 1.

7.4 Interviews of HMI 2 and HMI 3

The second *grouping* consists of specialist inspectors who took up post following the work of HMI 1 in setting up the inspection of religious education.

Two inspectors were interviewees, HMI 2 (App 7.2.2) and HMI 3 (App 7.3.2) of the two major Divisions. At the time of the interviews, there were in fact three specialist inspectors of Religious Education. Two interviews were regarded as a sufficient number, along with that of HMI 1, for the purposes of the study. These two interviews were conducted on schedules of questions which were very similar, and so they are considered together. Both the schedule of questions and the transcript of each interview are printed as appendices.

In the analysis the following significant areas were used on which to focus attention:

- Staffing of the inspectorate in Religious Education
- The mechanics of inspection
- Content of Religious Education
- Provision of Religious Studies
- Impressions of progress overall

7.4.1 Staffing of the Inspectorate in Religious Education

After the departure of HMI 1 from his RE responsibilities on 1 April 1985, there were three specialist inspectors of religious education, HMI 2 (appointed in 1983) in an urban division, a second specialist, (appointed in 1985 - 'the other specialist inspector') in a non-urban division, and a third specialist (appointed in 1992) in an urban division (HMI 3), one per division of the country. They covered all secondary establishments. Primaries were different, being covered in a broader way using a wider spectrum of the inspectorate. Secondary inspectors were trained to be able to assist in primary inspections also in a broad range of subject areas. At secondary however, inspection in RE as in any subject, was limited to subject specialists.

This meant that on occasion it was necessary for the specialists to assist in a division other than their own, which had a number of RE inspections. The larger urban Division, having a very large number of schools more frequently required the help of the other two specialists. HMI 2 made clear his awareness of the inconsistency of size:

As you know, the Inspectorate works in the three geographical divisions...

I'm never quite sure whether we divide the country by number of schools, or by the population, which would be different, obviously. In the North you have smaller schools. It's presumably approximately one third of

the 440 secondary schools in Scotland (App 7.2.2, p477).

This flexible use of specialists was required more at the earlier stages of inspection of RE because of the settling-in process, when there was the need to build up and sustain a data-base where none had previously existed. With the passage of time this difficulty diminished, and only in exceptional circumstances was it necessary for one division to call on help from beyond its own limits. It is clear that flexibility is a key factor in the management of the inspectorate. The use of RE HMIs beyond the borders of their own division is an indication of this.

The use of HMIs generally, in the inspection of the primary stages outwith the bounds of their own subject area, is another example. It is important that when this flexibility appears it is on the basis of training, so that the *helpers are prepared helpers*. It is also significant that the flexibility does not extend to secondary inspections and to HMI specialisms. There were three specialist RE HMIs in post at the time of interviewing, HMI 3, HMI 2, and *the other specialist*. HMI 3 was based in an urban division and was National Specialist in RE. HMI 2, also in an urban division, had been national specialist in RE when he and HMI 1 formed the RE team, but relinquished that post when HMI 3 was appointed. Subsequently, in his division, HMI 2 became national specialist in Guidance. This was yet another mark of HMI flexibility. It was not uncommon to have several remits. Similarly, in the *other* division, as well as having the RE specialist remit, *the other specialist* was also a District Inspector. Of the three RE specialist inspectors, therefore, only HMI 3 spent all his time in RE.

Despite the fact that three specialists, HMI 2, *the other specialist*, and HMI 3, were appointed and took up post, one in each division, HMI 2 in 1983, *the other specialist*, in 1985, and HMI 3 in 1992, it had been decided that the intended complement would be two. HMI 2 and *the other specialist* were

appointed at the time, alongside HMI 1, when he was introducing RE to inspection: *'We agreed that we would have a complement of two people, and the appointment of HMI 2, and then the other specialist, was made'* (App 7.1.2, p459). He then left (1985). HMI 2's planned departure left the way open for another appointment, and that was filled by HMI 3. That appointment kept the number of RE inspectors at two. HMI 3 became the Catholic member of the team. The agreement with the Catholic Education Commission therefore, had in fact meant, given this complement, that half of the RE inspectorate was Catholic. It is not clear whether HMI 1's undertaking that such an appointment would only be made *'when the best candidate happened to be a Catholic'* has been tested. That will have to await the appointment of a replacement for HMI 3.

It is clear that the first two specialist HMIs did not include a Catholic *'appointment'*. Only with the third appointment was that undertaking met. The undertaking does however, leave the unresolved question of whether it is possible for either HMI adequately to inspect schools from the sector other than his own. It seems to have been prominent in HMI 1's thinking on reporting the negotiations which he conducted with the Catholic Education Commission, that any specialist inspector should be acceptable in any school, non-denominational or denominational. The deciding criterion for appointment to HMI was that the best candidates should be chosen. If those lines of thought are carried full length, it should imply that the RE team should be made up of the best people, whether from the non-denominational or denominational sectors. Therefore, both might be drawn from the same sector. This argument could perhaps stand, were educational factors the only ones to be taken into account. Political considerations however did, as they still do, come into play.

7.4.2 The Mechanics of Inspection

The purposes of inspection according to HMI 3 are two-fold, 'to collect enough information to allow HMI to inform the Minister, and to allow of the publication every five years on each subject, a Standards and Quality Report' (App 7.3.2, p520). Types of inspection, in recent years have varied in form with time. According to HMI 2's description:

It used to be, as I said, that we sent in a big team to a secondary school to do every subject...Then we moved to the modal system, following the SCCC guidelines on the curriculum. But because RE was the main subject in its mode, though not the only one, then it was always included in the secondary inspection. So of course, we had a pretty large data-base of evidence in those years. But more recently we've been piloting, and are now moving over to what we call standards and quality inspections, (the purpose of which was to find how schools used the performance indicators), which means that we will always inspect English, and Maths, and then we will sample three other subjects from whatever a school provides (RE was covered in this type of inspection as part of the curriculum audit... Time allocation made to RE was noted, but the RE department itself was not necessarily inspected ...The reason for this is partly wanting to to increase the number of schools that are inspected in any one year, so that we can move to what we are calling a generational cycle of inspections, that is, every school should be inspected within the generation of a particular cohort going through. So every secondary school should be inspected once every six years... It'll probably work out doing, these days, only about four or five RE inspections a year, whereas we used to do about twenty (App 7.2.2, p479).

HMI 3's version of standards and quality inspections gives more detail than the above, but in principle is the same:

English and Maths will always be inspected. The third curriculum area will

be taken from either Sciences or Modern Languages, mainly because these are the areas that Ministers want us to inspect, and the fourth and fifth areas will come from any other subject in the curriculum (App 7.3.2, p520).

This sort of inspection allows a 'generational cycle of inspection' ensuring schools will be inspected every six years. *'It means that RE could be expected to have perhaps four or five inspections each session, whereas formerly it was four or five times that number of such inspections per annum'* (App 7.2.2, p480). The inspection report is described thus:

The form the report of such inspections took, was : 'a general introduction, dealing with 'parental questions', and this is followed by a section on each of the subjects involved in the inspection, concluding with 'priorities for action'. Thereafter is a short section on 'courses, learning and teaching, management, and quality assurance' (App 7.3.2, p523).

When RE is included in the inspection therefore, the treatment it receives is quite specific, both in terms of discussion of what was found, and in statement of what HMI consider to be the 'priorities for action'. It is in the light of this possible number of RE inspections of 'four or five' per annum the total number of inspectors agreed, seems more than reasonable. The numbers initially appointed were at the time needed because it was necessary to build up the data-base on the subject from nothing, to an accurate reflection of provision and practice in the subject country-wide. In the days of modal inspection, referred to above, RE, being the only subject in its mode, was always included in inspection.

In current inspection procedures, HMI do not raise with head teachers the question of time allocation to RE. This is done, not because HMI consider that enough progress on time allocation has been made to render enquiry about it unnecessary, but rather *'mainly because the present administration, the Scottish Executive, have been trying recently to allow schools to free up the*

curriculum to allow initiative within the parameters' (App 7.3.2, p525).

As if in explanation of this change in direction HMI 3 continues, *'what we have always been concerned with and should continue to be concerned with is the quality of the provision rather than the quantity. You know 5% of duff RE, you would be as well with nothing'* (App 7.3.2, p490). The corollary, however, to HMI 3's '5%' statement is that it may be acceptable for schools which formerly had an unbalanced curriculum to return to that sort of provision, arguing that since they were unable to ensure the quality in one field, they have built up their provision in those fields where they are sure of the quality. It may be however, that it is necessary to examine all of the factors in ensuring quality provision. Adequate time provision would feature as one prerequisite of quality provision. The national documents, in stating time allocation for RE, were always clear that they were referring to *minimum* standards of provision. To sink below the minimum is not the most effective way of ensuring quality. This is why, initially, HMI were extremely critical of schools which did not reach this minimum. In the past, schools which failed to provide RE, or adequate time provision in RE, often did so for idiosyncratic reasons, without great effort to square them with a balanced educational rationale.

It is arguable that the purpose of curricular advice from Secretaries of State, and from the SCCC and its central committees too, was primarily aimed at guiding schools in the direction of curricular balance and quality. There is a danger that standards and quality inspections may have been formulated, and been carried out on a basis other than the pursuit of educational balance, quality, and good practice. At the end of the day, all the activity generated through inspection from HMI 1's time, including the curricular support, and advice, and development deriving from the SCCORE reports, translated the legislative requirements into an educational rationale.

This decision not to pursue the provision of at least minimum standards of time allocation, was in face of the fact that so much progress had already been made in other respects. This will be considered further below, under the section on Provision of Religious Studies.

When inspection procedures were complete, and the report written, including '*priorities for action*' HMI would also have decided on major points which had to be raised for the department concerned within the whole-school context. These '*key points for action*' would form the basis of a follow-up visit within two years of the original inspection, to see how the school was progressing with the recommendations. The absence of comment on time-provision meant that time could not feature as a key point for action. Although in itself not the most major issue, given the history of provision in many schools in the past, this omission was a most significant statement of change in HMI policy towards RE.

7.4.3 Content of Religious Education

The three areas outlined in 5-14 (*Religious and Moral National Guidelines*, 5-14, SOED, November 1992), produced attainment targets for work on Christianity, Other World Religions, and Personal Search. There had been a considerable debate within RE about the use of World Religions as a major element in the subject. It was considered, by some, to be merely factual, without going far beyond that. It did therefore, not clarify in the view of its detractors, the specific contribution RE was considered to make to the development of pupils. Such an approach was not sufficiently distinctive of RE. The *National Guidelines* attempted to balance the position, retaining work on World Religions, including Christianity, and adding the area of Personal Search. HMI 2 referring to these three aspects continues:

These three aspects you mentioned are of course in the Five to Fourteen

Guidelines, so its particularly within S1 and S2 stages of secondary schools that you would be looking for a balance across those three aspects. The one area which perhaps schools have more difficulty with, is the Personal Search. When we devised the 5-14 Guidelines, the group that produced the guidelines, of which I was a member at the time, wanted to go beyond what I personally call the zoological approach to RE, that is looking at it through the bars of a cage, as what other people believe and practise, and to retain something of the personal reflection and response which good RE teaching should stimulate in pupils (App 7.2.2, p495).

This area involved in particular *ultimate questions* and the moral aspects of RME. HMI 2 suggests that it might better and more clearly, have been called *personal reflection and response*. HMI recognise that this is a difficult area to cover. Yet, in his interview, HMI 2 quoted above recognises that the core of what is now called *Personal Search*, is also at the heart of good RE teaching. In other words, it can be covered within the other two headings, Christianity and World Religions. Indeed the Guidelines make provision for such an approach. The basic intention of this emphasis is to move beyond the mere phenomena of formal religion to the fundamental human issues which underlie religion.

Summing this up, HMI 2 suggests that '*what we call the personal dimension of religion is really the personal dimension of being human*' (App 7.2.2 p497). HMI 3 is rather less precise in his analysis, without suggesting a curricular or philosophical way forward. He suggests a fundamental curricular slip-up is being made:

The Standards and Quality Report is going to show that the worst area is going to be Personal Search. Schools and teachers have not coped with Personal Search, partly because...they have gone to the attainment targets, and forgotten to read the rationale. And the rationale clearly states that

pupils should learn, not only about religion, but learn in and through religion (App 7.3.2 , p4533).

It is noteworthy that the problem identified by the two inspectors in outcome is the same, but the first identifies a philosophical source, and the second identifies a procedural source. In effect, HMI 3 assumes that teachers and schools, have simply slipped up. HMI 2 suggests that the true source of the problem with Personal Search goes back to the debate about the nature of Religious Education when he makes the point that *'what we call the personal dimension of religion is really the personal dimension of being human. Existing in a world full of contradictions within experience, having to find some meaning and pattern in the whole thing'* (App 7.2.2 p497). He enlarges on this area in discussing pupils who come from a non-religious background to RE:

Even if a person is not in inverted commas 'religious', they will have to appreciate the personal significance of religion to those who believe, and the issues that religion deals with can't be totally irrelevant to the individual's human experience, just as a human being. So even if they come down on the negative side of religious belief, the actual issues the belief is concerned with, confronting death, and what significance that has, and so on, and the question, 'what shall I do?' The basis of ethics. These questions affect the human individual (ibid).

It is further of interest, that HMI 3 indicates in his interview a solution to this problem:

Now what we are proposing to do is embodied in a project which is out for tender at the moment. It is going to get people to look at learning and teaching in terms of Personal Search and not in terms of ultimate questions, because everyone can cope with the ultimate questions (App 7.3.2, p535).

One of the significant factors, and it may be intensified given the reduction in the work of inspection implied in the freeing-up of controls on

the curriculum directed by the Executive, and taken further by the Education Minister as reported on the front page of the *Times Educational Supplement Scotland* (TESS, 3.10.03) is the increasing influence, as distinct from control, exerted by HMI on the development, curricular and otherwise, of the subject. In this case, HMI 3 is clearly overseeing this *project*, and HMI 2 was a member of the group which produced the *5-14 Guidelines in RE* (App 7.2.2, p 495). The content of RE therefore, is being influenced increasingly by the Inspectorate, with the introduction of inspection. This is perhaps, the practice across the board, where inspectors for each subject are influential in its development. There is however, the danger that that influence can be too great or, in the case of RE, may be attempting a nearly impossible task.

This recalls the situation referred to above, which implies an eventual complement of two inspectors for Scotland, one of whom is likely to be from the denominational sector. This suggests that there would, in effect, be only one inspector nationally, able to speak authoritatively about the non-denominational sector, and one able, so to speak, about the denominational. Such a situation would mean too much influence in the hands of a single person, particularly when the numbers of specialists throughout the country have increased so dramatically, and the wealth of experience in the subject therefore, is now so rich.

If, on the other hand, in line with HMI 1's agreement with the Catholic Education Commission, that even an inspector from a non-denominational background may conduct inspections in denominational schools, provided s/he can avoid inspecting the faith element of Catholic RE, it would be reasonable to have an inspector from the denominational sector inspect and influence RE in non-denominational education, provided s/he can omit the faith element from his/her thinking and practice. Once again however, administratively attractive though this solution is, the magnitude of the

problems associated with encompassing both approaches is very great, and whether it is feasible, or even possible to omit / include the *faith element* from an inspection of RE are unresolved questions. Omission of that element in the *open* approach of non-denominational RE is fundamental, and the reverse in denominational RE.

The complexity of this way of talking about possibilities in RE, particularly in light of the three content elements of 5-14: Christianity, World Religions and Personal Search, becomes very great. A little of the problem emerges in examining the approaches of the two interviewees to this content. HMI 2 for example, is entirely open to the benefits RE can offer to all *'religious or not, and on their own terms, the issues that religion deals with can't be totally irrelevant to the individual's human experience'* (App 7.2.2, p496). There is a different hue on the other hand to HMI 3's approach, still speaking about RE in the context of pupils with no religious background or learning when he says:

We want them (pupils with no religious background) to look at and think about how world religions, including Christianity, actually challenge pupils' own personal belief structure, whatever that belief structure may be.

Religion should therefore offer challenge to me and everyone else, which I might take up or reject for whatever reason, I should have the opportunity (App 7.3.2, p537).

There is here, a perceptible expectation that pupils ought to have a personal belief structure. This may or not be so, but whether it is the purpose of RE to ensure this, is open to question. It may be that if it succeeds in helping pupils to develop the sensitivity required to be able to perceive and value the belief structure of another, this may be a high order achievement, and may enable pupils to be better able to work out their own position subsequently. To expect pupils at this stage as result of work in RE

to formulate their own belief structure, or even to be able to do so is quite outwith the proper intention of Personal Search within an overall RE programme. Fundamental assumptions are being made here which may not be entirely in tune with the emphasis of the *'open investigative approach'*, quoted in part above:

To press for acceptance of a particular faith or belief system is the duty and privilege of the Churches and other similar religious bodies. It is certainly not the task of a teacher in a county school. If the teacher is to press for any conversion, it is conversion from a shallow and unreflective attitude to life. If he is to press for commitment, it is commitment to the religious quest
(Durham Report, SPCK 1970, section 217).

Nor are they in tune with the refinement of Durham which John Hull produces in his four criteria for the religious education curriculum, and his brief statement that *Religious Education should offer personal development through ideological criticism*, quoted above, and which is discussed in detail in chapter nine below.

If the key is *'conversion from a shallow and unreflective attitude to life'* this might be transposed to Personal Search, and might replace HMI 3's suggestion that pupils might be brought to the verge of decision making and the point of choice.

There are differing emphases in the two interviews in relation to the question of the content of RE, which initially, seem not significant. It may well be the case that they simply reflect the variety of views within the wider RE community on a number of issues. One of the differences in emphasis reflects that of non-denominational/ denominational approaches to RE. This in turn is reflected in appropriate content, and even more significant, in what is done with particular content. World Religions is a case in point. In a non-denominational context the purpose of looking at a world religion may

be to see its significance for its believers, and as far as is possible, to *'enter the shoes of a believer'*. In a denominational setting if specific presuppositions about a particular faith are at the root of the existence of the school, these affect the approach and attitudes to the study of another religious position. In turn this raises again the question of an inspector from one sector inspecting in the other, and whether s/he can take with her/him, drop her/his values with regard to good practice.

It is worthwhile to recall, at this juncture, that, although in some senses inspectors are in fact not unlike civil servants, at this point they are professional educators, and specialists. It is also worth recalling that the negotiator of the existing arrangements was an inspector, who was both in this civil servant mode, and that of professional educator. The only difference was that he was not an RE subject specialist. It is therefore, possible that he was unaware of the implications for both denominational and non-denominational RE, of the agreement he was reaching about future practice. Whether in particular, it is possible for an inspector to inspect RE in a denominational setting at the same time omitting reference to the faith dimension, is a major question. The emphases of the two approaches to the content areas of 5-14 RME reflects this major question.

7.4.4 Provision of Religious Studies

The discussion of content in RE above was limited to the key areas outlined in 5-14 RME. This therefore, was limited at secondary to the first years. Much of the provision beyond these years consisted in forms of Religious Studies. O-Grade Religious Studies was introduced in 1984, and Higher Grade in 1986. Even when a full programme of O-Grades/Standard Grades and Higher Grades was not offered, inspectors actively supported the replacement of locally produced core RE courses by, for example, one or

more Short Courses or National Units. This was to take account of the time restrictions of the 80 hours over the session recommendations for S3 and S4, operating within *core* RE. HMI 2 in particular, was so impressed by the quality of the short courses available that he strongly recommended their use as *core* RE, despite the views of many, who pointed out that such provision did not make for a balanced course.

At this point the significance of *balanced*, is that this being *core* RE it is the only RE these pupils receive. It is no longer optional. To do that it was argued, that two, or preferably three such courses would have been necessary. Some schools, limited in number, adopted another approach. It was to use Standard Grade as their core RE provision at S3 and S4. This produced the balance referred to above, but the time allocation remained as for core RE, and that presented another considerable problem. Despite this, some schools continue with this use of Standard Grade RS. In arguing his case which was based on the excellence of the short courses, HMI 2 may have been in part driven by the wish to draw teachers away from local provision. This was however, to fail to take account of the basic fact that certificate courses are '*opt-in*' courses, not core courses.

His intentions in showing such strong support for replacing core RE in S3 and S4 by a short course therefore, may have been broader than the obvious. One of the factors he may have had in mind was the attempt to draw teachers away from the subject development task, which RE, as a new subject area, was undergoing. He may have regarded centrally produced material as more appropriate than locally produced material. This was potentially harmful to the development of the subject, which was engaged in building up the experience of its practitioners in all curricular fields, and not merely that of presenting for SCE exams. Apart from the wholesale replacement of core RE at S3 and S4 which occurred in some places, there

was a considerable development of properly founded opt-in courses at S3-S6 in Religious Studies. 'Properly founded' is an appropriate term here in the sense that, unlike the situations where a short course or national unit replaced core RE, time allowed for these courses was the same as for any other certificate course. Standard Grade RS was allocated the same time as any other Standard Grade, that is 160 hours. Similarly with Higher. In these cases, core provision would continue for pupils not opting-in to certificate courses. They were an alternative, not a substitute.

Both inspectors were very upbeat about RS presentations. To HMI 3, so strong did he feel the case, that almost boasting, he indicated '*in the last year before SQA, we had more Higher candidates than Modern Studies. We had something like 12000 in 1997 sitting Short Courses in RME*' (App 7.3.2, p533). The wider context of this increase in RS presentations is the dramatic surge in staying-on rates in the upper secondary from 25% in 1985, to 51% in 1998 (quoted by Paterson, in Bryce and Humes (2nd Edit), 2004, p22). Religious Studies, while outstripping other subjects as indicated by HMI, was therefore part of a general movement. The detail of these comments is less significant. Their indication of a '*generally positive picture emerging*' (App 7.3.2, p583) is most important.

It could be argued that the Inspectorate was taking the long-term view of the development of RME in its attitude to Religious Studies. On the other hand, it could be argued that it was taking a general view rather than a detailed view. It seemed to be less interested in step by step progression in curricular maturity. It was clearly of the view that a centralist model of education was appropriate, itself forming the hub of the wheel, and in control of the speed at which it turned. Such a model would have had more to recommend itself had the Inspectorate been able to push harder at other points of development for RE.

It has already been indicated that they had ceased to push schools to reach even these minimum requirements recommended in the official advice. It was a question of crossed wires. The intention of introducing RE to inspection was to bring it out of isolation, and within a truly curricular and management context, to improve quality of provision within the subject. This fitted in well with the emphasis on child-centred education, gaining strength in RE since the start of child centred approaches in the 1960s.

Now, the initial stages over, RE was simply jumping on to the conveyor-belt of mass production. The centralist model was in use as a control mechanism. On the creative front, it was not in operation. Those schools which, by dint of willing leadership and high quality performance by the RE department, made impressive moves forward, ensuring the step by step progression in curricular maturity required of a fledgling subject. The Inspectorate seemed to be very busy at this point, collecting data for compilation of a *Standards and Quality in Secondary Schools* report as justification of their existence, and to keep the Minister informed. The civil-service emphasis in the role of the Inspectorate seemed to predominate at this point as it had in the past. In response to a question about Standards and Quality reports in RE, HMI 3 replied, in detail:

Yes. In Standards and Quality inspections, the actual published report takes the form of a general introduction..., and then parental questionnaires, what parents are saying, and then each subject involved has a section on its own. Now in the subject's section, if I take for example, RME, then the very first paragraph will be about attainment. ...After that there is a paragraph on courses, learning and teaching, management and quality assurance. At the end of each section, is a little 'priorities for action' for that subject...So it is quite specific, you know, there is a very specific report. Now in the near future, we will be publishing, as an appendix, the performance indicator

values that we have assigned to each element of the subject inspection...For example, it may say,...that inspectors found the following things to be good: basic courses, they found the following things to be good learning and teaching, they found the following things to be fair: the program. And they found the following things to be unsatisfactory. And those will be published in their stark reality. So that's the report (APP 7.3.2, p 523).

7.4.5 Impressions of Progress Overall

Development in the provision of optional courses in the senior school for candidates who wanted more in-depth study in the area of Religious Studies, is a good marker that progress was being made in RE generally. This was so not merely in terms of numbers of pupils choosing to follow certificate courses in Religious Studies, though that is borne out in HMI 3's figures above. It was significantly so also, because of the reasons for this choice being made at S3, S4, S5 and S6. Most gratifyingly for the teachers involved, the first reason is that the subject was gaining greatly in popularity, though still not alongside the 'big' subjects. This increase can be seen from census figures.

The reasons for choice cannot be seen there. One factor in this was undoubtedly the pupil-teacher relationships being built up in the subject, which proved in many cases to be an attraction to pupils. '*Good relationships between staff and pupils in most schools*' is listed as one of the Key Strengths (HMI, 2001, 8), thus, '*Ethos was good in over 80% of departments. In departments with more than one teacher there were very good relationships*' (ibid, p15).

It was perhaps also related to the nature of the subject, which included great emphasis on the significance of relationships. *Personal Search* is one evidence of this. In addition to this however, core RE provided a taster-and-more of the content of RS courses, and frequently this has proven very

attractive to pupils, even more as the age-range rose. Often pupils were totally unaware that a subject like Christianity, evidence of which surrounds them in the pervading culture, could be so interesting. When teachers started work on religions of the world, beyond the experience and the culture of pupils, to the surprise of many, this often proved to be rivetting in interest. This phenomenon is not particular to religious education. Across the curriculum subjects move up and down according to these two dimensions, pupil interest, and pupil/ teacher relationships. It is a factor of teaching which is of some significance. The interest factor is not easily defined, but it may be related to the concept of *usefulness*.

The evidence for these statements above is further supported in the comments of the two interviewees, not least HMI 3's figures for religious studies candidate numbers. In some detail, HMI 2 records that there has been a great change since he started in the inspectorate. Then he could expect to come across non-specialist teachers of RE, whereas now:

My impression of the schools that I've inspected is it is normal to have at least two people doing it. It may be 1.5, 1.7, and so on, but I don't come across many schools nowadays that have the one isolated individual teacher, ploughing a lone furrow (App 7.2.2, p509).

His 'rough rule of thumb', is:

That you need one teacher for every four hundred pupils in a school, if you are going to provide core RE at the recommended levels, and also make some provision for examination studies for those who opt for that. So that means that the average comprehensive school, with a roll of 800 to 1000 needs at least two teachers (App 7.2.2, p509).

He speaks in the same welcoming terms about promoted posts 'Again, nearly always it is a principal teacher or assistant principal teacher post' (App 7.2.2, p510). Speaking in his national capacity, HMI 3 indicated 'there are very few schools

now in the whole of Scotland without an RE department of some sort' (App 7.3.2, p545).

This was not as bright a picture as HMI 2 was able to paint for his division, but it does point to general improvement. Promoted posts too, nationally appear less well provided for than with HMI 2. There are many principal teachers, but the overall norm seems to be assistant principal teacher, with some schools using the post of senior teacher, looked upon as heads of department, perhaps reflecting the changes suggested in the McCrone Report (CEPCST, 2000). Once more the precise detail of provision of promoted posts and their level is less important than the fact that there is a wide variety of provision, and some authorities are able to make minimal provision, for example, using senior teachers as head of department. Such a variety of provision does not augur well for small subjects like RE, given the radical changes which are indicated in promotion structures in secondary education within the McCrone Report.

Again speaking nationally, HMI 3's picture of staffing provision in RE differs from the picture drawn by HMI 2 of provision in his division. Nationally, according to HMI 3 *'the vast majority (of RE departments in Scotland) would be single-person'* (App 7.3.2, p546). His *rule of thumb* for the size of departments also differs from that of HMI 2 quoted above. His figures are single teachers in the vast majority of cases, and *'Bigger schools from about 1200-1500 would have two and you would very rarely in the non-denominational sector see more than two'* (App 7.3.2, p546).

There has therefore, been progress in staffing in that most schools have an RE specialist teacher, and this is in fact, considerable improvement. On the other hand the improvement seems to have stagnated, given that the *rule of thumb* for staffing provision indicated by HMI 2 is a very long way off from being realised. The reasons for this stagnation are no doubt many and

complicated. Lack of pressure from the inspectorate on recalcitrant schools, however, must be one of them, alongside the policies and action / lack of action, of local authorities. The advice of many, including the Secretary of State, on the question of time provision for RE is clear and has been stated frequently, and in a number of significant documents for example, the Scottish Office Circular 6/91(SOED 1991), which was issued on 15 March 1991. At the outset it states unequivocally '*This Circular describes and explains the Secretary of State's policy on the teaching of religious education... in primary and secondary schools*'. On the question of provision at secondary stages, it indicates that:

Religious education should be provided for all pupils in accordance with the recommendations of the SCCC's Curriculum Design for the Secondary Stages. This recommends for the Religious and Moral Education Mode a notional minimum of 5% of curriculum time in S1 and S2, a minimum of 80 hours in S3 and S4, and a continuing element within the context of personal and social development which should feature in the curriculum of all pupils in S5 and S6. Again, aspects of moral education will occur from time to time allocated to the Religious and Moral Education Mode. It is desirable that opportunities should be given to pupils to choose certificated courses in Religious Studies (Circular No 6/91,SOED,1991, p3, para10).

Yet HMI 3 indicates that '*In terms of period time-allocation the norm in non-denominational schools would be 4.5 out of the 5% curricular time stipulated*' (App 7.3.2, p546). This is to say, that the minimum time allocation advocated for RE is not any longer a first priority for HMI. That this is the case is stated openly by HMI 3:

We would not go in and fight against 4.5%...What we would be saying in the case of a quality department, 'Here is a department which is not able to complete its learning outcomes

because you have not allowed enough time'. In other departments we would say 'you are quite right to keep this department to the time allocation until you get it strengthened up' (App 7.3.2, p546).

Given that this time-allocation is stated to be minimum, because it is indeed minimalist, it is unexpected for the inspectorate to tolerate it without making the case for improvement immediately and strongly. In what he says, HMI 3 attributes his inaction to the absence of quality in the department concerned. Where that occurs, it seems not unreasonable to be open to the possibility that the time allocation made may be a contributory factor to the absence of quality.

It may also be that the '*rule of thumb*' for calculating appropriate specialist RE staffing in secondary schools in the non-denominational sector, suggested by HMI 2 (*one specialist is required for every 400 pupils on the school roll*) is, in fact, more realistic in achieving the Secretary of State's advice of 5% of curricular time in S1 and S2, and 80 hours in S3 and S4, as well as ensuring quality within the RE provision, than the expectation of HMI 3, speaking of the non-denominational sector, that '*only larger schools of rolls in excess of 1000 have more than one specialist teacher*'. Were it only the RE lobby making the case for this time allocation it might be questionable. However, the literature is at one in stating the task to be curricular, describing RE as a mode, and the Secretary of State himself declares it to be both a mode, and in need of this time allocation *as a minimum*. It is difficult to see, whether talking of subject or mode, how it is possible seriously to expect a quality curricular piece of work to be achieved with less than this minimal time allocation. Progression and motivation in teaching are two of the factors which would weigh heavily.

This is to assume however, that the case for it to be a valid curricular component has been made, and is agreed.

7.4.6 In Conclusion

The remit of HMI 1 in his capacity as the introducer of RE to inspection on the one hand, and that of the subsequent specialist inspectors of Religious Education, are closely related though quite distinct. Two major distinctive features are, that HMI 1's position was an appointment to prepare the way and set up inspection for the first time, and secondly, those who succeeded him in religious education were subject-specialist inspectors. HMI 1 set the scene within which these subsequent specialist inspectors were to work, and set the parameters within which they might exert influence.

This was so, not only of the day-to-day operation of the inspectorate, their inspection of schools, and writing of reports, but also of the basic decisions which had previously been made by HMI 1, on the introduction of inspection. He did in fact set up the policy framework to which the inspectorate would work in its inspection of religious education, which derived from the political interest in the subject. One of the major factors in this interest, on the part of the Secretary of State, lay in its origins. The interest was in part stimulated by the Catholic Education Commission, who, although they had chosen to take no part in the work of the Millar committee, wanted, following the recommendations of Millar, to ensure the best representation for religious education within denominational schools.

The Commission was prepared to argue the general case for inspection, as a way of achieving that goal. When the Secretary of State appointed HMI 1 to introduce inspection in 1982, it was appropriate to take account of the wishes of the Commission. This was done in the subsequent negotiations carried out between the two parties. HMI 1, experienced in the inspectorate, but with no experience in RE, and therefore, perhaps, unaware of the different approaches to the practice of RE in the two sectors. The implications of the agreements he reached were, therefore, perhaps not

clear. The prize agreement seems to have been that the Commission were happy for any inspector to carry out inspection of RE in Catholic schools, and in return the inspectorate undertook to appoint a Catholic as an inspector when *'the best candidate on a list was a Catholic'*.

This meant that HMI had broken through the great divide, and that the only proviso was that a non-Catholic inspecting RE in a Catholic school would leave uninspected the faith dimension. This also implied that the HMI who was a catholic, would inspect non-denominational RE, leaving behind the faith dimension to which he was accustomed.

In the interviews, and above at various points, differences between the two specialist HMIs (HMI 2 and HMI 3) on a number of fronts, lead to the conclusion that they are caused, not by practical differences, but by differences deriving from fundamental disagreement, the source of which is divergent understandings of the nature of RE and its task in the curriculum.

These understandings are referred to above as the *denominational*, or *faith approach*, and the *open investigative approach*. This being so, it poses the question of whether it is possible to suspend these professional or religious positions in inspecting, and whether it is possible to do justice to both positions in national documents.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Consideration of Responses to the National Survey of Provision in Religious Education conducted for the Study.

8.1 Methodological Approach

One of the modes of data-gathering employed in the study was postal questionnaire. The number of questions in each of the five instruments was very restricted because the data required were extremely specific. The survey used in the study, however, was relatively complex in that as well as '*gathering data at a particular point in time*', it also aimed to '*present relational analysis*' (Cohen and Manion 1994, p83).

The survey was conducted over two successive sessions, in each case at the beginning of December, when initial figures for the session would be well established. Specific questions were sent to all local authority education departments, requesting information about provision of religious education in their secondary non-denominational schools. Authorities which did not reply were sent a second request, and if they still did not respond, it was assumed they were not willing to do so. The survey followed the pattern suggested in Cohen and Manion, where three prerequisites required in any survey are identified as the specification of:

the exact purpose of the enquiry, identifying and itemising subsidiary topics, the population on which the enquiry is to focus, and the resources available (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p85).

The first of these prerequisites, *the exact purpose of the enquiry*, was to explore the provision of RE made by each local authority education department, by establishing the school rolls of secondary,

non-denominational schools, establishing the full-time equivalent RE (FTE RE) staff in each authority, establishing numbers of promoted posts in RE, in each authority, establishing numbers of certificate courses in Religious Studies provided by each authority, establishing the relationship of numbers of FTE RE staff to the HMI 2 advice on this topic.

The second prerequisite, *the population focused*, was the pupil population in secondary non-denominational schools and their RE teachers, promoted and unpromoted, and certificate course numbers in these schools. This selection was decided on the basis of the subject-matter of the study.

The third prerequisite, *the resources available*, was the researcher alone. There was no external, financial, institutional, or other support at any stage. This was a weakness, in the sense that Local Authorities might have been more willing to respond had there been a more formal origin of the requests for their help. It also meant that the exercise was lengthier than it might have been had there been a team of workers available to dispatch the requests, and to process the replies. Given however, that the survey was for restricted purposes, these disadvantages were not regarded as major. Given that the survey was conducted of *all* Local Authority Education Departments, there was no question, at this stage, of random sampling error. Nor did this come into play in the schools selected. Although only secondary and non-denominational schools were concerned, it was *all* secondary non-denominational schools. It was written-in to the aim of the study that only secondary non-denominational schools were being studied.

The question of error arose only in relation to the returns received. Information was requested of *all* thirty-two Authorities. In Phase One, 28 Authorities responded to Instrument 1, but only 14 responded to Instrument 2. In Phase 2, 24 Authorities responded to Instrument 1, and 20 to Instrument 2, and 8 to Instrument 3. No particular reason was discernible

for this variety of response. It does however, mean that there may well be a degree of error in the data and conclusions. Where possible, external data are also called upon in such cases. However, the purpose of the survey was of significance at this point. Since the figures were not being subjected to a highly technical statistical analysis, but used as an indicator of strengths and directions, the variation has been taken to be, although subject to error, not caused by sampling bias, since there seemed to be little pattern behind the variation in numbers. This being so, the data was regarded as adequate as indicator of *strengths* and *directions* of the authorities concerned.

When returns were received, they were duly edited to ensure completeness, accuracy and uniformity, before being recorded in tables for use in the study. The returns from the instruments have been reproduced in eleven tables, and these results and data will be discussed under the broad headings of *Size and Quality of the Overall Response*, *Size of School / Authority*, *Pupil Rolls*, *Religious Studies Provision*, *Staffing of Religious Education*, *Departments / HMI 2 Advice*, *Inter-Phase Discussion*, *Inter-Council Comparison*.

In the discussion, the term *core RE* is used to denote the specific element, and time allocation indicated in the current national curricular reports on the subject. This is backed up by the direct advice of the Secretary of State for Scotland in Circular 6/91, which is 5% of curriculum time in S1 and S2, and a minimum of 80 hours over two years in S3 and S4, and a *continuing element* in S5 and S6. *Optional RS* is used to refer to any courses which pupils may *choose* to follow within the mode. These would normally, be in addition to *core RE*, but in some places might incorporate the *core* element.

8.2 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to view the provision of religious education

from the perspective of the Authorities charged with that duty, and to analyse and compare their responses (tables) to requests for information about their provision in religious education in the secondary, non-denominational schools within their bounds. Analysis was conducted using membership categorisation device (MCD) analysis from within an ethnomethodological orientation: *'MCD analysis attempts to ascertain what lies behind the understanding of (such) small (textual) units by members of a particular group'* (Titscher et al, 2000, p108), and again on the following page *'The task of MCD analysis is then to reconstruct this mechanism in texts, whereby observational and evaluative schemata of groups (or members) may be discovered'*.

The survey was not an official one, but its scope was national. It was sent to all thirty-two local authorities in Scotland. Since some authorities were reluctant to see themselves and their schools openly discussed, perhaps criticised, and compared with their fellow authorities, they asked that while permitting the use of the data provided for the survey, they be not named, councils or schools, individually. The researcher agreed to this request for anonymity. In the tables attached to this chapter therefore, councils are given a code number, which is used instead of naming them. The numbers are randomly attached to councils, though each council retains the same number throughout. The purpose of the survey was merely to discover what general provision of RE is stated to be nationally. It was not vital to be able to name schools or authorities. The positive factor in this requirement was that it focused attention even more firmly on the trends themselves. However, since each authority retains the same number throughout, it is possible to compare the various responses in numerical terms within the same council, as well as to compare the responses between councils. Responses were, however, not made in secret! Submissions were

identified by council and school name, and so the source of each return was known, and could be followed up as necessary by the researcher.

The summary table (8.3) is reproduced in this chapter. Relevant parts of it are listed and the sources of its data in the tables are given to allow of reference to the appendices of which 8.3 is summary.

8.3 Phases, Instruments, Tables, Appendices, Extracts

The survey was conducted in two **phases**, in successive school sessions. Phase 1 in 2000-2001 and Phase 2 in 2001-2002. Information was requested of authorities as at December in the respective sessions, by means of the **instruments** sent to them. There were two instruments in Phase 1 (appendices 8.1.1-2, p552-3) and three in Phase 2 (appendices 8.2.1-3, p554-56). The data derived from the five instruments are used to form the result tables which appear in this chapter as **extracts** from the Summary Table 8.3 (p557) and in full in the appendices. The returns are given in the extracts which follow. The data may be examined in full, in appendices (8.4.1-5, p559-66 and 8.5.1-5, p567-71).

The description *national* is used to reflect the intended scope of the survey: all Local Authorities in Scotland were invited to contribute. Most did in fact, fully participate, but there was a number of nil-returns, as indicated in the accompanying tables and extracts. Information was requested of schools in the non-denominational sector only. As indicated, the discussion of the chapter relies on tables by means of extracts made from them relating to the National Survey, and derived from the instruments sent to councils.

There are eleven tables (appendices 8.3, and 8.4.1-5, and 8.5.1-5. The first, 8.3, sums the results of both Phases. It is used in this chapter as the focal point. The next group of five (8.4.1-5, rely on data from Phase 1 of the survey, and the following five (8.5.1-5) on Phase 2.

Data from the returns for the third instrument from Phase Two, aimed at collecting information about the existence of authority policies on religious education appears in Table 8.5.3.

The titles and appendix numbers of the tables :

- Table 8.3 Summary Table: Relation of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE staff, the HMI 2 staffing advice, and RS Exam Course Totals, by Council (Phase 1 and Phase 2).
- Table 8.4.1 Provision in Religious Education: Pupil Numbers and RS Exam Course Numbers by Council (Ph1 Instr1).
- Table 8.4.2 Higher Still Course Pupil Numbers by Council (Ph1 Instr 2).
- Table 8.4.3 Relation of FTE RE Staff Numbers to Pupil Roll, and Exam Course Numbers (Ph1).
- Table 8.4.4 Analysis of Phase 1 Returns in relation to the HMI 2 Advice on RE Staffing.
- Table 8.4.5 Pupil Roll, RE staff complements, and Promoted Posts.
- Table 8.5.1 Provision in RE, Pupil Numbers and RS Exam Course Numbers, by Council (Ph2 Instr1). This table mirrors table 8.4.1.
- Table 8.5.2 Higher Still Course Pupil Numbers by Council (Ph2 Instr 2). This table mirrors table 8.4.2.
- Table 8.5.3 Local Authority RE Policies submitted (Ph2 Instr 3).
- Table 8.5.4 Relation of FTE RE staff to Pupil Roll Numbers and Exam Course Numbers (this table mirrors table 8.4.3).
- Table 8.5.5 Analysis of Phase 2 Returns in relation to the HMI 2 advice on RE Staffing (this table mirrors table 8.4.4).

Data from these tables is extracted for the purposes of the discussion of the chapter. There are five extracts, each giving details of its source table.

They are:

- Extract 1 Link between core Provision and availability of Optional Courses,
- Extract 2 Link between Staffing of RE Departments and HMI 2 Advice,
- Extract 3 Link between RS Provision and HMI 2 Advice,
- Extract 4 Numbers of Promoted Posts in RE Departments,
- Extract 5 Local Authority Policies for RE.

Phase One of the survey consisted of two instruments, asking specific information about each of the Authority's non-denominational secondary schools. Instrument 1 asked about staff complement, pupil roll, size of the RE department, promoted post in RE, and information on certificate courses in RS offered by the department. Instrument 2 asked more specifically about provision in the same schools of RS courses offered at Higher Still.

Phase Two, sent to authorities in the following session (2001-2002), consisted of three instruments. Instrument 1 requested the same information as that requested in Phase 1 Instrument 1, but as at December 2001. Instrument 2 asked for the same information as was requested in Phase 1 Instrument 2, but again for the new session. Instrument 3 appears only in Phase 2. It asked if the Authority had a policy for RE in the non-denominational sector, and if so, requested a copy.

Information requested in the instruments is recorded in the tables. Each table is identified by three digits, of which one indicates the chapter, the next the phase, and the third, the table within that phase.

The first table (appendix 8.3, with only two digits) is a summary table of both phases. Phase 1 has five Tables (appendices 8.4.1-8.4.5) and Phase 2 has five Tables (8.5.1 - 8.5.5).

Responses were received to the instruments of the two Phases as

follows, where FR = full response, PR = partial response, NR = nil response:

Phase One

	Instrument 1	Instrument 2
FR	27	14
PR	1	0
NR	4	18

Phase Two

	Instrument 1	Instrument 2	Instrument 3
FR	10	4	8
PR	14		
NR	8	12	24

Authorities which did not reply to a first request were sent a second. If they still did not provide the information, it was assumed they did not intend to do so. Four authorities operated schools which covered both primary and secondary age ranges. In these cases, only schools whose roll consisted of secondary pupils alone were counted for the purposes of the survey.

Table 8.3 (Appendix 8.3)

The table entitled *Relation of Numbers of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE staff, HMI 2 advice and Pupil Numbers Following RS Exam Courses* (Table 8.3) is at the heart of the analysis. Appropriate extracts from it, and other tables are used in the chapter to highlight points. The tables from which extracts derive are indicated in the extracts. Table 8.3 is reproduced on page 252, below. It stands on its own, and is represented by two digits of which the first indicates the chapter, and the second its place in the sequence. Other tables appear as indicated. Table 3 relies on the information given in more detail in those tables.

In it, *numbers of schools, pupil rolls, FTE RE staff, HMI 2 Advice on RE staffing*, as well as *numbers of pupils involved in RS exam courses* offered in schools are given. In this table, councils are arranged by size of pupil population. Figures in each case are given initially for Phase 1, and those for Phase 2 follow in brackets. In the main, the other tables provide the base information for table 3. The second last column of table 3, headed *HMI 2 Advice*, applies the RE staffing criterion offered by HMI 2 to headteachers of his Division, to the Councils in the survey, using the data they provide. HMI 2 explains his advice in the HMI 2 interview in the appendices:

The advice I've often given to schools when they ask about staffing provision for RE is that a rough rule of thumb is that you need one teacher for every four hundred pupils in a school, if you are going to provide core-RE at the recommended levels, and also make some provision for examination studies for those who opt for that. So that means that the average comprehensive school with a roll of 800 to 1000 needs at least two teachers (App 8.2.2 , p509).

His advice was not based merely on aspirations for RE, but on practical requirements, in the light of how schools had till then managed. It emanated from HMI 2's experience, as first-ever specialist HMI in RE nationally, when he worked alongside, and subsequently succeeded, HMI 1, and then as specialist RE Inspector in his Division. Given that HMI are not known to rush headlong into making ill-considered or intentionally foolish statements, it may be useful to measure the performance of the authorities against this easily calculated, simple piece of advice which HMI 2 offered to head teachers in his Division while he was specialist HMI there for religious education.

Twenty-seven of the thirty-two authorities, nationally, made returns providing the information which is reproduced in Table 8.3. Of those, two

reached, and passed the HMI 2 advice:

Appendix 8.3

Chapter 8

Coded Survey Results

Councils randomly coded

Table 8.3

Ph 1 and Ph 2: 2000-2002

Relation of Numbers of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE Staff, HMI 2 RE staffing advice and Pupil Numbers following RS Exam courses

Figures for both phases are provided. Those for Phase 2 appear in brackets. PR indicates a partial return

Council	No of Schools	Pupil Roll	FTE RE Staff	HMI 2 Advice	Total Exam Courses
15	17(17)	21324(20812)	30.5(32.5)	53.31(52.03)	2457(4969)
13	20(20)	193335(20411)	34.97	48.33(21.87)	1639(3002)
16	19(one unnamed) (NR)	18143(NR)	32.7(+)	45.35(NR)	3050(NR)
2	16(16)	15505(6876)	29.50(19.9)	38.76(17.19)	448(4413)
29	16(16)	15226(14843)	20.5(18)	38.06(37.10)	2786(479)
17	28(28)	14872(111568)	27.225(28.85)	37.18(28.85)	4325(1931)
32	13(13)	10999(10947)	22.2(13.0)	27.49(27.36)	223(921)
7	13(14)	9460(8401)	16(15.8)	23.65(21)	846(517)
25	9(9)	8884(7679)	8.2(16.2)	22.21(19.19)	545(3478)
21	8(8)	7696(7507)	7(12)	19.24(18.76)	0(0)
10	7(NR)	7278(NR)	14.86(NR)	18.19(NR)	1370(NR)
3	8(8)	7208(5795)	10.2(11)	18.02(18.02)	1620(625)
26	9(9)	6561(6629)	14.95(14.5)	16.40(16.57)	1263(825)
1	9(10)	6392(8364)	12.3(6.9)	15.98(20.91)	1526(812)
9	8(8)	6320(7919)	9.2(10.2)	15.8(19.79)	1470(167)
20	8(8)	5723(1925PR)	10.3(5.2PR)	14.3	616(175PR)
4	10(10)	5591(1303PR)	7(3.4PR)	13.9	40(620)
8	8(7)	5517(3792)	10.8(13.2PR)	13.79	1205(1817)
11	6(6)	5238(5246)	8.6(9.1)	13.09(13.11)	1213(376)
12	5(NR)	5069(NR)	8.5(NR)	12.67(NR)	1621(NR)
30	6(9)	4899(1552PR)	8.3(2.1PR)	12.24	231(398)
31	4(4)	3564(3464)	6.8(6.7)	6.91(8.86)	668(542)
18	5(4)	3370(2170PR)	5.8(3PR)	8.4	1226(705)
5	3(3)	2968(1723)	8(8.2)	7.42(4.30)	692(390)
6	3(3)	1410(1906)	4.2(4)	3.52(4.76)	511(721)
24	*1	1310(1650)	2(3)	3.27(4.12)	221(460)
23	2(2)	1275(1265)	2.6(2.6)	3.18(3.16)	496(370)
14	nil return				
19	nil return				
22	nil return				
27	nil return				
28	nil return				

Council 5 (three schools, total pupil roll: 2698) had one teacher more than HMI 2 advised,

Council 6 (three schools, total pupil roll 1410) had 0.68 FTE RE staff

above the recommended staffing level.

Neither of these figures greatly exceeds what was advised. They are figures for entire authorities, albeit in this case small ones, and not individual schools. All of the others fell below the HMI 2 recommendations by the following margins:

between 0 and 5 below:	thirteen councils (1,8,10,11,12,18, 20,23,24,26, 30,31,32)
between 6 and 10 below:	six councils (2,3,4,7,9,17)
between 11 and 20 below:	five councils (13,16,21,25,29)
more than 20 teachers below:	one council (15).

This analysis in Table 8.3 is of Phase 1 figures. The Phase 2 figures are in brackets in that table. In offering his advice to headteachers, HMI 2 was careful to make reference to RE as *core*, spelled out in a number of curricular reports, and as required in official advice for example, from the Secretary of State for Scotland, in Scottish Office Circular No 6/91 (in pre-devolution terms), discussed elsewhere, and also to *optional* RE, or, more precisely, RS, Religious Studies. Table 8.3 gives figures for the certificate courses available in the senior school (more detail is given in Tables. 8.4.1 and 8.4.2 for Phase 1, and for Phase 2, in tables 8.5.1 and 8.5.2.).

Extract 1 of 8.3, which follows below, pinpoints this key factor of *options for further in depth study* which is linked to the principle of *educationalisation*, and *core RE*. In each of the phases, it is necessary to consider also, and at the same time as the two tables given immediately above, table 8.4.3, which links particularly pupil roll, RE staff and exam courses for each authority. This link between provision and the availability of optional RS is significant. (The same is so for Phase 2, and is demonstrated in further detail in tables 8.5.1, 8.5.2 and 8.5.4). This point is shown in *Extract 1* of 8.3 below.

As indicated above, Table 8.3 brings together totals from other tables, with the staffing advised by HMI 2. It lists the exam course totals of tables 8.4.1, 8.4.2 and 8.5.1, 8.5.2 with pupil rolls and FTE RE staff in both Phases. It is an overview table. It gives the information appropriate to both phases of the survey.

EXTRACT 1	<u>Link between Provision and availability of optional RS courses</u>	
fromAppendix 8.3		
Chapter 8	Coded Survey Results	Councils randomly coded
Table 8.3		
Ph 1 and Ph 2: 2000-2002	Relation of Numbers of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE Staff, HMI 2 RE staffing advice and Pupil Numbers following RS Exam courses	

Figures for both phases are provided. Those for Phase 2 appear in brackets. PR indicates a partial return

Council	No of Schools	Pupil Roll	FTERE Staff	Total Exam Courses
15	17(17)	21324(20812)	30.5(32.5)	2457(4969)
13	20(20)	193335(20411)	34.97	1639(3002)
16	19(one unnamed) (NR)	18143(NR)	32.7(+)	3050(NR)
2	16(16)	15505(6876)	29.50(19.9)	448(4413)
29	16(16)	15226(14843)	20.5(18)	2786(479)
17	28(28)	14872(111568)	27.225(28.85)	4325(1931)
32	13(13)	10999(10947)	22.2(13.0)	223(921)
7	13(14)	9460(8401)	16(15.8)	846(517)
25	9(9)	8884(7679)	8.2(16.2)	545(3478)
21	8(8)	7696(7507)	7(12)	0(0)
10	7(NR)	7278(NR)	14.86(NR)	1370(NR)
3	8(8)	7208(5795)	10.2(11)	1620(625)
26	9(9)	6561(6629)	14.95(14.5)	1263(825)
1	9(10)	6392(8364)	12.3(6.9)	1526(812)
9	8(8)	6320(7919)	9.2(10.2)	1470(167)
20	8(8)	5723(1925PR)	10.3(5.2PR)	616(175PR)
4	10(10)	5591(1303PR)	7(3.4PR)	40(620)
8	8(7)	5517(3792)	10.8(13.2PR)	1205(1817)
11	6(6)	5238(5246)	8.6(9.1)	1213(376)
12	5(NR)	5069(NR)	8.5(NR)	1621(NR)
30	6(9)	4899(1552PR)	8.3(2.1PR)	231(398)
31	4(4)	3564(3464)	6.8(6.7)	668(542)
18	5(4)	3370(2170PR)	5.8(3PR)	1226(705)
5	3(3)	2968(1723)	8(8.2)	692(390)
6	3(3)	1410(1906)	4.2(4)	511(721)
24	*1	1310(1650)	2(3)	221(460)
23	2(2)	1275(1265)	2.6(2.6)	496(370)
14	nil return			
19	nil return			
22	nil return			
27	nil return			
28	nil teturn			

The tables and extracts of chapter eight are discussed under headings deriving from their content:

- The size and quality of the overall response
- The size of school/ authority pupil rolls
- Religious Studies Provision, and its link to core
- Staffing of Religious Education Departments
- Discussion of the Phases
- Inter-council comparison

8.4 The Size and Quality of the overall Response

A request was sent to every local authority in the country in both phases. In Phase 1 there was a drop in response between the two instruments with four authorities failing to respond to Instrument 1, and eighteen failing to respond to instrument 2. This was despite the fact that Instrument 1 requested more data and in greater detail, and Instrument 2 restricted itself to Higher Still information. The paucity of the Higher Still response may be caused by its being the early stages of the introduction of Higher Still, and therefore, it may have been considered by authorities and schools as less relevant to them at that moment.

Overall responses to Phase 2 were slightly less full, with only twenty-four authorities making a response to Instrument 1, and twenty to Instrument 2. Responses to Instrument 3 in Phase 2 were, at eight, very low, and this may reflect the stage of development of policies for RE in councils, rather than on their unwillingness to pass on existing policies. All three instruments were sent at the same time, so it seems that the failure to return policy statements was caused by their non-existence at that time. There exists also, the possibility that since councils had been asked for their help in phase 1, and this was the final instrument in Phase 2, the irritation factor was

playing a role.

8.5 The Size of School / Authority Pupil Rolls

The size of pupil rolls per authority, ranged from 21,324 (17 schools) to 1275 (2 schools). That is to say, that the smallest authorities barely surpass the roll of a single school in some of the other authorities. Many of these small schools are in isolated rural areas or are island-based. Seven authorities exceeded rolls of ten thousand, thirteen ranged from five to ten thousand pupils, seven had rolls of up to five thousand, five registered nil returns. Extract 1 of 8.3 already reproduced, provides the data in summary form.

8.6 Religious Studies Provision

The main concern of the study is with *core* RE. As a core subject, or *mode*, the significance of RE derives from the contribution it makes to the broad education of all children. The absence of that contribution at any stage would be to leave a gap in the pupil's education. Its contribution is not restricted to the religious any more than, for example, that of arithmetic is restricted to the mathematical.

RS has an altogether narrower focus. Discussion of, and data about Religious Studies, is included in order to explore its relation to *core* RE. RS is, almost by definition, an option for senior pupils. To be an option means it is not *core*, required for all pupils. It has a distinctively different aim from that of *core*. Should it be used instead of core RE, it cannot achieve its own goals simultaneously with those of core RE.

Extract 1 (which appears above) indicates the total number of RS courses undertaken. A detailed break down of types of RS courses followed in each authority is given in appendices 8.4.1 and 8.4.2 for Phase 1, and

appendices 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 provide the same information for Phase 2 (and may be seen in volume 2). The range and types of course covered under this head is great, from minimalist courses (as in the Short Courses) to the full-blown type of course (as in Higher Grade). Numbers undertaking these courses mirror this difference in type. The most popular was Short Courses, followed by Modules, then Higher, followed closely by Standard Grade. Some councils were far ahead of the majority. Council 2 for example, had a total of 4448 candidates engaged in certificate courses. This was made up of 3703 Short Course candidates, 635 Module candidates, 19 Standard Grade candidates, and 91 Higher Grade candidates.

Fourteen councils (1,2,3,8,9,11,12,13,15,16,17,18,29,32) had Short Course candidate numbers of more than one thousand. All of these fourteen were below the staffing level advised by HMI 2. It emerged that in some schools, religious studies courses, often a Short Course but sometimes a Module, were being used as core, statutory RE. One school was using Standard Grade as its core RE course between S3 and S4. One of the reasons for so using a short course is that the time allocation for core RE fits relatively well the ground to be covered in a short course or module. In addition, in the view of those concerned, pupils prefer to be engaged in courses with a certificate available at the end. This same principle was applied by the school using Standard Grade as its Core RE course at S3 and S4. It is however, an open question how effective it might be, taking two years to cover such a course within the scope of one period per week. Would it be sufficient to generate and keep interest and involvement high, particularly when stretching over two sessions? These are questions which must be put.

In all of the cases where RS material is being used for core RE, it is open to question whether it is possible to talk of *options* on the part of pupils,

except in *choosing* a course which leads to a certificate. In any case, where this was so, there was no question of additional time being made available for the certificate work undertaken by RE, or additional staffing being provided to meet demand. The sort of religious studies provision being made was not geared to meet interest in opting to pursue the subject at greater depth. In such coverage of work, the concepts of interest or depth are less significant. Rather, it is a question of following a different direction, which in effect produces more shallow coverage of the stated ground.

Not all of the short courses or modules referred to in the returns, came into this category though undoubtedly some did. The Principal Assessor reports of the Scottish Qualifications Authority for the years concerned show a lively interest in Religious Studies courses. Entries for the following are given:

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
Standard Grade	1181	1358
CSYS	15	9
RMPs Higher Level	1354	1408

(SQA Principal Assessor Reports, 2000 and 2001, SQA, Glasgow)

Only with the single exception of the school referred to above, the Standard Grade and Higher Grade courses in the returns may have been in fact the result of real *opting in* by senior pupils. If this were so, the RE staffing returns made are further from the HMI 2 criterion than at first appears, since they do not provide *core* RE as well as *optional* RS courses.

8.7 Staffing of Religious Education Departments / HMI 2 advice

As a criterion by which to measure authority staffing of RE departments, a figure suggested by HMI 2, and actively offered by him as advice to head teachers in his division is used. The figure, as quoted above, is *one RE teacher for every four hundred pupils* to cover *core* RE, and to allow for optional RS in the upper school. By *core* RE is meant the specific time allocation indicated in the current national curricular reports on the subject, backed up by the direct advice of the Secretary of State for Scotland (Circular No 6/91). *Optional* RS implies the certificate courses available from Short Courses to full-blown Higher Grade Religious Studies, as well as the gamut of Higher Still courses which have become available in RS, since it was taken into the CCC (LTS) fold, and national working parties were set up as in all curricular subjects.

The main criterion for this category is that pupils may *opt* for the subject with a view to studying it in greater depth, either because they enjoy the subject and find it of value, or because they wish to use the certificate to be gained for other purposes, for example university entrance, or for both purposes simultaneously. Extract 2 on the following page gives this information in summary form: *number of schools, pupil roll*, alongside their complement of *FTE RE staff*, with particular reference to the attainment of the HMI 2 goals. He did have in mind in his advice the ability of departments to offer RS courses too. Provision of RS courses is discussed above, and numbers of courses offered by authorities is given in Extract 1.

All of this information is given in more detail in the Appendices: appendices 8.4.3 (p563) for phase 1, and 8.5.4 (p570) for phase 2. A list of appendices appears above. They give basic information about councils. They also give the total number of RS exam courses being operated within the council, a crude initial indication under the broad heading *options*.

EXTRACT 2:**Link between Staffing of RE departments and HMI 2 Advice**

from Appendix 8.3

Chapter 8

Coded Survey Results

Councils randomly coded

Ph 1 and Ph 2: 2000-2002
RE**Relation of Numbers of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE Staff, HMI 2
staffing advice and Pupil Numbers following RS Exam**

courses

Figures for both phases are provided. Those for Phase 2 appear in brackets. PR indicates a partial return

Council	No of Schools	Pupil Roll	FTE RE Staff	HMI 2 Advice
15	17(17	21324(20812	30.5(32.5)	53.31(52.03)
13	20(20)	193335(20411)	34.97	48.33(21.87)
16	19(one unnamed) (NR)	18143(NR)	32.7(+)	45.35(NR)
2	16(16)	15505(6876	29.50(19.9)	38.76(17.19)
29	16(16	15226(14843)	20.5(18)	38.06(37.10)
17	28(28)	14872(111568)	27.225(28.85)	37.18(28.85)
32	13(13)	10999(10947)	22.2(13.0)	27.49(27.36)
7	13(14	9460(8401)	16(15.8)	23.65(21)
25	9(9)	8884(7679)	8.2(16.2)	22.21(19.19)
21	8(8)	7696(7507)	7(12)	19.24(18.76)
10	7(NR)	7278(NR)	14.86(NR)	18.19(NR)
3	8(8)	7208(5795	10.2(11)	18.02(18.02)
26	9(9)	6561(6629)	14.95(14.5)	16.40(16.57)
1	9(10)	6392(8364)	12.3(6.9)	15.98(20.91)
9	8(8)	6320(7919)	9.2(10.2)	15.8(19.79)
20	8(8)	5723(1925PR)	10.3(5.2PR)	14.3
4	10(10)	5591(1303PR)	7(3.4PR)	13.9
8	8(7)	5517(3792)	10.8(13.2PR)	13.79
11	6(6)	5238(5246)	8.6(9.1)	13.09(13.11)
12	5(NR)	5069(NR)	8.5(NR)	12.67(NR)
30	6(9)	4899(1552PR)	8.3(2.1PR)	12.24
31	4(4)	3564(3464)	6.8(6.7)	6.91(8.86)
18	5(4)	3370(2170PR)	5.8(3PR)	8.4
5	3(3)	2968(1723)	8(8.2)	7.42(4.30)
6	3(3)	1410(1906)	4.2(4)	3.52(4.76)
24	*1	1310(1650)	2(3)	3.27(4.12)
23	2(2)	1275(1265)	2.6(2.6)	3.18(3.16)
14	nil return			
19	nil return			
22	nil return			
27	nil return			
28	nil return			

A break down of these figures by course is available in Appendices 8.4.1 and 2, and 8.5.1 and 2.

It is clear from the figures that some councils are well ahead of the

majority in securing (often large) numbers of candidates for Religious Studies courses. In 2000-2001 for example, Council 16 had, with a pupil roll of 18,143, a total of 3,050 Religious Studies courses, Council 17, with a pupil population of 14,872, had a total of 4,325 Religious Studies courses. On the other hand, Council 2, with pupil roll of 15,505, had a total 448 Religious Studies courses, and Council 21, with pupil roll of 7,696, had a total Religious Studies courses of zero. Similar comparisons are evident in phase 2. There seems therefore, to be a great deal of scope for expansion. Whether fault for this lack of development lies at the feet of pupils, RE staff, or management, is a question which the survey did not address. At this juncture, all that it is possible to note is the potential for expansion. Certainly, if a greater uptake of Religious Studies options were achieved, the sort of staffing levels envisaged by HMI 2 would need to be exceeded.

At the time of the survey, staffing levels in RE were inadequate to allow the sort of coverage of core RE and RS which HMI 2 regarded as necessary on the part of all schools. Extract 2 (on the previous page) raises another facet of RE staffing at this point. The subject matter of the HMI 2 advice is already discussed above, and in Extract 2, the margins by which councils differ from HMI 2 are indicated. As shown above, only two authorities surpass HMI 2, and even then by a very small margin. Council 5, which has three secondary schools and a pupil roll of 2,698, exceeded HMI 2 by one teacher. Council 6, with three schools and a total of 1,410 pupils had 0.68 FTE RE staff in excess of HMI 2's advice. The greatest proportion of the remaining councils were between 0 and 5 below HMI 2's figures (councils 1, 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32). Their pupil roll ranged from 1,275 (council 23) to 10,999 (council 32). The next group, (six councils: 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 17) fell between 6 and 10 below HMI 2. Their pupil rolls ranged from 5,591 (council 4) to 15,505 (council 2).

The third group consisted of five councils (13, 16, 21, 25, 29), who fell between 11 and 20 below the HMI 2 recommendation. They ranged in pupil population from 7,696 (council 21) to 19,335 (council 13). The final council, 15 fell 22.81 FTE RE staff below the HMI 2 figure, with a pupil population of 21,324 and a total RE staff of 30.5 teachers. Five councils made nil-returns.

Looking at the returns globally, pupil population was 221,137, the FTE RE staff complement was 383.23, and the HMI 2 staffing advice was 552.84, that is a shortfall of 169.61 RE teachers to meet this basic, minimalist level of provision. In broad measure, the figures tend to indicate that the larger the council, the more inadequate is its staffing of RE in numerical terms. It could be argued therefore, given these figures, and the fact that the HMI 2 advice was aimed at basic provision of core RE as already advised in all the national curricular documents, with the option of RS for pupils, in the senior school, who wish to pursue it, that time allocation in RE/RS was not seen as a priority by councils or schools. This was so despite its now being open to inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate. The principal reason why so many authorities seem to have reasonably healthy RS provision may be that their schools have replaced their core RE with RS courses. Extract 3 (on the following page) adds the dimension of RS provision in the context of HMI2 advice to the schools in his division. He was clear in his staffing calculations that there were two dimensions to the question: *core* RE for all, and RS for senior pupils who *opted* to follow such courses. Extract 3 adds this dimension to the data of extract 2, already considered.

HMI 2 advice therefore, is being turned on its head, and all of the RS courses which stand instead of *core* RE courses can no longer be used as evidence that the authorities concerned are moving in the direction of HMI 2. It would be an abuse to use the word *option* in this context. In these cases,

the authorities are providing for only one slot, one half of the HMI 2 advice,

EXTRACT 3

Link between Core RE and RS in HMI2 advice

from Appendix 8.3

Chapter 8

Coded Survey Results

Councils randomly coded

Ph 1 and Ph 2: 2000-2002

Relation of Numbers of Schools, Rolls, FTE RE Staff, HMI 2 RE staffing advice and Pupil Numbers following RS Exam courses

Figures for both phases are provided. Those for Phase 2 appear in brackets. PR indicates a partial return

Council	No of Schools	Pupil Roll	FTE RE Staff	HMI 2 Advice	Total Exam Courses
15	17(17)	21324(20812)	30.5(32.5)	53.31(52.03)	2457(4969)
13	20(20)	193335(20411)	34.97	48.33(21.87)	1639(3002)
16	19(one unnamed) (NR)	18143(NR)	32.7(+)	45.35(NR)	3050(NR)
2	16(16)	15505(6876)	29.50(19.9)	38.76(17.19)	448(4413)
29	16(16)	15226(14843)	20.5(18)	38.06(37.10)	2786(479)
17	28(28)	14872(111568)	27.225(28.85)	37.18(28.85)	4325(1931)
32	13(13)	10999(10947)	22.2(13.0)	27.49(27.36)	223(921)
7	13(14)	9460(8401)	16(15.8)	23.65(21)	846(517)
25	9(9)	8884(7679)	8.2(16.2)	22.21(19.19)	545(3478)
21	8(8)	7696(7507)	7(12)	19.24(18.76)	0(0)
10	7(NR)	7278(NR)	14.86(NR)	18.19(NR)	1370(NR)
3	8(8)	7208(5795)	10.2(11)	18.02(18.02)	1620(625)
26	9(9)	6561(6629)	14.95(14.5)	16.40(16.57)	1263(825)
1	9(10)	6392(8364)	12.3(6.9)	15.98(20.91)	1526(812)
9	8(8)	6320(7919)	9.2(10.2)	15.8(19.79)	1470(167)
20	8(8)	5723(1925PR)	10.3(5.2PR)	14.3	616(175PR)
4	10(10)	5591(1303PR)	7(3.4PR)	13.9	40(620)
8	8(7)	5517(3792)	10.8(13.2PR)	13.79	1205(1817)
11	6(6)	5238(5246)	8.6(9.1)	13.09(13.11)	1213(376)
12	5(NR)	5069(NR)	8.5(NR)	12.67(NR)	1621(NR)
30	6(9)	4899(1552PR)	8.3(2.1PR)	12.24	231(398)
31	4(4)	3564(3464)	6.8(6.7)	6.91(8.86)	668(542)
18	5(4)	3370(2170PR)	5.8(3PR)	8.4	1226(705)
5	3(3)	2968(1723)	8(8.2)	7.42(4.30)	692(390)
6	3(3)	1410(1906)	4.2(4)	3.52(4.76)	511(721)
24	*1	1310(1650)	2(3)	3.27(4.12)	221(460)
23	2(2)	1275(1265)	2.6(2.6)	3.18(3.16)	496(370)
14	nil return				
19	nil return				
22	nil return				
27	nil return				
28	nil teturn				

and it is a mix of RE and RS. It cannot be regarded as both. It is RS in the guise of core RE. Provision of core RE in the senior school therefore, is much poorer than at first it appears, since what many pupils are being given is an RS course and not core RE. In calculating the adequacy of staffing, it is not possible to count these figures twice, as core RE and again as RS.

Yet another facet of the staffing question is the degree to which RE staff in schools are treated as a department. With sometimes the possible exception of size, RE meets all the generally applied criteria used in schools for awarding departmental status: it is a subject specialism recognised specifically by the GTC, it requires a specialist training on the part of those who would teach it, it represents a distinctive mode of learning. Extract 4 (on the following page) provides figures from the returns about how far RE departments have promoted-post status.

Of the returns made, eight authorities had a promoted post in RE in all their schools (Councils: 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 15, 20, 21) one had no promoted posts (Council 18). The remaining 17 Councils had a number of promoted posts, less than the number of schools within their bounds, suggesting the lack of a clear policy. This data can be examined in more detail in appendix 8.4.5.

There was a considerable variation in the type of promoted post used for RE. Normally it was at *principal teacher* level. *Assistant-principal teacher* was frequently used instead of principal teacher, and in a small number of cases the post *senior teacher* was used as head of department. It seems that the creation of a promoted post in a subject is a problem, which is more easily addressed than the full, effective staffing of the department.

EXTRACT 4:
from Appendix 8.4.5

Numbers of Promoted posts in RE Departments

Chapter 8.4.5

Coded Survey Results

Councils randomly coded

Table 8.4.5

Phase 1 2000-2001

Pupil roll and RE staff complements

Council	Number of Schools	Pupil Roll	RE Staff Compl	Pro Posts
1	9	6392	12.3	7
2	16	15505	29.50	16
3	8	7208	12.20	8
4	9	5591	7	4
5	3	2968	8	3
6	3	1410	4.2	3
7	13	9460	17	9
8	8	5517	10.8	6
9	8	6320	9.2	5
10	7	7278	14.86	6
11	6	5238	8.6	5
12	5	5069	8.5	5
13	20	19335	34.97	18
14	7	Nil Return		
15	17	21324	30.5	17
16 (incomplete return)19(26)		18143	32.7	15
17	28	14872	27.25	16
18	5	3370	5.8	0
19	Nil Return			
20	8	5723	10.3	8
21	8	7696	7	8
22	Nil Return			
23	2	1275	2.6	1
24(incomplete return)6 (1 return)		1310	2	1
25	9	8884	8.2	7
26	9	6561	14.95	8
27	Nil Return			
28	Nil Return			
29	16	15226	20.5	12
30	6	4899	8.3	5
31	4	3564	6.8	2
32	12	10999	22.2	

8.8 Inter-phase Discussion

Some reference has already been made to the differing returns for the phases and between them. The tables for both phases are the same except in one respect. Phase 2 undertook an enquiry into council policies for religious education (table 8.2.3 on page 521). This was left till the second phase, in the expectation that at Phase 1, some councils might be in the process of producing such a statement.

The delay was not productive. Extract 5 (on the following page) shows responses to the request for details of RE policies. Only eight councils sent a copy of a policy (Councils 6,7,8,15,17,24,26,31). Of those one was large, extending over 105 pages, one was eleven pages in length, one ten, one four, one three, and three were one page in length. Between the phases there is no more than a normal fluctuation of school numbers and pupil rolls. In the case of FTE RE staff, the survey seemed to show a figure decrease from 313.8 in Phase 1 (table 8.4.1) to 232.85 in the Phase 2 (table 8.5.1) returns for those councils which made a return for both phases. That is a difference of 80.95, which, given the overall totals, is a substantial difference. The incompleteness of the survey returns may have affected the outcome. Councils returning this information for both phases numbered only eighteen out of the possible thirty-two.

Parallel figures for staffing levels are not available from HMI sources. HMI did not in fact conduct their normal annual teacher censuses by subject for those years, for reasons internal to the service. There are therefore, no figures from HMI sources of teachers of RE by main subject for the two sessions of the national census of the present study. They did however conduct censuses in the following years with the results given:

2003: 603, 2004: 623, 2005: 662

(HMI Statistics Division, Edinburgh).

EXTRACT 5:**Local Authority Policies for RE submitted**

from

Appendix 8.5.3Chapter 8
coded

Coded Survey Results

Councils randomly

Phase 2 2001-2002

Local Authority Religious Education Policies submitted

Phase 2 instrument 3

Council	Policy submitted	Policy length	No policy submitted
1			
2			x
3			x
4			x
5			x
6	x	10pp	x
7	x	1p	
8	x	1p	
9			
10			x
11			x
12			x
13			x
14			x
15	x	3pp	
16			x
17	x	4	
18			x
19			x
20			x
21			x
22			x
23			x
24	x	105pp	
25			x
26	x	11pp	
27			x
28			x
29			x
30			x
31	x	1p	
32			x

These figures, although not for the years of the National Survey, demonstrate a clear pattern of development. There is no reason to assume the existence of a change to create this pattern which did not exist earlier. The *Information and Analytical Services* section of the Education Department of the Scottish Executive reflect the pattern. For the years 2003-05 they give

the following figures:

2003	Teaching RE	590	
2004	"	622	Registered to teach 1075
2005	"	661	" 1135

With Exam Course totals, the figures are, for Phase 1: 34,433 (table8.4.1), and for Phase 2 they are 20,498 (table 8.5.1). Once again there is a considerable gap of 13,935. In the case of Higher Still totals, the figures are Phase1:1,975 (table 8.4.2) and for Phase 2: 8,215 (table 8.5.2), quite a reversal of the trend evident elsewhere. Taking exam course totals together, the figures are Phase 1: 30,691 and those for Phase 2: 27,280, a difference of 3,411, much less dramatic than with individual types of courses. A ready numerical comparison of the two phases can be made using Table 8.3, which gives figures for both on number of schools, rolls, FTE RE Staff and Exam Course totals.

8.9 Inter Council Comparison

In the Phase 1 tables there were:

- one council with a pupil roll of more than 20,000 (15),
- four councils (2, 13, 16, 29) with rolls between 15,000 and 20,000,
- two councils (17, 32) with rolls between 10,000 and 15,000,
- thirteen councils (1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21,25,26) with rolls between 5,000 and 10,000,
- seven councils (5, 6, 18, 23, 24, 30, 31) with rolls of less than 5,000.

There were five nil-returns.

In the Phase 2 returns there were:

two councils (13, 15) with pupil rolls
 of more than 20,000,
 no councils with rolls of between 15,000
 and 20,000,
 three councils (17, 29, 32) with pupil rolls
 of between 10,000 and 15,000 pupils,
 nine councils (1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 21, 25, 26)
 with pupil rolls between 5,000 and 10,000,
 ten councils (4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 20, 23, 24, 30, 31)
 with pupil rolls of less than 5,000.

It is interesting to lay the findings of this classification of councils by size of pupil population, alongside that given in tables 8.4.4 and 8.5.5 which categorise them by the HMI 2 staffing advice. For example, one of the two biggest councils is worst staffed following HMI 2 with 22.81 FTE RE staff below HMI 2s calculated requirement. The other of the largest pair (13) fell 13.36 below HMI 2.

All of the tables, 8.3, 8.4.1-5, and 8.5.1-5, are reproduced sequentially as appendices in volume II.

The main concern of the study is with *core* RE. Religious Studies data are included as demonstration that the purpose of core is educational rather than simply 'religious'. It is therefore, suitable for all, whether religious or not in the same sense that arithmetic is included for all, without regard to whether pupils are mathematical. Data on RS is also provided because of the danger of using RS courses to serve in place of *core* RE.

CHAPTER NINE

The Contribution of Religious Education to General Curriculum Thinking

an examination of the relationship of religious education with, and its contribution to, the education of children, and to general curriculum thinking. Consideration of some of the factors in treating religious education on the same pragmatic and theoretical footing as other contributors to the educational process.

9.1 Methodological Approach

The aim of this chapter is to examine the contribution which RE may make to the educational process, functions which it may perform, and which would not otherwise be covered. It will also consider some of the factors, pragmatic, theoretical and philosophical, which separate it from, and identify it with, the other elements of the curriculum.

This is attempted initially, by analysing a piece of writing from the work of John Hull of the University of Birmingham School of Education, in which he discusses *'the educational implications of ideological enclosure, and particularly, the role of religious education in the curriculum of public schools, either as contributing to ideological enclosure, or as standing right outside all ideologies, or as occupying some intermediate position'* (Hull, 1990, p335). The Hull article is considered at some length because it contributes greatly to, and focuses the rest of the discussion, and because it highlights and gives body and context to some of the elements detailed above which are further discussed below. The chapter then considers in brief, some of the work of religious studies academic, Ninian Smart, one of the earliest and most fundamental thinkers in

the field of modern religious studies (some of whose work was discussed earlier). It measures two of the reports discussed in chapter 3 *A Review of Reports on Religious Education*, against the thinking of Hull and Smart, as a means of uncovering the educational factors at the base of these two reports. These two authors are selected because of their seminal work. In the first case, Hull identifies an area of some interest to the present study, and Smart because he produced a rationale for religious studies at all levels which still exercises thinkers, and which is constantly being refined.

9.2 Identifying the Parts

It has been suggested that it is somewhat odd to use two words to describe, and, or, define the area of the curriculum called religious education, rather than to use simply religion, or an alternative of some sort. Religion is sometimes used. It was for example, used a great deal in the report *Religious Education in Secondary Schools* (Schools Council, 1971). A case in point of its use by an individual author is in the writings of Harold Loukes. He conducted an enquiry into *Attitudes and Possibilities Among British Boys and Girls* which he called *Teenage Religion* (Loukes, 1961). In general however, both adjective and noun are used. One of the consequences of this pairing of *religious* and *education* is that RE is then taken beyond mere subject content. It may be argued that this is necessary only because of the history of RE in schools, which is that it was totally wrapped up within content at the expense of methodology, and in particular, child-centred approaches. The content was in fact, determined for religious reasons rather than educational. It was aimed in particular, at the transmission of Christian culture. That history meant that religious education did not adequately deal with its relationship and potential functions within the broader world of education, and its needs and purposes. This is an evident effect which the

inclusion of RE within the educational world has begun immeasurably to change. Another way of expressing that idea is to say that RE derived from a context other than the educational world, and the use of the two terms *religious* and *education* indicated that a radical transformation, or adaptation, from one milieu to a totally different one was in train. Even to place the two terms together points to a fundamental change. The fact that this process of change has been underway for so long, and still is far from complete, underlines the magnitude of the change which had been demanded. Yet in that change is potential benefit. RE has something to offer back to the rest of the educational world. If that *dual personality* of qualifying adjective alongside substantive (whether literally or in thought only) were to be more freely used, the entire curriculum might derive great enrichment. For example, one might ask how *mathematical education* might differ from *pure maths*, *literary education* from literary studies, *art education* from art, *language education* (of particular current interest) from French, German or English, and so on. One might ask what mathematics consists in when unrelated to education? Does it cease to be the same mathematics (or French, or German, or English) when adapted for use in the school curriculum? What is the implication of the term *pure maths*? What would be the implication of the term *mathematical education*? Professor John Quicke of Sheffield, makes the point clearly in a letter to the Times Educational Supplement, discussing, in particular, the *usefulness factor*, and relating it to individual needs: '*The average person learns most of the maths they will ever need by the end of primary school. All they require at secondary level are short modules, including revision modules, according to individual needs*' (TES. 27.8.04, p17).

Loukes' use of *Religion* on its own comes out of the English tradition in RE. He makes the assumption that the subject of RE will be *Christianity*, and how far it '*makes sense to the pupil, and helps him to make sense of his own human*

condition' (Loukes, 1961, p9). At the same time, Loukes would be offended were he accused of indoctrination. It seems obvious for good, sound, cultural reasons, that Christianity be the tool used. In making out his case for improving RE, Loukes was perhaps here more concerned with methodology than content. The justification for emphasising Christianity, for Loukes and others therefore, may come from *education* and not from *religious* in his subject title. He is therefore, here not making a claim for Christianity except on the purely pragmatic grounds that '*in this setting, with these pupils, this is the most suitable material to employ*' (*ibid*), to achieve one's previously stated aims. It would make no statement whatever, about the inclusion of other world religions within the RE experienced by pupils. This has already taken Loukes far from the dangers of indoctrination, or confessional or denominational approaches to RE. At any rate, the use of both *religious* and *education* is the first prerequisite.

Religion, if it has a contribution to make to the educational development of children and adolescents can do so only in so far as it is guided methodologically, and in terms of selection of content by educational criteria. Just as mathematical education is distinct from mathematics, art education from art, so religious education is attempting a task quite distinct from that undertaken by religion. The *automatic* assumption that *Christianity* must be a major part of any RE programme, creates the potential danger of failing to clarify more fundamental aims and objectives.

9.3 Making a Case

In an article called *Religious Education within State Schools of Late Capitalist Society*, John Hull argues against '*ideological enclosure*' which he describes as '*the situation which arises when an individual or a group sees everything from the perspective dictated by the ideology*' (Hull, 1990, p335). He

makes the link between ideology and identity, and quotes Erikson, 'Religion will occupy our attention primarily as a source of ideologies for those who seek identities' (Erikson 1958, as cited by Hull, 1990, p335). He then indicates that 'Ideologies generate identities' (ibid, p335), and that 'to become aware of the fact that one is enclosed within one's ideological identity is already to have begun to transcend it' (ibid, p336). This leads him to the statement and question:

Education, we believe, must always encourage personal development and reorganisation at more complex and more effective levels. Does this mean that education is thus bound to be destructive towards ideologies, just as education of the junior school is bound to lead the child away from the intimate circle of his family and of his nursery school ? (ibid, pp336-7), and

If it were the case...that the processes of personal development through education must lead children and young people sooner or later to break the bounds (the bonds) of their religious identities (ibid p337).

Whatever the truth of the matter, Hull's argument implies a great deal for religious education. He suggests from the history of religion a developmental:

transition from a state of being to a state of having...(which) is repeated again and again, both in the history of religion and in the history of the self. To be conscious of having a relationship with something, is already to have distinguished between oneself and that to which one is related. One is no longer simply within it (ibid, p337).

He further suggests that: *the role of religions lies in creating ideological enclosures, and encouraging a passage through a series of natural emergencies. During these emergencies the ideological simplicity of one stage becomes the object of the ideological critique of the next stage, and so on* (ibid p338).

From this comes the question *'can a religion emerge from its former self-understanding?'* (ibid p338).

Given that it is ideology rather than education which deals in identity, and that often secure untroubled identity within an ideological enclosure, Hull indicates that the task of religious education is *'to trouble that secure identity. It is to initiate an emergency from which a more complex and adequate identity may arise'* (ibid p338). Summing up his argument Hull states that *'Religious education should offer personal development through ideological criticism'* (ibid p338).

9.4 Criteria for the Religious Education Curriculum

Hull offers four criteria for the religious education curriculum. At this point in his argument he proposes the first two:

- *Does the Curriculum content disturb and unsettle the learner's sense of identity?*
- *Does the religious education curriculum offer help to the pupil by drawing upon the internal critical and developmental power of the religion being studied?*
(Hull, BJES vol xxxviii, No4, 1990. p338).

He goes on to discuss the relationship between ideology and contemporary *'mass societies'*. His conclusion is that:

the ideologies lead to social action in the hope of utopia; the consciousness-creating industries of contemporary technology lead to social inactivity, since meanings are sought in private life and in leisure pursuits, and people are stimulated only by acquisitiveness (ibid, pp339-40).

He notes the conclusion of Gouldner that:

the technological consciousness of today is not unlike that created by that created by the traditional forms of religious faith, since one of its principal features is a naive belief in a form of universal power, the power of science, and of technology to perfect human life

(Gouldner, 1976, as cited *ibid* p340). On the other hand, Gouldner also notes of the consumer society *'the absence of the transcendent in the consciousness of its members,...and the lack of a utopian perspective and the consequent lack of hope'* (Gouldner, 1976, as cited in BJEdS, vol xxxviii, 1990, p340). Hull concludes from Gouldner's data, that *'This hopelessness is rooted in a misplaced faith in the adequacy of technology as a source of meaning for human life,...'* (*ibid* p340). This inadequacy leads to one of the dilemmas of late capitalism, which according to Habermas is that:

Society needs these traditional cultures in order to give meaning to life in late capitalism and to lure people into co-operation with the economic structures, but at the same time it is these traditional cultures of spirituality which are marginalised and silenced by the contemporary combination of beaurocracy, industry and consciousness-creating media (Habermas, 1975, as cited in *ibid*, BJEdS, p341).

Hull argues that the ideological groups have been marginalised, because, as he graphically expresses it *'The hamburger society is not interested in the stories of oppression and the hopes of utopia offered by the committed ideological groups'* (*ibid* p341). Hull indicates, again referring to Gouldner, that thus being marginalised leads to the ideological groups being frustrated, and this, in turn may lead to *'an ideological rage'*. It is this *'denial of effective means of rational persuasion which may turn from the word to the deed. So terrorism is born'* (*ibid*, p341).

Hull's view is that education is the point of confrontation between the ideologies and the technologies. He discusses the possible role of religious education in this context, posing some questions of which not the least is, *Can Religion be Trusted?* He cites from the history of religion examples where the answer must be negative. Yet he raises the possibility that these negative images of religion may also be thought of as *'defences raised by*

technological consciousness against the liberation which religion, at best, offers from complacent hedonism and self-centred acquisitiveness' (ibid, p344).

Leading to the third and fourth criteria, Hull suggests these widen the discussion, by considering the relation of religious education to the rest of the curriculum. He suggests this contribution may be to help make it more educational by challenging and reviving a sense of fundamental values.

These criteria are:

- *Does the religious education curriculum challenge the pupil by offering patterns of diverse and even conflicting spiritualities? By what means is the pupil enabled to appreciate those spiritualities?*
- *Does the religious education curriculum engage and challenge the mass-produced outlook of ready-made values? Does the study of religion enable pupils to become ill-at-ease with the taken-for-granted values of modernity? Does religious education enable the pupil to become baffled by the internal contradictions of technology?* (ibid, pp344-5).

In addition to these four criteria Hull provides a final curriculum principle:

- *Religious education should provide the source of energy and meaning through which the assumptions of the contemporary mind can be exposed. The spirituality of all the school subjects should be brought out by religious criticisms. Religion should be the salt of the whole curriculum. Pupils should be enabled through religious education, to articulate their own and other people's peak experiences. Through such spiritual disciplines, pupils should be encouraged to explore inner space and to apply constructive criticism to social problems* (ibid, p347).

The article of which the quotations above form part, is one of the few pointers to the true nature and purpose of religious education in the curriculum to have appeared. Even the official reports on RE quoted above, often omit the essence of what Hull points to. They latch on to some of the

facets of religion without going to its heart and significance. It is doubly interesting, in the light of the discussion immediately above about 'religious' and 'education' and their relationship with each other. These official reports, in a way that Hull does not, rely on religion as seen in the most obvious way, through the eyes of the religious community. These reports may be so anxious to ensure the inclusion of particular content that the nature and purpose of the exercise is weakened. The true nature of religion is broader than this unnecessarily restricted understanding and experience of it. Hull is able to go beyond religion as it may be practised, or represented in particular content, and to look at it through the eyes of theologians, religious studies academics, and spiritual leaders, who attempt to penetrate to the roots and origins of the religion rather than merely to follow the tradition.

It is important, if one for the moment limits one's attention to Christianity, to note that Hull remains in the mainstream of Christian scholarship. He is supported in his views of religion by many theologians. It would for example, be easy to find ready justification for his four criteria in the Christian gospels as a guide to the religious life. They reflect the direct teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, as recorded particularly in the first three of the gospels. What is implied is that the sort of thinking of which John Hull's work is an example, makes good use of a wide breadth of disciplines, including theology and religious studies, in reaching conclusions about the nature and purpose of the curriculum of religious education in schools. It is entirely appropriate for the religious educationist to use both religious studies and theology as academic sources for content of religious education. They may do so however, only from the perspective of religious education, remembering that theology or religious studies are not focused on education as a school discipline, but on their own academic content.

However, the dangers of an ill-defined link with theology or

theologians, are highlighted in an article by Leslie Francis, Mansel Jones Fellow, Trinity College, Carmarthen. The article is entitled *Theology of Education* (Francis, 1990, in BJRE, 38.5, pp349ff). On its own, the title sends out warning signals. It appears that the starting point is to be *Theology*, with an attempt to see what that discipline has to say about education, rather than having an open discussion between two disciplines. He does however, start well by stating '*The theology of education must begin by taking its educational context seriously and must conclude by subjecting its empirical claims to appropriate methods of investigation*' (ibid, p349). However, as the article proceeds, it becomes clear that Francis is arguing, not merely as an academic theologian, but as one from within a particular branch of the Christian tradition. In turn this leads him to make the basic assumption '*that church schools are an integral part of the state-maintained system of education in England and Wales*' (ibid, p350). This is initially stated as merely a matter of history.

The rest of the article however, is devoted to discussing the issue. Education is therefore, being perceived as a subset of theology. It is not, in the earlier phrase, being '*taken seriously*'. It is being examined to see how it can best fit into Francis' world-view. It might well be that it would have been worthwhile to have had a study using Francis' title above, with a parallel study entitled *The Educational Significance of Theology*. A comparison of two such studies might have been productive. However, Hull is not setting out to achieve an evangelical goal. His reason for stating the four criteria, is, that they would be potentially extremely helpful in formulating aims for an RE programme, designed to assist the adolescent as she / he grows up, not least because they will remain as she continues her life.

9.5 Applying the Criteria

Religious Education, suggests Hull, is not primarily concerned with

the creation of identity. *'It is ideology rather than education that offers identity'* (Hull, BJES vol xxxviii, No 4, 1990, p338).

The first criterion indicates that this area of the curriculum is not one which has to do merely with factual, but rather with personal knowledge. It is therefore, essentially of practical significance. It is an attempt to take a very broad look at what will be of value and necessary, for the growing child and adolescent and to prepare the way for systematic work in this area of experience.

The second criterion makes plain the knowledge and experience base to be worked on. Whichever religion is under study, it has to be studied at base, to see what it says about the *'big issues'*, how it guides the lives of those who follow it. The religion chosen, is not the most significant factor. What is important is that in the study, pupils should be able to see and understand, the religion as it were, *from the inside*, standing in the shoes of a follower of that religion. This is what Ninian Smart describes as *'the inner life of a religion'*. This, for many pupils, will be no more difficult if the subject is Buddhism, or Christianity, or Islam. The internal and developmental power of the religion is what in this facet of religious education, will determine what is to be the content of the course. This knowledge and experience base is intended to achieve the supremely practical aim of making a contribution to the development of pupils, which no other facet of the curriculum makes, and which is essential for the balanced development of the pupils. It takes what is of supreme significance to people, and analyses it to see how it drives their lives. It is this core point that the subject matter is what is of central importance to the lives of those concerned which distinguishes religious education, and its task, and methodology, from the rest of the curriculum. It is of the nature of religion, that it is that on which all else rests in the life of the believer which deals with ultimate concern. What is required of the

pupil is to '*stand in the shoes*' of the believer. This clearly does not require the pupil to be a believer, and this is implied in the third criterion.

The third criterion assures an outward thrust to the RE programme. It assumes that the developing adolescent and adult will be able to see and appreciate diversity, will be able to see and appreciate different approaches to problems, and to life without regarding these as a threat to her/his own position. This criterion points to the requirement to put a value on diversity, and on the question of one's response to diversity. This requirement to look at, and penetrate experience beyond their own will be a key aspect to the programme for pupils. It will be one of the means by which they will become progressively more able to come to terms with themselves, their own identity, and will be enabled to see their own experience of life in a balanced way. This is the main thrust of the methodology to be used whether considering any religious or non-religious stance on life. It is a primary goal in content terms as well as methodologically. The final point in this criterion is aimed at indicating that it is no mere phenomenological approach to religious education. The phenomena are fully to be utilised, but their meaning and significance, and the use to which they are put, within the religion in question are at the core of the religious education programme envisaged here, and are related directly to the life experience of the believer.

The fourth criterion takes up that central factor in religion and religious education values. There are three strands to this criterion. The two verbs used in the first strand '*engage*' and '*challenge*' while speaking to this criterion specifically, also highlight the main thrust of the Hull religious education curriculum. They also place RE at the centre of the whole educational process. Nothing is determined in advance, except that it is the growing needs of the adolescent which are to be met. There is no fruitful educational development which does not rely on these two verbs.

The first of the three strands underlines the need to question the tradition of whatever sort. Day to day life relies on the assumption of ready-made values. There is a ready quip for every situation in daily conversation to support this summing up and dealing with the situation. This is assured in the age of ubiquitous television.

The second of the strands highlights the concept of modernity, which in the current century has a place in the political, as well as social, jargon of the day. It assumes that modernity is a sine-qua-non of right thinking and action, and that the term has a very specific meaning which is culturally and time-related, and politically, often merely party-related. In highlighting modernity therefore, Hull wishes to stress that it is essentially time and culturally related, and that it may be appropriate to be able to view modernity from outside these two perspectives because of its ephemeral nature.

The last of the three strands pinpoints the other mark of modern civilisation, technology, in particular its inherent contradictions. The greatest contradiction may be the danger that technology, the servant of man, may easily make of its users slaves. Movie films, and then television, may both have moved in this direction for very many citizens. He is perhaps, suggesting the technology has become a determining factor in the formation of values, rather than a tool. That these should be highlighted by Hull as criteria for his religious education curriculum indicates that he is once again penetrating to what he considers to be at the roots of religion, and to be core needs of someone being educated for life in contemporary society.

The thinking of John Hull is very pragmatically based. It is so in that it relates directly to the purpose of RE in the curriculum. This purpose has a number of bases, one of which is that it contributes in a clearly defined manner to the ability of children and adolescents to start developing a

balanced outlook to life, with its problems, and its suffering, and its peak experiences. While not being the only curricular contribution in this area, religious education does make a more direct contribution than other curricular elements. This is so in that it is central to the purpose of RE to contribute in this way, whereas it is ancillary in other curricular disciplines.

This pragmatism is at the heart of the purpose of the educational function of religious education. It is to be useful in living. It is also at the heart of the purpose of religion itself. One of the main functions of religion is to support believers. The word *community* is deeply embedded in religious language, as are *love* and *sharing*. This is clearly seen by looking at the sacred writings of any of the great religions of the world, for example the Jewish *Torah*, the Muslim *Koran*, the *Upanishads* of Hinduism, the Christian *Bible*, the *Adi Granth*, of Sikhism. It is nonetheless, slightly paradoxical to link the term pragmatic too closely to religious education, since the main area of experience with which religion is concerned has to do with *the ultimate*, or at least with *experience at depth*. It is appropriate however, in the sense of how best to manage experience. Experience, whether about the ultimate questions or the daily round of life, has to be managed, even if in different ways.

The question of management of experience, by definition, requires a pragmatic approach. In other words, it is methodological pragmatism. Finally, it is the use to which the methodology and the content are put which ultimately indicates that pragmatic is an appropriate term to use in relation to the purpose of religious education in the curriculum.

A key theoretical affirmation in the Hull article, is the fundamentally evident link between content and pupil needs. The content must be tailored to fit in with expressed pupil-as-learner needs. That is the measure by which the curriculum is to be judged. The needs of both the individual and the class

are stated, and the curriculum writers are then required to go off and devise aims, and a package of content which will meet these stated criteria. Once more the approach has to be that tried and tested in the rest of the school curriculum. Only that content may be included which fits the age range in question, and which will help in the development of the pupil, and will be of value to her as she becomes a member of the adult community. However, that does not imply a diluted approach to content. Only real maths can be 'pure' maths, and so with religious education.

9.6 A Direction Indicator

There have been many approaches to analysing the nature of the subject matter. One which is particularly outstanding, and which was used in the thinking of Working Paper 36, is that of Ninian Smart, whose work is discussed in chapter 3. His theory of religious dimensions is particularly significant. The Working Paper uses the Smartian dimensions, though not in their final form, which did not appear till the 1980s. The original version included only six, the final one being added some years later. In formulating the dimensions, he was attempting to ensure that the student would penetrate to the core of religion. This for Smart was a *'scientific and an empathetic process. Empathy here means the ability to feel what other people feel, to identify with them in their feelings'* (Smart, 1970, p13). In discussing his dimensions, Smart is keen not to talk about religion in general, but about *'a religion as a practical way forward'* (ibid). He also makes the point strongly, that within a tradition, for example Christianity, there is a very great deal of variety, and yet *'despite all this, it is possible to make sense of the variety and to discern some patterns in the luxurious vegetation of the world's religions and subtraditions. One approach is to look at the different aspects or dimensions of religion'* (Smart, ibid, p12). His final list of dimensions is seven in number :

- *the Narrative or Mythic dimension*
- *the Doctrinal and Philosophical dimension*
- *the Ethical and Legal dimension*
- *the Social dimension*
- *the Practical and Ritual dimension*
- *the Material dimension* (Smart, *ibid* pp15ff).

The Experiential dimension is about the inward-looking aspect of the religion. The *Mythic dimension* concerns the stories relating to the religion, told because they speak of important beliefs, not necessarily because they are historical. The *Doctrinal dimension* deals with teachings of the religion. The *Ethical dimension* is about the lifestyle of the followers of the religion. The *Social dimension* concerns the institutional life of the religion. The *Practical and Ritual dimension* involves the symbolic actions performed, usually during worship or celebration. The *Material dimension* deals with the significant objects and artefacts of the religion.

9.7 Possible Links

Smart suggests that the purpose of the dimensions is:

to help to characterise religions as they exist in the world. The point of the list is so that we can give a balanced description of the movements which have animated the human spirit and taken a place in the shaping of society, without neglecting either ideas or practices (Smart *ibid*, p21).

He is therefore, not anxious to use the dimensions negatively, to exclude a movement which may be regarded as deficient in any of the dimensions. Smart is engaged in the task of clarifying the nature of religion. As with Hull, he distinguishes religion from ideologies of a non-religious nature. In doing so, both of them are describing the significance of religion to social, and personal life, and therefore, its significance to education.

The dimensions are unquestionably wide. They cover aspects of religion which a more cursory study might fail to investigate. They are therefore, a reasonable analysis of the nature of religion, and are in their breadth, fairly comprehensive. Smart's is not the only such analysis, but it is a reasonable workable one. A link in intention between Smart and Hull has already been suggested. It consists in the concept of pragmatism being a purpose of RE within the curriculum, for example in helping adolescents to start on the process of developing a balanced outlook to life, with its problems and its suffering and its peak experiences. Hull's thinking relates directly to this purpose, and Smart's dimensions are designed to allow the pupil/student more easily to unpack the significance of the content of the religion being studied.

Further comparison might be made. In particular, it is interesting to place Hull's four criteria alongside Smart's seven dimensions. It is clear, on doing this that they are not *immediately* compatible. There appears to be a missing element in the exercise of making a comparison, whose absence makes it difficult to achieve a meaningful outcome, in the sense that the two documents seem to be the outer edges, with a central section missing. This is so because both Hull and Smart are fundamentally starting out from a theoretical point, yet in each case it is appropriate to attach the description, *pragmatist* in some measure to both of them. The final description then becomes *theoretical pragmatist*, indicating that both have an interest that their theoretical work be implemented. But the two may not meet. The '*gap in the middle*' between the two, is simply that reserved for the '*pragmatic theorist*' who is able to implement the work of Hull or Smart. Both of these need to be seen in operation. In order to permit of a comparative analysis, two further pieces of work, of which in both cases analysis is made above, *Working Paper 36*, and *SCCORE Working Document: Developing the Religious*

understand history and other cultures than our own. It can thus play a vital role in breaking the limits of European cultural tribalism.

5 *religious studies should emphasise the descriptive historical scale of religion, but need thereby to enter into dialogue with the parahistorical claims of religious and anti-religious outlooks* (Schools Council, 1971, p38).

Even so, the Working Paper is influenced by the environment in which it operates in that it allows its own cultural interests and milieu heavily to influence its outcome at the expense of sticking closely to Smart, his aims, and his theory of the nature of religion. One of the main points at which it diverges from Smart is that its thinking is also guided by questions of its own devising. The major of these questions relate directly to the place of RE within the education provided for children and adolescents. In particular, it poses the question of the educational justification for including RE within the curriculum. Having to its own satisfaction answered that point, it proceeds to make the case via another of its questions for RE to be widely based, and to include potentially any world religion.

Working Paper 36 demonstrates to some degree, the question which John Hull was discussing, that of ideological enclosure. The Working Paper was well aware that it was operating within a tight context. Much of what it says reflects closely the sociological, cultural, and other aspects of its environment. To that degree it is enclosed. In the six questions which the Working Paper says guided its own thinking, the concern is with internal matters, the superficial rather than the fundamental. It does not therefore, approach the type of questioning in which Hull is engaged. It is then a matter of the curriculum process not yet having taken account of the developmental educational task outlined, as the basis on which curriculum

thinking should be conducted.

The CCC *Working Document* (CCC/SCCORE, Undated) does not bear a close relationship to the work of Ninian Smart. It does however, offer questions as '*a structure to frame curriculum development which could cover religion*'. These questions are, *What is the human condition? What is the goal of life? and, How may that goal be achieved?*' (WD, 2.5). These questions are linked with the following criteria, '*comprehensiveness, simplicity, clarity, criteria in assigning priorities, a consistent approach to diversity, and, they enable teachers to map their own stance*' (ibid). The questions and the criteria are linked, and together they are used against which to measure any objectives. Unlike *Working Paper 36*, the *Working Document* was not a one-off. It was in fact, the last document in the series, *Bulletin 1* (CCC/SCCORE,1978), then *Bulletin 2* (CCC/SCCORE,1981), and then the *Working Document*. Indeed the *Working Document* states in its preamble that it '*has developed the thinking and ideas of Bulletin 2 and is offered as an important step towards the production of classroom material*' (WD, Preamble, CCC/SCCORE, undated).

Both *Bulletin 1* and *Bulletin 2*, even in their chosen titles (*A Curricular Approach to Religious Education*, and *Curriculum Guidelines for Religious Education*), show themselves to be totally pragmatic in orientation. In its preamble, the *Working Document* (CCC/SCCORE, undated), still pragmatic, refers to that of *Bulletin 2* in which is outlined '*the background to curriculum development in Religious Education, the place of Christianity and other world religions in the curriculum*' (CCC/SCCORE, WD, Preamble, undated, p3). Despite its stated intentions, it does not follow the Millar / Munn trail.

The CCC committees all had, unlike the Millar committee, a widened remit, which included the denominational sector. Given that the aims and intentions of religious education in the non-denominational sector are quite distinct from those of the denominational sector on theoretical, and

philosophical, and educational grounds, it is difficult to see how the two could meet on the pragmatic field of the curriculum. Yet this is what the CCC *Working Document* said it was about. It follows on directly from SCCORE 1 and 2. Neither of these reports was strong on the theoretical, and even less on the philosophical side. Bulletin 1 makes a good start at stating the educational justification of RE:

The general educational justification for religious education can be briefly stated. Education deals with human growth and development, which has a spiritual dimension, accepted by educationists as an area of proper concern to the schools. Religious education seeks to explore the contribution in this context of religious belief, attitudes and experience (CCC/SCCORE, 1978, p2).

Having made this good start however, the *Bulletin* then proceeds to demonstrate its pragmatic, theoretical and philosophical ambivalence by continuing *'Too much should not be read into the separate identification of denominational and non-denominational schools. The term non-denominational is not synonymous with non-religious'* (CCC/SCCORE,1978, p2). In one statement the Bulletin would sweep aside the pragmatic, philosophical and educational discussion and debate of decades. This would dismiss the Millar Committee, its remit and its report, as well as the Munn Report, where the *educational* contribution to a child's development has been the justification for the inclusion of RE as a curricular component, and not the religious status of the community, or even of the parents of the pupil. Nor does the *Working Document* relate directly with the thinking of the Hull approach.

The document poses three questions in catechetical form: *What is the human condition? What is the goal of life? How may this goal be achieved?* Some interesting and detailed objectives follow from these questions, but it is clear that the intention is at all costs to achieve answers to the questions, rather

than to engage, and challenge the pupils. This flaw is present in all three SCCORE Reports. They do not regard the educational implications of ideological enclosure as of sufficient significance to merit attention. Having been changed in make-up from that of the Millar Committee, to include both non-denominational and denominational sectors, it was reasonably not possible to produce a joint pragmatic, theoretical or philosophical base for religious education. The solution which *Bulletin 1*, *Bulletin 2*, and the *Working Document* adopted was therefore, simply to launch into 'curriculum development', failing to take account of the co-relation of good curriculum development, and a sound pragmatic, theoretical and philosophical base. The outcome has been material and suggestions which demonstrate an attempt to include something for everyone. Good curriculum development however, depends on good, clear, precise, agreed aims and objectives.

The Association of Teachers of Religious Education in Scotland (ATRES), conducted a lengthy correspondence with David McNicol, secretary to the CCC, at the end of the seventies, on a matter closely related to the above. The Association was concerned about the make-up of the new SCCORE, which they said did not contain a sufficiently high number of principal teachers of religious education. The total number of members of SCCORE 2 was fifteen. The break up of this number bears out the ATRES point that there were fewer principal teachers on the RE central committee than there were on other central committees. For example, on the newly reconstituted Central Committee of Music there were 12 members, of whom five were principal teachers of the subject. On the Mathematics central committee there were fourteen members, of whom five were principal teachers. On the central committee of Home Economics there were ten members, including four principal teachers. SCCORE 2 had fifteen members. Of these 3 were principal teachers, 1 was an unpromoted teacher, 2 were

advisors in RE, 2 were college lecturers in RE, 1 was a university lecturer in Divinity, 5 were senior management of schools, 1 was an education officer and 1 was an HMI. Such a make-up is quite different from that of the other central committees. It could be argued that there was an academic weighting, which ought to have permitted due attention to be paid to the theoretical, and philosophical grounding on which the Central Committee would proceed, which needed to be stated clearly.

The justification for the make-up offered by David McNicoll in replying on 22.8.79 to an ATRES letter was *'Of the fifteen members of the committee, nine are practising teachers actively involved in teaching religious education in their own schools, while other members have a direct professional concern with administration or development of religious education in schools'* (ATRES correspondence with CCC, 22.8.1979). The justification however, does not deal with the basic ATRES claim, that teachers in promoted positions within RE are not represented to the same level as in other central committees. Even if the five members of the committee, who were senior school managers, also were RE specialists by virtue of their training, they had now, at least partially, left their curricular interest behind in favour of their developing interest in management/administration. The major difference between this group and principal teachers is that principal teachers are primarily subject and curriculum orientated, whereas senior managers are not. In no other central committee would the CCC have been satisfied to appoint such a large proportion of members who were not promoted within the subject, and were not full-time teachers of it, given that the remit of the committee was entirely curricular. Further analysis of the make-up of this committee bears out the earlier discussion, suggesting some of the reasons for the theoretical and philosophical impotence of the central committees on RE and their remit.

Of the three principal teachers, two were from the non-denominational, and one from the denominational sector. One of the advisors was a local authority advisor, and one was an archdiocesan advisor. One of the college members was from a non-denominational college, and one was from a denominational college. Of the five members from senior management of schools, four were from the non-denominational sector and one from the denominational sector. So distinctively different is the approach to, and understanding of, religious education in the two sectors, that it was an unrealistic expectation that a committee of such make-up, could produce an approach, or curriculum suggestions, which would fit with the pragmatic, theoretical and philosophical thinking in RE in Scotland which had preceded it.

9.9 In Conclusion

Only one part of the *missing element* is in fact able to make the necessary contribution to fill the gap. *Working Paper 36* could well have stood alongside Smart and Hull in showing the way to the provision of a pragmatic basis to accompany this theoretical word. *SCCORE* however, was not able to do so. The pragmatic gap remains. The theoretical way however, is clear.

9.10 Hull's Criteria and Curriculum Principle

Hull's criteria are:

- *Does the Curriculum content disturb and unsettle the learner's sense of identity? (ibid, p339)*
- *Does the religious education curriculum offer help to the pupil by drawing upon the internal critical and developmental power of the religion being studied? (ibid, p339)*

- *Does the religious education curriculum challenge the pupil by offering patterns of diverse and even conflicting spiritualities? By what means is the pupil enabled to appreciate those spiritualities? (ibid, p344)*
- *Does the religious education curriculum engage and challenge the mass-produced outlook of ready-made values? Does the study of religion enable pupils to become ill-at-ease with the taken-for-granted values of modernity? Does religious education enable the pupil to become baffled by the internal contradictions of technology? (ibid, p347)*

In addition to his criteria, Hull gives a final curriculum principle:

- *Religious education should provide the source of energy and meaning through which the assumptions of the contemporary mind can be exposed. The spirituality of all the school subjects should be brought out by religious criticisms. Religion should be the salt of the whole curriculum. Pupils should be enabled through religious education, to articulate their own and other people's peak experiences. Through such spiritual disciplines, pupils should be encouraged to explore inner space and to apply constructive criticism to social problems (ibid, p347).*

CHAPTER TEN

Consideration of the Implication of Educationalising Religious Education

an interpretation of the findings of this study, what is happening in RE currently, and how it might develop in the future.

10.1 Introduction

The concept of *educationalisation* of religious *instruction* has been under scrutiny in this study. It is a recurring concept. It is used to indicate the process by which core religious education radically updated its rationale, methodology and philosophy. With the advent of professionally educated and trained teachers it developed apace. It became the goal of development which would guide those involved in the teaching and learning of the subject. It became also a measure by which to gauge all developments in the transformation from *instruction* to *education*. Another clear symbol of this process was the introduction of the mode to inspection. This was symbolic in nature. There were other evidences of *educationalisation* which were of greater significance, and without which it would have been almost meaningless to introduce inspection. Important among these were: the incorporation of the subject within the national framework of curriculum development, the provision of certificate courses of Religious Studies, and the recognition by the General Teaching Council of a teaching qualification as a requirement for teaching the subject in schools, that is, the relation of the subject to broad thinking on the curriculum, and to policy making in general.

All of the above may be categorised as subject-specific developments, or developments internal to the subject. They are by definition, steps which

though required for *educationalisation*, were not of themselves able to achieve it, since it involved not only the subject itself, but its relationship to the rest of the educational world, not least to general development and practice in curriculum thinking, and in the practice of policy-making within the overall educational system. Any developments within religious education were linked very closely to these developments, as discussed in chapter three.

It is a two-way process. The rest of this present chapter examines the findings of the study, in order to gauge the state of development of this process. It also suggests some additional work which might be undertaken to ensure that the process of *educationalisation* continues, and that it develops the skills of self-evaluation, and self-assessment. The question which sums up the origins of this study, and which directs its procedures is *what is the contribution which this curricular area, religious education, has to make to the development of children and young people, which otherwise would not be made?* In exploring this question, the study identified from the literature review these key issues: *pupil needs, academic rigour, and teaching and learning.*

In order to explore this question, and these issues, the study identified a number of committee documents of central significance to the development of modern religious education as well as the periodic output of reports by HMI. The documents which are pre-eminently significant from these for modern approaches to religious education however, are two: the Millar Report (SED/HMSO 1972), and the Munn Report (HMSO 1977). The study used the results of interviews with three HMIs, and with three RE Teacher Educators. Finally, it conducted a national survey of provision sent to all local authority education departments in Scotland. These are the sources of the findings, reported in the following discussion.

10.2 Methodological Approach

In order to achieve the aim stated above, *to draw together from the various sources identified in the study, the stage of development of core religious education within the curriculum*, the chapter will discuss the contribution of the various sources to the process of educationalisation. The justification for identifying these sources has already been made in earlier chapters, but the broad rule of thumb has been that each of the types of source had a central role to play in the development of religious education, and each of the individuals within the types had a distinctive role in, and contribution to, the development of religious education. The chapter will review the finding of each of the sources, and will extract the key points from the more general discussion above, in order to state what are the implications of these findings for core religious education as a curricular component.

Greatest attention will be paid to the three SCCORE documents considered as a whole, since these were the response of RE after it had passed the initial hurdles of educationalisation, and when it was *up and running*. Having identified the position which religious education has reached, it will discuss the way forward, to facilitate the continuing development of the subject, in addressing the big issues of pupil needs, academic rigour, and learning and teaching, with respect to this mode or form of knowledge.

10.3 Contribution of the Universities

At various points in the work of the study, it becomes clear that there is not a great deal of fundamental research underway into the Scottish religious education scene. Fortunately, there is a considerable amount in progress in England. Despite the different cultural and educational milieux, much of the English research is of some significance in the Scottish setting.

One piece of work of particular value for Scottish RE, is a discussion of different pedagogical approaches to the subject produced by Michael Grimmitt (Grimmitt, 2000). Given the discussion of the study, the conclusion is reached that from the types of pedagogies considered, one which readily fits the Scottish setting is the *phenomenological, undogmatic* model, linked with the name of Ninian Smart. Here, the *educationalising* process suggests, for example, that although Christianity is important in the RE curriculum, it must be dealt with in the same way as all world religions.

The most notable weakness of the *phenomenological* approach is discussed by another researcher, John Hull (as cited above in chapter 9). He identifies the main contribution of RE to the development of pupils: '*the requirement to look at and penetrate experience beyond their own, will be a key aspect to the programme for pupils*' (Hull, as cited above, ch 9, p 252). He indicates that '*The phenomena are to be fully utilised, but their meaning and significance, and the use to which they are put within the religion in question, are in the core of the religious education programme envisaged here*' (ibid, p 252).

Another pedagogy, which might be of great value in the Scottish setting is the *ethnographic, interpretive, multifaith* model linked with Robert Jackson. This approach emphasises *worldview analysis*, acknowledging plurality, and thus avoiding the isolation engendered by pedagogies which play down plurality and religious diversity. However, these are judgements made without detailed curricular research consideration having been possible. It is the case that there is not adequate research underway, nor appropriate research mechanisms, to ensure the valid discussion of this sort of question, or indeed many others in equal need of consideration. The basis of curriculum development, as already undertaken, is described in this study as flawed, much of it being over-influenced by HMI, rather than the educationalising influence of the Millar and Munn reports. Curriculum

development seems currently to be controlled by HMI. In his interview, the national specialist RE HMI indicated that he had a project '*out to tender*' to meet a curriculum need he had identified. HMI, as discussed above, also is found to be less than adequate in its origins and procedures in the case of RE.

The first need in research terms, in Scottish RE is curricular in nature. The philosophy to which religious education in Scotland is to work needs to be researched, and thereafter the production of curricular guidance on the basis of that philosophy, is urgently required. It is not likely that this research work could come from the RE sections of the faculties of education. They have been shown to be understaffed, even for their existing strictly professional, duties. Indeed, in some cases their remits are being extended to cover areas outwith religious education. Either they must be strengthened, or departments of Religious Studies need to be re-established within the faculties of Arts or Theology. This level of research work, starting from Millar and Munn, is what would have acted as a brake on the weaknesses of the past of the SCCORE bulletins, discussed above. Provision by the universities for ongoing research within the academic discipline of Religious Education is not made. The discipline has suffered because of this failure. Provision requires to be made at some point.

Apart from research needs, the study identified one particular need within provision for would-be specialist teachers of religious education in the Faculties of Education. The GTC upgraded requirements for such candidates. Instead of two degree passes in their subject, such students now required to gain three passes. Additional support is needed for these students, instead of the compressed course which, to date, has been their fate during their single session course within education faculties. It may be that the duration of the courses needs to be looked at, but unless the initiative of the GTC is to be squandered, more professional provision needs to be made for these

secondary specialist students. This urgent need remains, despite the decision of spring 2004 (Education Department, Teachers Division, 21 May, 2004) by the Scottish Executive Education Minister, Peter Peacock, MSP, effective for entry to courses in autumn 2005, to introduce a degree of flexibility into the system. It is only recently that the colleges of Education for the training of teachers have been incorporated into the education faculties of universities. Since this happened, provision of religious education in teacher education, has weakened.

It is clear that the universities are not taking part in the process of educationalisation of religious education. However, the contribution RE must make to the education of the young, is being made clear. This tendency on the part of the universities to pay insufficient attention to small departments, is not helpful in terms of the philosophy of education, espoused by, for example, the Munn Report, and the 5-14 Report, and the 3-18 Report, which highlights the variety of necessary inputs for a balanced approach to education. Inadequate provision is presently being made in this area.

10.4 Contribution of the TEIs

This section is linked to that preceding it, since TEIs are now part of the larger institutions, having in recent years been assumed within the university system, forming part of the faculties of education. They are included here under a separate heading because their whole function is to prepare candidates for the teaching profession, and particularly to prepare secondary specialist teachers, of amongst other subjects, religious education. They have been operating for some time before joining the university system in an educational setting. In the past, RE was different from the other departments in that its course did not lead to a teaching qualification, and

therefore the status of specialist teacher. As indicated above however, the General Teaching Council has now recognised RE as being on the same footing as other departments, and they have had to conform to the standards required of all departments offering courses leading to a specialist qualification to teach the subject. The TEIs therefore, have been required to be educational in RE, as in all other subject departments. This differs in the denominational TEI where church influence exists alongside the educational, and the type of qualification which will prepare a teacher to be a specialist in a Roman Catholic school setting is what is offered, rather than being identical to the open, investigative, critical approach offered in the other TEIs.

The TEIs have no rationale other than educational. Their function however, is so clearly to prepare would-be teachers, they have little scope to tackle the broader aspects of the educationalising process, and the continuing use of the term *training* rather than *education* of the preparation of teachers, indicates that a fresh look may be required to upgrade the functions of the teacher training of the past to the more appropriate *teacher education*. The terminology has already changed, but the process of teacher training may not have kept up with, or been transformed in all respects, into teacher education.

10.5 Contribution of HMI

The contribution of HMI to the educationalisation of RE was somewhat complicated by the fact that RE was at this point being introduced to inspection for the first time. Historically HMI had been forbidden any contact with that part of the curriculum occupied by RE.

The Secretary of State had set up the Millar committee in order to prepare the way for the improvement of that subject within the curriculum. When Millar had produced his report, as a consequence of its

educationalising recommendations HMI were invited to start on the process of inspecting RE. Given the past history of the relationship, there was no tradition of RE within HMI. In order to set inspection in motion therefore an inspector of considerable experience within the service was appointed to set it up. HMI 1 expresses the situation in his interview: *'I wasn't pretending to be an RE specialist. What I was, was an experienced inspector capable of using my experience in other areas to make sure we got off to a good start'* (App 7.1.2 pp10-11). His remit was altogether broader than that of a subject specialist. Such a remit served the purposes of Miller well. It started a process in which RE followed the norm for the rest of the curriculum. Also, this was carried out by an experienced inspector following broadly established *inspectorial*, procedures to the subject without at this stage paying particular attention to the subject content. This meant that he was able to react primarily as a member of HMI rather than an RE specialist. In this sense the contribution of HMI 1 to the educationalisation process of RE was significant. It was at this introductory stage that policy decisions about the future shape of inspection of RE were made. These decisions covered the general incorporation of RE into inspection, but they also covered procedures and arrangements specific to the subject RE. Subsequent specialist HMIs of RE simply inherited the arrangements arrived at under the period of introduction, when HMI 1 was in office.

One of the significant arrangements reached followed on from the interest generated on the part of the Catholic Education Commission by the results of the Millar Report, and the proposed introduction of inspection of RE. The denominational sector had opted to take no part in the work of Millar, but did wish to be involved in discussions about the introduction of inspection. The end result of this interest was that when the complement was reduced to two specialist inspectors of RE, there was the possibility of

one being from the denominational sector.

The study notes that inspection arrangements make the assumption that all schools, non-denominational and denominational, operate with the same aims and objectives for the provision of core RE. They may therefore be inspected by either HMI, and may be open to a single sort of curriculum development. This raises the question of whether the assumption therefore is that there are no fundamental differences between, on the one hand the faith-based approach to core RE, and on the other the open, investigative, critical approach of the non-denominational sector in core RE. This is suggested in the discussion of the HMI interviews. If it is so, it suggests that the educationalisation instituted by the work of HMI1 does not apply at this point, but rather the subject-specific dimension.

Such an initiative taken in development of the curriculum on the part of HMI, begins to resemble *administrative control*, rather than fostering growth and development on the part of those professionally involved in the teaching of the subject, that is, rather than *educationalisation*. HMI 3, in his interview highlights the knife-edge on which HMI balance, '*We also need, as inspectors, information about subject performance, subject departments, in order to advise and give information to the Minister*' (App 7.3.2 p484). The two functions of HMI: civil-service administration on one hand, and educationalising on the other are, at this point, held together in tension.

10.6 Contribution of Local Authorities and Schools

The data used in reaching these evaluations are given in chapter 8, which deals with responses to the national survey, and in particular the Local Authority and school responses to the staffing suggestion made by HMI 2. This suggestion was a clear step away from statutory thinking, and in the direction of educationalisation. It was pre-eminently practical, and geared to

allow scope for improvement on the minimal, and minimalist statutory advice. It did not specify a fixed time allocation, but suggested a staffing allocation which provided leeway to allow for pupils who wished, to follow RS certificate courses. To that extent the staffing advice can be described as educationalising. The flexibility inherent in it, particularly since it relied on the possibility of pupils to develop their own interests through extending their involvement in core Religious Education / Studies, fully justified the description *educationalising*. Yet the numbers of schools adhering to the advice was extremely small. Across the board there appeared a lack of willingness to act upon this matter.

Nonetheless, despite the inaction of authorities and school management to provide this level of staffing, one of the factors which HMI 2 highlighted did receive attention. There is evidence that in spite of continuing low staffing levels, RS certificate courses flourished in some places. In Phase 1, fifteen councils had in excess of 1,000 pupils undertaking such courses :

Council	Pupil Roll	RS Course Totals
1	6,392	1,361
2	15,505	4,448
3	7,208	1,579
8	5,517	1,158
9	6,320	1,427
10	7,278	1,021
11	5,238	1,182
12	5,069	1,621
13	19,335	1,939
15	21,324	2,457
16	18,143	2,781
	305	

17	14,872	3,683
18	3,370	1,189
26	6,561	1,263
29	15,226	2,786

(App 8.4.1,

p523).

This suggests that councils were not willing to provide the staffing to allow this sort of expansion, nor, indeed, was senior management in schools, and yet the figures did increase. In turn, this suggests that development occurred because of the enthusiasm of the existing staff and the interest of pupils, thus demonstrating that it was no statutory artefact, but an educationalising process. In so far as authorities and school management were prepared to allow core RE and RS to flourish, they played a positive role in this educationalising process. However, as leaders and providers, they were perhaps remiss in that they did not perceive the educational contribution RE could make, and did therefore, not actively encourage it to make this contribution. The law of the jungle was the rule: *if it could, it would*, and artificially to encourage it to develop was regarded as inappropriate.

10.7 Contribution of the Reports

In Chapter Four, a number of reports were discussed. Two of these are from ecclesiastical sources (*Durham* and the *Report to the General Assembly*), yet the discussion indicates that their intention is supportive of educationalisation. In both cases it appears to be a deep concern that religious education become fully absorbed within the educational, rather than ecclesiastical world, and mode of thinking.

Working Paper 36 and the *Millar Report* also form a pair. In both cases, they are standard-bearers of the subject within education. They advance

beyond *Durham* and the *Report to the General Assembly*, and detail how religious education is to move in the direction of educationalisation. Indeed, in Scotland, *Millar* is clearly allied to *Munn*, and together they progress the place of religious education within the educational world.

The three *Central Committees on RE* of the CCC are of such significance that they are discussed separately, and at greater length below. The remaining three documents, *5-14*, *5-14 RE*, and *3-18 Curriculum for Excellence*, are important here because they make reference to religious education from within overall developments in the educational world, and in the whole curriculum. All of these reports, therefore, contribute to the educationalisation of RE, simply by dint of incorporating it within their discussion of the general curriculum. The only caveat is the three *SCCORE* documents, and these are discussed further below.

10.8 Contribution of the Literature

The Literature Review appears as chapter Three. It is by definition supportive of educationalisation. The methodological approach of that chapter states '*the developments in thought...are noted by looking specifically, and in detail, at some of the thinking in the debate which produced the creative input to change RI into RE*' (Ch 3, p43, above) with all that the second of those terms implied. The Review indicates five major areas for discussion. These are:

thinking in general curriculum and policy,
the application of educational psychology to religious
education,
the academic integrity of Religious Studies,
the range of philosophies of religious education,
the contribution of core Religious Education to the general
curriculum.

In conducting the discussion, the research work of academics is cited and analysed. The five areas are quite distinct, though they bear a close relationship to each other, and together they help to produce a picture of the rigour required by the change from a base of *instruction*, to one of *education*, in all its breadth. In a sense therefore, the Review of Literature depends on all the movement which has taken place towards educationalisation.

10.9 Contribution of the Scottish Central Committees on Religious Education

The placing of core Religious Education within the remit of the Central Committee on the Curriculum, as with the setting up of inspection, looked like another landmark in the educationalisation of the subject. The three Central Committees which sat worked hard, and provided RE specialists from round the country with the opportunity to engage in vastly important professional development. Much work was also done in support of curriculum development. However, the three central committees were also heavily influenced by HMI. This was unnecessary, because the basic document, the Millar Report was available, and the membership of the committees, in the main, consisted of specialist religious educationists. However, as suggested above, HMI worked to the agenda of '*the introducing HMI*' which did not particularly tie in with Millar, and which was fundamentally non-specialist in origin. All three central committees also had the additional problem that they consisted of specialists from both approaches to RE, as well as a number of members other than specialists in RE.

It is possible to analyse the membership of only the first two Central Committees. *The Working Document* (the report of the third committee) was identifiable only by the tag *Consultative Committee on Religious Education*. It

was not dated, and names of committee members were not printed within the document. *SCCORE 1* had 22 members. In the following list, opposite each category of member are printed two numbers. The first is that of non-denominational members, and following in each case, and in brackets, the number of denominational members:

Primary Members	4 (1)
Secondary Members	6 (1)
College of Education Members	3 (1)
Advisers	2 (1)
Primary Adviser	1
University	1
Chair	<u>1</u>
	22

SCCORE 2 had eighteen members:

Secondary	3 (2)
Senior Management	4 (1)
Advisors	1 (1)
Directorate	1
College of Education	2 (1)
University	1
HMI	<u>1</u>
	18

The spread of membership was impressively broad, including both primary and secondary, non-denominational as well as denominational, College of Education, the Advisory Service, a university member, directorate, and senior management of schools. *SCCORE 2* also included a member of HMI. Given that sort of spread, it is difficult to see what detailed work on the subject could be achieved. Such breadth meant a consequent

lack of depth, in the sense of a lack of specialists, in favour of members of the teaching profession involved in other areas. It might have been possible to compensate by commissioning some preparatory research into the philosophy by which an RE curriculum might be developed, (indeed this first committee would perhaps have been well suited to such a task) but this was not done.

Bulletin One describes itself as the '*Bulletin of Curriculum Guidance*' (SED/HMSO, 1978, piii). It makes no pretension to be other. It is quickly into the practicalities of the curriculum, with aims and objectives. The closest it gets to discussion of philosophy of religious education is its consideration of factors to be dealt with in curriculum development (ibid, p15) in order for the general objectives already given to be developed further for specific units. Three factors are suggested for this purpose: the subject matter, the pupil, and the context. As well as having a smaller membership, SCCORE 2 produced a much smaller report. It too is very much a practical curricular document. It details objectives under the three headings: *knowledge, understanding and evaluation*. It also, as did its predecessor, deals with three factors to be considered under curriculum development: *the 'subject matter'* (CCC/SCCORE 2, 1981, p15), *'the pupil'* (ibid p16), and *'the context'* (ibid, p16). It makes the general point that it follows on from *Bulletin One*. *Bulletin 1* makes certain points which have an important bearing on the nature of the guidelines here proposed. It lists three of these points: *'the place of Christianity, the place of other World Religions, and denominational and non-denominational schools'* (ibid, ppvi-vii).

The Working Document sees itself as '*consolidating and expanding the work of Bulletin 1 and 2 by offering further guidance to teachers and others actively involved in curriculum planning*' (WD, p3). Like *Bulletins 1 and 2*, the *Working Document* advances educationalisation in that it attempts to tackle curriculum

in an educational fashion. Indeed, the document is summed up in chapter 8, entitled *Checklist for Evaluating Religious Education curricula* (ibid, p31). It too therefore, is essentially a practical piece of curriculum advice for teachers.

Taking an overview of the work of SCCORE, it appears that the three reports deriving from the CCC, tried to follow each other in intention. In that they were CCC Central Committees, they were by definition educational in origin. Yet the make-up of the committees is so broad as to make it difficult to determine what would be its philosophy of religious education, or on what basis they reached their conclusions. Both *Bulletins 1 and 2* make specific reference to the *Millar Report*. *Bulletin 1* draws justification for its existence from *Millar*, which recommended that '*a group should be brought together at national level to study and develop the curriculum in religious education in the same way as has been done with considerable success in other subjects*' (CCC/SCCORE, 1978, pvii). *Bulletin 2* also refers to the same *Millar* recommendation to set up a national body (CCC/SCCORE, 1981, pvi). Both bulletins quote the *Millar* remit in full. Apart from these references, *Millar* is not much used in any of the bulletins. The links between the thinking of the bulletins is greater than between any of them and *Millar*. This is surprising, not least because they recognise that *Millar* presents the great divide between the religious instruction of statute, and the developing subject of religious education (CCC/SCCORE, 1981, pvi).

There is therefore, a great gap between *Millar* and SCCORE, with SCCORE operating on an unpredetermined course. *Millar* had laid down a solid foundation for the educationalisation of religious instruction, but his remit had not been to provide a detailed basis for curriculum development in the subject to begin. The quotation, immediately above from the *Millar Report*, suggests a dual function for the group. It uses two verbs, '*to study and develop the curriculum*'. SCCORE pursued only the latter of these verbs.

It developed the curriculum without preparatory study. That stage of the educationalisation process remained to be undertaken.

No previous research work was undertaken as the intermediary step between the Millar Report and curriculum development. None of the three Central Committees was in a position to do the basic research work required, and therefore, the immensely important task of provision of curriculum guidelines was undertaken without explicit work on preparation of a philosophy of the curriculum, but rather on the basis of the assumption of a philosophy. Such an assumption could not be made given the make-up of the Central Committees. Because of this vacuum, the influence of HMI was great, and the findings of the study were that all three SCCORE reports were, because of this lack of clear, progressive, and logical study and development, open to the charge of being, at least, flawed.

10.10 Progress of Educationalisation

Detailed statistical analysis of provision, and staffing, in religious education was not undertaken as part of the study. Nonetheless, a clear pattern of developing improvement is discernible. It appears that some improvement is underway. This is visible from the incomplete returns to the national survey, even making ample allowance for statistical error and incompleteness. It is evident too, in the impressionistic view of HMI and Teacher Educators, two groups deeply involved with schools and religious education provision, and staffing in them. It was the figure provided by HMI 2, against which staffing was measured as part of the national survey, that an overall figure was worked out. Respondents showed 383.23 FTE RE staff in schools. The HMI 2 advice showed 552.84 were needed. The shortfall therefore, was 169.61 RE teachers. Despite this, both the HMIs interviewed and the Teacher Educators indicated that there are now no

secondary schools in Scotland without an RE department, even if that may mean a single teacher. The overall view therefore, is one of improvement. That however, means improvement from the straits of dire poverty. It does not mean that the goal of *educationalisation* has been reached.

Provision and staffing of core religious education may still have many educational arguments levelled against them. The time allotted to the subject is a case in point. Minimum figures of coverage have been produced from a number of sources, professional and official. In general they are agreed to be: two periods in S1 and S2, 80 hours in S3 and S4, and a *continuing element* in S5 and S6. This is in addition to the possibility for pupils to *opt in* to Religious Studies certificate courses. All agree that this time-allocation is made up of minimum figures. It must remain a lively educational question whether anything by way of shorter time-provision than these figures can achieve a positive outcome. The question must arise: how to use a time-allocation less than this *minimum* figure, to achieve something of quality and value for the pupil, and for her/his future life? Nonetheless, HMI do not any longer urge schools which do not reach this minimum provision to do so. For what they regard as compelling reasons, HMI do not pursue recalcitrant headteachers on this score. This points to another area where research is required. It is not research which is entirely restricted to religious education. RE is a case in point. The broader question is about what *educationalisation* implies in the case of a small subject. It raises the question of what is educationally unacceptable provision in terms of time, of staffing, and of resources.

These questions have been regarded as administrative questions by senior management of schools and by HMI. They are, in fact, profoundly educational questions. They speak of the values built into the curriculum.

10.11 Implications of Educationalisation

Yet another if related area which is raised, though not in great detail in the study, is one which links directly to religious education, but which has wider curricular implications. The small subject, at which this study is aimed has been because of its history, extremely peripheral in the educational context. This state was changed at a stroke with the publication of the Munn report, which spelled out three sets of claims on the curriculum: *social*, *epistemological* and *psychological*. From this basis were devised four sets of aims, involving the development of knowledge skills, affective development, the demands of society (CCC,1987, pp21-22). Within this broad curricular study, Religious Education was clearly an integral element. This was the basis for the development of the movement towards *educationalisation* of religious education. The subject has done all that it could, for its own part to facilitate *educationalisation*. This is what is described above as a success-story. But the process of *educationalisation* has not been fully completed. The subject could not do this on its own.

Earlier, *educationalisation* was described as a two-way process. RE has done its self-evaluation. It now is required to use what it has found to indicate what its necessary task in the curriculum is. This was well summed up in the extract from John Hull, quoted above, in which he identifies the main contribution of RE to the development of pupils in these terms: '*the requirement to look at and penetrate experience beyond their own, will be a key aspect to the programme for pupils*' (above, ch 9, p 252). He then indicates that: '*The phenomena are to be fully utilised, but their meaning and significance, and the use to which they are put within the religion in question, are in the core of the religious education programme envisaged here*' (ibid, ch9 pp252).

If this is a necessary task, if it is for all pupils, it is necessary to ask '*what is needed to ensure its achievement?*' But another question must precede these

practical questions. That is, is this aim '*to look at and penetrate experience beyond their own*', an important aim? Is it a valuable aim? Important for what? Valuable for what? The next question is: *How important is it? How valuable?* Then there comes the urgent question, precisely how will it advance the educational development of pupils? It may be, that because of the changing environment and pressures of living, religious education is currently more valuable to the developing child than it was in the time of the Munn report or the Millar report. The world has changed much since then, and the consciousness on the part of the West, of other cultures, has developed immensely. This ties in closely with the findings of Robert Jackson, who describes Western democracies as '*increasingly plural*' (Jackson 2004, p14). Professor Jackson's thinking has a particular resonance with that evident in some current general curriculum thinking in Scotland, as expressed in the report of the ongoing *Curriculum Review Group: A Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, Edinburgh, 2004).

The link is well expressed in *Curriculum for Excellence* when it explains '*why the curriculum must change*' as it cites '*new influences forcing curriculum change*' one of which is '*growing diversity*' (ibid p10). The major emphases of that report show progression from the thinking of the Munn report. It cites values which underpin the curriculum '*In essence, it must be inclusive, be a stimulus for personal achievement, and through the broadening of pupils' experience of the world, be an encouragement towards informed and responsible citizenship*' (ibid p11). From these, the Review Group's four purposes for the 3-18 curriculum '*that all children should be successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, and effective contributors to society and at work*' (ibid p12).

Even the seven sets of principles which the report produces are a clear enrichment of, and progression from Munn. Given that the curriculum

in mind is for 3-18, and not the much narrower focus of Munn, the enrichment is not unexpected. *Curriculum for Excellence* is clear however, that this richness does not apply alone to the stages other than the S3-S4 interest of Munn. The principles for curriculum design to be applied across the board, are, '*Challenge and enjoyment, Breadth, Progression, Depth, Personalisation and Choice, Coherence, and Relevance*' (ibid pp14-15).

The report is not concerned at this stage with the detail of specific subjects. They are therefore, not discussed. However, the RE discussed in this present study, for example in the work of Robert Jackson, or the key contribution RE makes to the development of children and young people, quoted above from John Hull, indicates that it is very much in accord with the thinking of *Curriculum for Excellence*.

The next question raises the practical issues of time, resources, staffing, in a word, status. All of these questions are part of the *educationalisation* process. They do not apply alone to Religious Education. They must apply equally to Maths, Modern Studies, English, History, Languages, Science, or any other subject/mode.

Educationalisation in this context is the criterion against which all components of the curriculum must be measured, and a way forward in this field is signalled in *Curriculum for Excellence*, following up, and developing as it does, the start made by the Munn Report.

10.12 Educationalisation the Ultimate

Religious Education has started on the process of providing its part in a child's education which is necessary for the child to become a balanced adult, and which only it, as a subject, offers. If it is fully to attain this goal, the process of *educationalisation* of religious education must continue to its completion. If educationalisation is anything, it is radical. It has already

proven so in terms of the content, and methodology, appropriate, and possible, within religious education. It is so, wherever it is applied. This means that its logic may lead one along unexpected routes and to unexpected destinations. Already referred to in a previous chapter (above, Ch 9, p244, Prof Quicke, in TES of 27.8.04), is the suggestion that most people need little in mathematics after primary. The immediate response to such a suggestion is that it is simply not realistic, or in touch, with reality. However, the comment was made for precisely the reasons that it is not only realistic but practically very desirable, and entirely within the bounds of reason, if educationalisation is to be applied across the curriculum.

All areas of the curriculum need to submit to the radical educationalising questions referred to above. It is in this sense that *educationalisation* has a touch of the ultimate to it. It is not easily attainable, and therefore, in the main, is not considered by many to be realistic. However, as with all ultimate questions, it is the case that only by facing up to it honestly is it possible to begin to derive any benefit from its consideration. Also like all ultimate questions, educationalisation can yield up the benefits it holds only when it is taken seriously, and applied in experience. This element of the ultimate in educationalisation needs to be applied across the curricular board, when practically putting the questions raised above to each area of the curriculum followed in schools.

10.13 A note on the nature of Religious Education

In discussion of religious education the study identifies two approaches to the subject. First is the *open, investigative, critical* approach, and the second is the denominational, or *faith-based* approach. Because these are two distinctively different approaches, in Scotland, the study limited its interests to one, the *open investigative, critical approach*.

Therefore from the outset, the study has omitted the denominational sector from its enquiries. This was done because there are many issues which would have been involved had that sector been included which were not germane to the immediate interests of the study. Approaches to religious education in the denominational sector are too, quite specific to that sector, and are fundamentally different in aims and intentions from the state sector. Denominational RE has however, necessarily been referred to at various points, and must be mentioned in summary at this stage. The denominational sector was expressly excluded from the work of the Millar committee by its terms of reference (HMSO, 1972, p2) because that sector felt itself to be independent of such a group, and did not wish to submit its structure of RE to examination by others. RE in the Roman Catholic sector was strong and well organised. There seemed therefore, to be no reason for it to be involved in the work of reviving religious education in state schools. The Millar report however, was such a promising document, that the Catholic Education Commission rightly foresaw great benefits flowing from it for RE.

Therefore, at the point where the Secretary of State was exploring Millar's recommendations for improving RE, in particular by incorporating it within the remit of HMI, the CEC indicated to him its willingness to be involved. It did so because it felt this could assist in the furtherance of good faith-based RE in Roman Catholic schools. It indicated this intention at a meeting it requested in 1980 with the Secretary of State for Scotland, at that time George Younger. There was however, a non-sequitur. *Millar* had been set up in the first place because of the wish as stated above, for the *educationalisation* of religious education within the curriculum. All the Millar recommendations were aimed at this goal. This meant cutting the subject adrift from constraints other than educational, and allowing it to become like

all other subjects, properly and solely curricular, educational, in purpose and intention. In the denominational sector there were two constraints other than educational: *statutory*, and *ecclesiastical*. The first was the same as in state schools, statutory in the sense of the *law of the land*. But secondly, there was *denominational, church influence*, which assured church control, and which had brought RE the strong position it occupied in the denominational sector. Given this apparent dichotomy, it is interesting that the Commission should, at this point, after Millar, indicate to the Secretary of State its willingness to go along with the move to introduce inspection. When the Catholic Education Commission welcomed the suggestion that RE be subject to HMI, it was not moving in the direction of *educationalisation* in the way that state schools religious education was. Rather, as the discussions with HMI 1 indicated, it wished to ensure that part of HMI would be drawn within the denominational *ecclesiastical, statutory, structure, and sphere of influence*.

10.14 In Conclusion

The primary finding of this study is the pinpointing of two religious education documents which have had the most major influence in directing the key concept in re-forming religious instruction as religious education. They are the Schools Council *Working Paper 36*, and the Scottish Education Department report, the *Millar Report*. From these two documents, in the main, the principle of *educationalisation* has grown. *Educationalisation*, in this context, means the transformation of the statutory *instruction* into *education*.

One of the key movements reported in the study was the introduction of the subject to inspection. The development of inspection of the subject is fully discussed in various places, but the study, in the end, is not able clearly to conclude that this was in fact a step on the road of *educationalisation*. The first difficulty in reaching that conclusion was the nature of the appointment

of an HMI to introduce inspection. The selection of an inspector, whose professional area of expertise and experience was in another and quite distinct subject, was to use the non-professional approach to the subject which schools had already tried: the use of non-specialists. It may be that the results could be no more satisfactory in the use of a non-specialist inspector than they had been with non-specialist teachers in schools.

One of the major issues associated with the use of a non-specialist is his agreement with the Catholic Education Commission that any inspector should be allowed to inspect RE in any school, non-denominational or denominational. This was agreed on an apparently administrative, civil-servant, inspectorial/management rationale. It did however, make the assumption that it was possible for an inspector to take up, or drop, as appropriate, the *faith* element when inspecting RE, and depending on the position of the inspector himself. It was therefore, acting without regard to the educational realities of the situation, and the nature of the *faith* element. (This agreement to allow any RE HMI to inspect denominational RE was reached with the Catholic Education Commission only on the clear understanding that a Roman Catholic would be appointed to the ranks of the inspectorate if appropriate).

This failure to recognise that the distinction between denominational RE and that of other schools, was taken further. The Millar report was aimed only at RE in non-denominational education. In subsequent curricular work, in the work of the CCC Central Committees on RE, the committees were made up of representatives from the state sector, as well as from the denominational sector. The resulting work therefore, could not be guaranteed to meet the curricular needs of either approach to religious education. The expected complement of RE HMIs is two. This may mean one HMI from the state and one from the denominational sector. Given the

comparative numbers of schools of the two sectors, this means an imbalance, except on an administrative, civil-servant, inspectorial rationale.

Post Script To the Study

In this postscript four significant areas which have not elsewhere been directly and specifically dealt with are discussed. All but the last of them have been referred to within the study, and are now briefly but directly dealt with.

The areas are:

- 1 Issues the thesis did not address but might have.
- 2 The qualities and weaknesses of the questionnaire survey data.
- 3 Recent developments in the *educationalisation of core* RE in Scottish secondary schools.
- 4 Reflections on the present and future development of RE.

1 The major issue of the thesis is the relationship of Religious Education to mainstream educational thinking and developments. This relationship is the subject at all points. The aim of the study is therefore a restricted aim. Because of this it was not possible to examine and compare the different methodological emphases used within the world of RE itself. It also meant that the different types of content of RE could not be examined critically and in detail. These are particularly significant areas, given the proliferation of curriculum development within RE and RS which has taken place in recent years, fostered not least by the inclusion of RE within the CCC system.

Even developments within the RE curriculum which are on the verge of being influential in the subject were raised, but not fully discussed because they were not of the substance of the main concern of the study. One such development is the potential link between RE and Philosophy, discussed in

the TEI interviews.

2 The main quality of the questionnaire survey and data lies in its relationship to the two other methodologies used in the study to collect data.

On its own, had it been attempting to derive detailed statistical data, the survey would have been inadequate. Indeed, within the text of the study it is explicitly stated that the survey data are being used only as a means of gauging an indication of the direction in which RE was travelling. Also stated is the intention not to subject the data to sophisticated statistical analysis. This was not done because the data were not regarded as sufficiently detailed or precise to allow of that sort of analysis, but because the survey was designed in order to produce results which were contributory to the outcome of the overall threefold methodological approach, and not simply to furnish results on its own, from a single-pronged approach. The threefold approach was not competitive in intention.

When seen in this light, it is clear that the survey data serve a function which the other methodologies employed do not serve. This is to say that the results of each of the three methodological approaches verifies those of the others. As well as being verified by these other methodologies, the survey in turn verifies and extends them. Basically, the variety of methodologies used was designed to produce a joint result, each making its own specific contribution to the findings at the end of the day. It was a methodological team effort. In this context, the survey was significant in that it produced a *slant* on the data not generated by the other methodologies used.

The survey therefore, was tailor-made to make its own particular contribution to the study data. It was restricted by the aim of the study. Had this aim been much wider, the survey data could have been used in a more extensive manner. Herein lies the main weakness of the survey. Much

greater use might have been made of its detailed data had the aims and intentions of the study been more expansive. All three of the methodologies used would have received more detailed attention had they been the sole source of data.

3 The study aimed to assess how far Religious Education had tried to evaluate if it was performing an educational task like any other element of the curriculum. In doing so it raised the same question in relation to the education system and the structure of the school curriculum as a whole, that is, to what degree are the factors which determine the curriculum *educational* or other? Existing thinking on the curriculum has a specifically *current day* hue to it. The hue is expressed, in one case, in the phrase *curriculum for excellence*. Such a development is a move on from the emphases formerly made in thinking about the curriculum. In turn therefore, this is to say that what is actually meant by *educationalisation* happily changes with the passage of time. Equally important however, is the developing nature of educationalisation, the need for which is created by the changes in society which determine educational good practice. The current state of society is one of quite clear and radical and speedy change. Basic values may be subject to the kind of change which, until recently, may have been considered untenable and unnecessary. In turn this has made it necessary to look again at the meaning for example, of *multicultural*, widening that term immensely, and requiring that the starting point from which it be examined also be redefined.

Currently, one local authority has decided that the terms *denominational* and *non-denominational* do not reflect accurately the type of schools within its bounds. The authority has decided to change the terminology to *denominational* and *multi-denominational*. Whether this implies

an actual change to be effected in the schools involved, or whether it is an attempt to reflect the situation as it already exists, has not yet been made clear. Whether indeed it is a clear, radical or speedy change is open to question. Whether even it constitutes a widening of the term *multicultural*, may be open to question. Terms like *denominational* and *non-denominational* have a clear mono-cultural ring to them. Whether schools are multicultural is not the primary issue. Rather the issue is whether multiculturalism is a significant area or concept in the present setting to which religious education may contribute, and from which school pupils will benefit. Is it indeed a pressing issue which will enable children to make sense of their lives in society?

Like any aspect of the curriculum, Religious Education has constantly to undergo change as the needs of children and society change. When the purely educational basis, rationale and justification of religious education is totally and unquestionably clear, the direction of the change and changes in philosophy, methodology and content of religious education is no more problematic than for any curricular area, and will be decided in precisely the same fashion.

4 Religious Education has now breached the wall which until now has separated it from the rest of the curriculum and educational thinking and philosophy.

In the non-denominational (or multi-denominational) sector, only ignorance now pardons the assumption that the aim of religious education is to make children religious. In detail, a study of Islam is not geared to making pupils Muslim, as a study of poetry is not aiming to make pupils poets, and the aim of mathematics is not to make children mathematicians.

In thinking since the Millar Report (1972) on religious education, and

the Munn Report (1977) on the curriculum, the subject has taken on two labels. The first is *mode*, and the second *core*. These are implied in each other, and make it clear that religious education is a central building block of the curriculum to be experienced by all pupils. Within the subject the element which forms the modal part of religious education is CORE RE.

The first priority of all practitioners is to attend to core RE. Much more work remains still to be done in the philosophy, methodology and content of core RE for use within the Scottish educational system. This priority exists for teachers and researchers in the field. To date a great deal of practice has relied on development in other places for use in other systems of education. Both fundamental and practical work remains urgently to be done for, and in, the Scottish system in the above three areas.

Despite the work of the Munn committee and the Millar Report, the educational establishment has reacted in gingerly fashion to the potential benefits which Religious Education might offer its children. This can most crudely be seen in the curriculum placing of the subject. It clearly has not been given a crucial place.

In this final reflection on future development needs, the various points referred to on the page above about changing needs of children and those of society are highlighted.

In the year just closed (2006), there may have been as many and radical changes in society, globally, as have occurred for some time. What is clear is that Western society has been required to reconsider some basic assumptions and values about its way of life. It has become necessary for it to re-examine its attitude to other cultures and religions, and its attitudes to the practitioners of those cultures.

The *current day hue* to the present century therefore may be quite different from that of its predecessor. If that be the case, thinking on the

curriculum also would be required to develop as the needs of growing children also change. It may be that the two major contributors to the curriculum of Scottish children, English and Mathematics, may not so clearly be of the greatest potential practical value as curriculum leaders if the aim is to prepare children for life in twenty-first century society.

It may be that a successor to the Munn Committee will be required, and if so it may need to take even more into account the aims of educationalised religious education in helping children to grow into fully developed mature adults, able to deal with what life in their century may provide for them, and able also to live within a world diverse in culture and practice and values. Such a task may require a committee more radical still than the Munn committee.

Bibliographical References made in the Text

- Bettenson, H. (ed) (1963) *Documents of the Christian Church*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Burn, J. and Hart, C. (1988) *Crisis in Religious Education* , London: Educational Research Trust.
- Cameron, J.K (1972) *The First Book of Discipline*, Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- CCC (1978) *Bulletin 1: A Curricular Approach to Religious Education*, Edinburgh: CCC.
- CCC (1981) *Bulletin 2: Curriculum Guidelines for Religious Education* Edinburgh: CCC.
- CCC (1983, approx) *Working Document: Developing the Religious Education Curriculum*, Edinburgh: CCC.
- CCC (1987) *Management Issues in Religious Education in Secondary Education*. Edinburgh: CCC.
- Chadwick, H. (1967) *The Early Church*. London: Penguin.
- Church of Scotland. (1988) *Christian Teaching in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Education Committee.
- Cohen,L and Manion, L (1994) *Research Methods in Education*, London: Routledge.
- Commission on Religious Education in Schools, (1970) *The Fourth R* (the Durham Report), London: SPCK.
- Cortazzi, Martin(1993) *Narrative Analysis*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Curriculum Review Group (2004) *A Curriculum for Excellence: 3-18*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

- East Renfrewshire (2006) Council drops the 'non' in 'non-denominational'.
Posted 28.11.06, www.easternrenfrewshire.gov.uk.
- Erricker, C and J (2000) *Reconstructing Religious, Spiritual, and Moral Education*
London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Francis, (1990) Theology of Education, in *British Journal of RE* 38.5 p349.
- Fairweather, ICM and MacDonald, JN (1992) *Professional Issues in Religious Education* Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Gates, Brian (1976) *Religion in the developing world of children and Young People*, Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Lancaster.
- Goldman, R(1964) *Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence*,
London: RKP.
- Goldman, R (1965) *Readiness for Religion*, London: R K P.
- Gouldner, A (1976) *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology, The Origins, Grammar and Future of Ideology*, Chapter 7, New York: Seabury Press.
- Graham, R (2001) *John Knox Democrat*, London: Robert Hale.
- Grimmitt, M (1987) *Religious Education and Human Development*, Great Wakering: McCrimmons.
- Grimmitt, M (2000) *Pedagogies of Religious Education*, Great Wakering: McCrimmons.
- Herald Newspaper*, Independent newspaper. 29.1.07.
- Hirst, Paul (1965) Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge, in Archambault, RD (ed), *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, pp113-38,
London: Routledge.
- Hirst, Paul (1965) Morals, Religion and the Maintained School, in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol 14, pp5-18.
- Hirst, Paul (1974) *Moral Education in a Secular Society*, London: ULP.
- HMI of Schools (1986 a). *Learning and Teaching in the First Two Years, of the*

- Scottish Secondary School*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools(1986 b). *Learning and Teaching in Religious Education, An Interim Report by HMI*, Edinburgh:HMSO.
- HMI of Schools.(1994), *Effective Learning and Teaching in Scottish Primary and Secondary Schools: Religious Education*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- HMI of Schools(1996a) *Achievement for All*, Edinburgh:SOEID.
- HMI of Schools(2001) *Standards and Quality in Secondary Schools: Religious and Moral Education (1995-2000)* Edinburgh, HMSO.
- HMI (2003) Statistics Division, *School Census Figures, 2003-5*, Edinburgh (SEED).
- Huberman and Miles (1984) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Huberman and Miles(2002) *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion*, London: Sage.
- Hull, Charles (1985) Between the Lines: an analysis of interview data as an exact art. In *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol 11, No1, pp.27-32.
- Hull, J.,ed. (1990) Religious Education in State Schools, in Late Capitalist Society *British Journal of Educational Studies*, pp.339-347.
- Hyde, K.E. (1969) *Religion and Slow Learners*, London: SCM.
- Jackson, R.(ed) (1978) *Perspectives on World Religions*, London: SOAS.
- Jackson, R.(1982) *Approaching World Religions*, London: John Murray.
- Jackson, R. (1997) *Religious Education: an interpretive approach*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Jackson, R. (2004) *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Loukes, H. (1961) *Teenage Religion*, London: SCM.
- Loukes, H (1965) *New Ground in Christian Education*, London: SCM.
- McCrone, G., (Chairman), (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century*, (Committee of Enquiry into Professional Conditions of

- Service for Teachers), Edinburgh.
- McCulloch, G. (2004) *Documentary Research in Education, History*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- McPherson & Raab, (1988) *Governing Education*, Edinburgh: EUP.
- Madge, Violet (1965) *Children in Search of Meaning*, London: SCM Press.
- Mason, Jennifer (2002) *Qualitative Researching*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Mason, Jennifer (2002) *Qualitative Researching* (2nd Edition), London: SAGE Publications.
- Mason, Jennifer (2002) *The Qualitative Researchers Companion*, London: SAGE.
- Millar Report, (1972) *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools*, Edinburgh: HMSO .
- Munn Report, (1977) *The Structure of the Curriculum*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- and
- Pack Report (1977) *Truancy and Indiscipline in Schools in Scotland*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Phenix, P. (1964) *Realms of Meaning*, New York: McGraw-Hill .
- Rodger, A R (1982) *Education and Faith in an Open Society*, Edinburgh: The Handsel Press.
- Schools Council, (1971) *WP 36: Religious Education in Secondary Schools*, London: Evans Brothers.
- Schostak, John (2002) *Understanding, Designing and Conducting Qualitative Research in Education*, Philadelphia: O U P.
- Scottish Executive (2000) *5-14 Guidelines: The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum*, Edinburgh: Learning and Teaching in Scotland.
- Seale, Clive (1999) *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, London: SAGE Publications.
- SED (1965) *Primary Education in Scotland*, Edinburgh: HMSO
- SED (1972) *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools*. The Millar

- Report, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SED (1986) *Religious Education: An Interim Report by HMI* Edinburgh:SOED.
- SED (1992) *Upper Secondary Education in Scotland* (Howie Report) Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Shap (1989) *World Religions in Education*, Shap.
- SJCRE (1975) *Religious Education: Primary School Handbook*, Edinburgh: SJCRE/ Church of Scotland.
- Skeie, Geir, (1995) Plurality and Pluralism: a challenge for Religious Education, in *British Journal of RE*, 17, no 2, pp84-91.
- Smart, N. (1968) *Secular Education and the Logic of Religion*, London: Faber & Faber.
- Smart, N (1970) *The Religious Experience of Mankind*, London: Fontana.
- Smith, J.W.D. (1975) *Religion and Secular Education*, Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- SOED (1977) *Assessment For All: The Dunning Report*. Edinburgh: SOED.
- SOED (1991) Circular 6/91. *Provision of Religious Education and Religious Observance in Primary and Secondary Schools*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SOED (1992) *National Guidelines - Religious Education 5-14*, Edinburgh: SOED (1993), *National Guidelines: Structure and Balance:5-14* Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SOED/SCEC (1994) *Religious Education - 5-14. Roman Catholic Schools*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SQA (2001, 2002) *RMPS Panel - Principal Assessor Reports*, Edinburgh: SQA.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. 1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research* Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
- Sunday Herald Newspaper, *Independent newspaper* , Glasgow.
- TES and TESS, Weekly educational newspapers. London/Edinburgh.
- Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse*

Analysis London: SAGE Publications.

Warnock Report (1978) *Meeting Special Educational Needs: Brief Guide*
London: HMSO.

Wilson, J. (1971) *Education in Religion and the Emotions. Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp121-152). London: Heinemann.

Wright, A. (1993) *Religious Education in the Secondary School. Prospects for Religious Literacy.* London: David Fulton.

Complete Bibliographical Listing

- Advisory Council (1947) *The 1947 Curriculum*, HMSO 1947.
- Albans, Phil (1999) Beyond 2000: Teaching and Learning Opportunities in RE, Derby, *Resource* 21/3, pp3-5.
- Alves, C (1991) Just a matter of words? The religious education debate in the House of Lords. *British Journal Religious Education*, 13/3, pp168-174.
- Ansari, E and Morrison, I (1994) *Differentiation in RE: Teachers Guide*.
Dumbarton Division, Strathclyde Region.
- Association of RE Inspectors, Advisors, and Consultants (AREIAC) (1998)
Directory of LEA RE Contacts, Articles of Faith.
- AREIAC (1999) *Effective Subject Leadership in RE*, AREIAC.
- AREIAC (1999) *Literacy in Religious Education*, AREIAC.
- Ashraf, S.A. and Scott (1998) What makes a good RE Teacher? *Resource* 20/2, pp9-14.
- Astley, J. and Francis, JF, eds, (1996) *Christian Theology and Religious Education: Connections and Contradictions*, London: SPCK.
- Association of Teachers of RE in Schools (ATRES) *Files: Latter half of 20 Cent*.
ATRES.
- Attfield, D (1978) Is RE Possible? A Reply. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 12, pp93-97.
- Ball, S J (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education*. Routledge.
- Ball, SJ (1994) *Education Reform*. Buckingham, OUP.
- Bash, L., and Coulby, D (1989) *The Education Reform Act*, London: Cassell.
- Best, R.(ed) (2000) *Education for Moral, Social, and Cultural Development*,
London: CONTINUUM.
- Bettenson, H. (ed) (1963) *Documents of the Christian Church*. London:

Oxford University Press.

- Bobcock, R., Thompson, K (1985) *Religion and Ideology*, Manchester: MUP.
- Bolton, A. (1996) RE and Values: key questions for the next 5-10 Years. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 17/2, pp8-11.
- Bolton, A. (1996), A developing vision for Religious Education. *Resource*, 18/2, pp3-8.
- Bolton, A. (1997) Should RE foster national consciousness? *British Journal of RE*, 19/3, pp134-142.
- Borders RC (1980) *Regional Policy : Religious Education*. BRC Educ Dept.
- Boyle B. & Leicester G, eds. (2000) *Changing Schools. Education in a Knowledge Society*. Scottish Council Foundation.
- Briggs, C. (1986) *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge, Eng: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinberg, D, & McGrath, J.E. (1985) *Validity and the research process*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage .
- Bryce, T.G.K., and Humes, W (1999) *Perspectives on Policy. No 1: Policy Development in Scottish Education*. Universities of Glasgow and Strathclyde.
- Bryce, T.G.K, and Humes, W.M (2004) *Scottish Education*. (Second Edition) Edinburgh: EUP.
- Bryce and Humes (2005) *No 1: Policy Development in Scottish Education*. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde.
- Burn, J. and Hart, C (1988) *Crisis in Religious Education*. London: Educational Research Trust.
- Cameron, J.K, (1972) *The First Book of Discipline*. Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- Carr, David (1996) Rival Conceptions of spiritual education, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30/2, pp159-178.

- Carr, David (1987) *Management Issues in RE in Secondary Schools*, Edinburgh: SCCORE.
- CCC (1976) *Curriculum Paper 15: The Social Subjects in Secondary School*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1987) *Curriculum Design for the Secondary Stages, Guidelines for Head teachers*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1977) *Delivery of Process Skills*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1996) *Teaching for Effective Learning*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1978) *Bulletin 1: A Curricular Approach to Religious Education*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1981) *Bulletin 2: Curriculum Guidelines for Religious Education*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1983, approx) *Working Document: Developing the Religious Education Curriculum*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- CCC (1987) *Management Issues in Religious Education in Secondary Education*, Edinburgh: CCC.
- Chadwick, H (1967) *The Early Church*, London: Penguin.
- Church of Scotland (1988) *Christian Teaching in Scottish Schools*, Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Education Committee.
- Church of Scotland (1982) *A Good Education*. Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Education Committee.
- Church of Scotland (1972) *The First Book of Discipline*, Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- Cohen, L & Manion, L (1994) *Research Methods in Education*, London: Routledge.
- Commission on Religious Education in Schools (1970), *The Fourth R* (the Durham Report), London: SPCK
- Copley, T (1998) What kind of Vision for RE? Derby: *Resource* 20/2, pp3-6.

- Cortazzi, Martin (1993) *Narrative Analysis*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cox, C (1988) Foreword, in J Burn and C Hart,(eds) *The Educational Crisis in Religious Education in England*, London: Research Trust .
- Cox, E. (1966) *Changing Aims in Religious Education*, London: RKP.
- Cox, E. (1983) *Problems and Possibilities for Religious Education*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Craft, M., ed. (1984) *Education and Cultural Pluralism*, London: Falmer Press.
- Crawford,M, Rossiter, G (1996) The Secular Spirituality of Youth: Implications for Religious Education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 18/3, pp133-143.
- Curriculum Review Group (2004) *A Curriculum for Excellence: 3-18*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Curtis, B. (1972) Religious Education: A pleonasm. *Learning for Living*, 10/11 4, pp11-14.
- Dale,R,ed. (1976) *Schooling and Capitalism*, London: RKP.
- Davies, D. (1982) *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, Oxford: OUP.
- Devlin and Warnock (1977) *What Must We Teach?* London: Temple Smith.
- Denzin, N.K. (1978) *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw Hill .
- Diorio, J.A. (1978) Sailing to Byzantium. Issues in RE. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 26, pp247-262.
- Dodd, T., ed. (1996) *Developments in Religious Education*, Hull: Hull University.
- Douglas, A.M. (1985) *Church and School in Scotland*, Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- Dunbarton (1984) *All Together, Guidelines for Primary RE*, Dunbarton: Dunbarton Ed Dept.
- Dunbarton (1994) *Differentiation in RE. Teachers Guide*, Dunbarton, SRC.
- Dunbarton (1990) *RE 14-16: A Core RE Course for S3 and S4*, Dunbarton:

Dunbarton, SRC.

East Renfrewshire Council, (2006) Council drops 'non' in 'non-denominational'. Posted 28.11.06 www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Edgington, D., (1999) Teaching Christianity within RE: What do the Parents think? Derby: Resource 22/1, pp3-7.

Elliott, John (1998) *The Curriculum Experiment*, Buckingham: O U.

Erricker and Barnett, eds (1989) *World Religions in Education*, 1989, *Humankind and the Environment*. SHAP.

Erricker, C and Erricker, J (2000) *Reconstructing Religious, Spiritual, and Moral Education*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Erikson, EH (1958) *Young Man Luther*, London: W.W.Norton.

Fairweather, I.C.M., and Macdonald, J.N (1992) *Religious Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Finch, and Scrimshaw, eds (1980) *Standards, Schooling and Education*, Oxford: H+S and OU.

Francis, (1990) Theology of Education, in *British Journal of RE* 38.5, p349.

Garforth, FW (1985) *Aims Values and Education*, Whitby, Christiegate Press.

Gates, Brian (1976) *Religion in the developing world of children*. Unpublished PhD thesis University of Lancaster.

Gates, Brian (1996) Research in religious education. *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 17(1): pp42-43.

Gates, Brian ed (1996) *Freedom and Authority in Religions and Religious Education*. London: Cassell.

Gatherer, W.A.(1989) *Curriculum Development in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Gold, Karen (2000) Faith in our Schools. *Guardian Education* 25.4.00.

Goldman, R (1964) *Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence*, London: RKP.

- Goldman, R. (1965) *Readiness for Religion*, London: RKP.
- Gouldner, A. 1976 *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology*, New York: Seabury Press.
- Graham, R. (2001) *John Knox Democrat*, London: Robert Hale.
- Grimmitt, M. (1973) *What Can I Do in RE?* Great Woking: Mayhew - McCrimmon.
- Grimmitt, M. (1987) *Religious Education and Human Development*, Great Woking, McCrimmons
- Grimmitt, M. (1994) Pluralism and RE. *British Journal of RE* 16.3.pp 133-147
- Grimmitt, M. (2000) *Pedagogies of Religious Education*, Great Woking, McCrimmons.
- Grove, J., Teece, G. (1999) *Effective Subject Leadership in Religious Education*, ARELAC.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989) *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Habermas, J. (1975) *Legitimation Crisis*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. 1983 *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, London: Tavistock.
- Hampshire (1980) *Paths to Understanding*, Hampshire EA.
- Hart, John, and Tuck, Ron(2005) *Consultation, Consultation, Consultation: Policy Making in Action Plan: Higher Still and Beyond*: Seminar on Policy Learning in 14-19 Education. Nuffield Review. University of Edinburgh.
- Hartshorn, B. J. (2000) *Changing Perspectives in Religious Education With Particular Reference to the Early Years*. Unpublished MEd Thesis. Glasgow: University of Glasgow .
- Hayward, M. ed (1985) *Worship in World Faiths*, SHAP.
- Hick, John (1999) *Philosophy and the Study of Religions: Part 1 Resource*

22/1, pp 3-7.

Hick, John (2000) *Philosophy and the Study of Religions: Part 2. Resource*
22/2, pp14-17.

Hirschi, Travis, Hanan, Selvin (1973) *Principles of Survey Analysis*, London:
Collier Macmillan.

Hirst, Paul (1965) *Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge*, in
Archambault, RD (ed) *Philosophical Analysis and Education* , pp113-38
London: Routledge.

Hirst, Paul (1972) *Christian Education: A contradiction in terms? Learning*
for Living 11(4), pp6-11.

Hirst, Paul (1973) *Religion: A Form of Knowledge? Learning for Living*
12(4), pp 8-10.

Hirst, Paul (1974a) *Knowledge and the Curriculum*, London: RKP.

Hirst, Paul (1974b) *Moral Education in a Secular Society*, London: ULP.

Hirst, Paul (1975) *Morals, Religion and the Maintained School. British*
Journal of Educational Studies Vol 14 No.1, pp5-18.

Hirst and Peters(1970) *The Logic of Education*, London: RKP.

HMI of Schools (1986a) *Learning and Teaching in the First Two Years of the*
Scottish Secondary School, Edinburgh: HMSO.

HMI of Schools (1986b) *Learning and Teaching in Religious Education: An*
Interim Report by HMI, Edinburgh: HMSO.

HMI of Schools (1988) *Management of Educational Resources: 1 Effective*
Secondary Schools, Edinburgh: HMSO.

HMI of Schools (1989) *Religious Observance in Primary and Secondary Schools*
(An Interim Report), Edinburgh: HMSO .

HMI of Schools (1990) *Curriculum, Staffing, and Timetabling*, Edinburgh:
HMSO.

HMI of Schools (1991a) *Religious Education in Roman Catholic Schools*,

- Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools (1991b) *Survey of RE and RO In Dunbarton and Lanark Divisions*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools (1994a) *Effective Learning and Teaching in Scottish Primary and Secondary Schools: Religious Education*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- HMI of Schools (1994b) *Summary Issues: RE: Effective Learning and Teaching*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools (1996a) *Achievement for All*, SOEID
- HMI of Schools (1996b) *Achieving Success in S1/S2*, SOEID.
- HMI of Schools (1996c) *How Good is our School?* Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools (1996d) *Standards and Quality in Scottish Schools: 1992-95*, Edinburgh: Audit Unit.
- HMI of Schools (2001) *Standards and Quality in Secondary Schools: Religious and Moral Education 1995-2000*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMI of Schools (2003-5) *Schools Census Figures*. Edinburgh: HMI Statistics Division.
- Hobson, P.R. (1999) *Religious Education in a Pluralist Society*, London: Woburn Press.
- Edwards, J.S., Howie, J.M., *The Key Philosophical Issues* (1992) *Upper Secondary Education in Scotland*, Edinburgh: SOED / HMSO.
- Gouldner, A. (1976) *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology, The Origins, Grammar and Future of Ideology*, Chapter 7. New York: Seabury Press.
- Hirschi, T. and Selvin, H. (1967) *Principles of Survey Analysis*, New York: The Free Press.
- Holley, R. (1978) *Religious Education and Religious Understanding*, London: RKP.
- Holm, J. (1975) *Teaching Religion in School*, London: OUP.
- Holmes & McLean (1989) *The Curriculum. A Comparative Perspective*,

London: Unwin Hyman.

Howkins, K.G. (1966) *Religious Thinking and Religious Education*, Tyndale.

Huberman and Miles (1984) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Huberman and Miles (2002) *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion*, London: Sage.

Hull, Charles (1985) Between the Lines: an analysis of interview data as an exact art, in *British Education Research Journal* Vol 11, No1, pp27-32.

Hull, J. ed (1982) *New Directions in Religious Education*, Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

Hull, J. (1990) Religious Education in State Schools in Late Capitalist Society, in *British Journal of Educational Studies* 38.4, pp335-348.

Hulmes, E. (1979) *Commitment and Neutrality in RE*, London: Chapman.

Humes & Paterson (1983) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*, Edinburgh: John Donald.

Humes, W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Hyde, K.E. (1969) *Religion and Slow Learners*, London: SCM.

Islamic Academy and Dept of Education of Cambridge University (1985) *The Teaching of Islam in British Schools: An Agreed Statement*, Islamic Academy.

Jackson, R.(ed) (1978) *Perspectives on World Religions*, London: SOAS.

Jackson, R. (1982) *Approaching World Religions*, London: John Murray.

Jackson, R. (1997) *Religious Education: an interpretive approach*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Jackson, R. (2004) *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Jordanhill College (1980) *The Religious Education Curriculum*, Glasgow: Jordanhill College.

- Jordanhill (1981) *RE Syllabus for the 80's: S1-S4*, Glasgow: Jordanhill College.
- Jordanhill (1984) *Assessment in RE for S1-S4*, (McCulloch et al). Report of a Project funded by NICCER, 1982-84 Glasgow: Jordanhill College.
- Jordanhill (1984) *Assessment in RE for S1-S4. Supplement 1*, NICCER (to be read in conjunction with the Report).
- Jordanhill (1984) *Assessment in RE for S1-S4. Supplement 2*, NICCER.
- Kalve, Peter (1996) Some aspects of the work of Michael Grimmitt, *British Journal of RE* 18/3, pp181-190.
- Kelly, A.V. (1980) *Curriculum Context*, Harper & Row.
- Kenneth, Rev Bro. (1972), *Catholic Schools in Scotland 1872-1972*. Catholic Education Commission.
- Kerr, J.F. (ed.) (1968) *Changing the Curriculum*, London: ULP.
- Kerry, T. (1984) *Teaching Religious Education*, Macmillan.
- Kincaid, Michael (1991) *How to improve Learning in RE*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Kirk, Gordon (1982) *Curriculum and Assessment in the Scottish Secondary Schools*, London: Ward Lock.
- Kirk, Gordon (1986) *The Core Curriculum*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Klein, Reva (2000) *Uniquely Sikh*, London: *Times Education Supplement*, Friday 28.4.00.
- Klink, J. 1972) *Your Child and Religion*, London: SCM.
- Lavender, S., (1999) *Towards National Standards in RE.*, *Resource* 21/2, pp19-21.
- Leach, E. (1976) *Culture and Communication*, Cambridge UP.
- Loukes, H. (1961) *Teenage Religion*, London: SCM.
- Loukes, H. (1965) *New Ground in Christian Education*, London: SCM.
- Loukes, H. (1973) *Teenage Morality*, London: SCM.
- McCrone, G. (Committee Chairman) (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st*

- Century, Edinburgh: Committee of Enquiry into Professional Conditions of Service for Teachers.
- McCulloch, G. (2004) *Documentary Research in Education, History*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- McPherson & Raab (1988) *Governing Education*, Edinburgh: EUP.
- MacDonald, J.N. & Fairweather, I.C.M. (1992) *Religious Education*. Scottish Academic Press.
- Madge, Violet (1965) *Children in Search of Meaning*, London: SCM Press.
- Mason, Jennifer (2002) *Qualitative Researching*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Marples, R.(1978) Is Religious Education Possible? *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 12, pp18-19.
- Marwick, A. (2001) *The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language*, London:Palgrave.
- Mason, Jennifer (2002) *Qualitative Researching* (2nd Edition), London: SAGE Publications.
- Mead, Nick, (1999) The Challenge of Citizenship to RE, *Resource* 22/ 1 pp12-15.
- Miles, M.B.,and Huberman, A Michael (1984) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, Beverly Hills: SAGE.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.. Michael (2002) *The Qualitative Researchers Companion*, London: SAGE.
- Millar Report(1972) *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools*, Edinburgh: HMSO .
- Mott-Thornton, Kevin (1996) Language, Dualism and Experiential Religious Education: A critical appraisal. *British Journal of RE* 18/3, pp155-165.
- Mulgan, G. (ed) (1997) *Life After Politics: New Thinking for the Twenty-First Century*, London: Fontana.
- Munn Report (1977) *The Structure of the Curriculum*, Edinburgh: HMSO.

- Mylne, Morag (2007) Letter in the *Herald Newspaper*, Glasgow.
- National Course (1980) *The RE Curriculum*, Glasgow: Jordanhill College.
- National Course (1983) *RE Curriculum: Assessment and Examinations*,
Dundee: Dundee College.
- National Course (1994) *Effective Learning and Teaching in RE*, Glasgow: St
Andrews R C College.
- Nat RE Com (1974) *The Approach to RE in the Catholic Secondary School*.
Catholic Education Commisssion.
- Niblett, W.R. (1959) *Christian Education in a Secular Society*, OUP.
- NICCER Project (1984) *Assessment in Religious Education*, Glasgow:
Jordanhill College.
- O'Leary, D, ed (1983) *Religious Education and Young Adults*, Slough: St Paul
Publications.
- Peatling, J.H. (1977) On Beyond Goldman. *Learning for Living* V16,3, pp99-
108.
- Peters, R.S. (1966) *Ethics and Education*, Allen and Unwin.
- Peters, R..S. (1973) *Philosophy of Education*, Oxford UP.
- Phenix, P. (1964) *Realms of Meaning*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pring, R. (1976) *Knowledge and Schooling*, Open Books.
- Professional Council For RE (1989) *Religious Education in Schools: England and
Wales: Guidelines for Parents*, PCFRE
- Raffe, D. (1984) *Fourteen to Eighteen. The Changing Pattern of Schooling in
Scotland*, Aberdeen: Aberdeen U.P.
- Ramsey, I. (chairman) (1970) *The Fourth R: report of the Commission of Religious
Education in Schools*, (the Durham Report). London: SPCK.
- Read, Rudge, (1992) Westhill Project 1986. *How do I teach RE?* Stanley
Thornes et al.
- RE Council for England and Wales (1999) *The RE Directory*, Abingdon:

Culham College Institute.

Rodger, A.R. (1982) *Education and Faith in an Open Society*, Edinburgh: Handsel Press.

Rodger, A.R. (1986) *A Conceptual Structure for RE: on-going research*, Dundee: Dundee College.

Roger, A. & Hartley, D. (1990) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

SCCC /SOED (1991) *Values in Education: for Discussion and Development*, Edinburgh, SCCC.

SCCC/SOED (1995) *Religious and Moral Education: 5-14.*, Edinburgh, SCCC.

SCCC/SOED (1990) *Curriculum Design for the Secondary Stage*, Edinburgh, SCCC.

SCCC/SOED 1999) *Report on Consultation On Curriculum Design (Sec)*, Edinburgh, SCCC .

SCCC/SOED (2000) *Structure and Balance of the Curriculum 5-14. National Guidelines - Consultation Draft*, Edinburgh: SCCC.

Schools Council (1969) *Humanities: An Approach through Religious Education*, London: Evans/Methuen.

Schools Council (1971) WP 36: *Religious Education in Secondary Schools*, Evans/Methuen.

Schools Council (1972) WP 44: *Religious Education in Primary Schools*, Evans/Methuen.

Schools Council (1977) *Groundplan for the Study of Religion*, London: Schools Council (RE Committee).

Schools Council (1977) *Discovering an Approach*, London: Macmillan Education.

Schools Council (1979) *Seeking Meaning*, London: Macmillan Education.

Schools Council (1979) *Celebrating Meaning*, London: Macmillan Education.

- Schools Council (1979) *Conveying Meaning*, London: Macmillan Education.
- Schostak, John (2002) *Understanding, Designing and Conducting Qualitative Research in Education*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Scottish Executive (1999) *Improving our Schools: consultation on Education Bill*, Edinburgh, Stationery Office.
- Scottish Executive (2000) *5-14 Guidelines: The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum*, Edinburgh: Learning and Teaching in Scotland.
- Seale, Clive (1999) *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Sealey, J. (1985) *Religious Education: Philosophical Perspectives*, London: Allen & Unwin.
- SED (1965) *Primary Education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SED (1972) *Moral and Religious Education in Scottish Schools*, The Millar Report. Edinburgh: HMSO .
- SED (1982) *The Munn and Dunnung Reports: Framework for Decision*, Edinburgh: Scottish Education Department.
- SED (1986) *Religious Education: An Interim Report by HMI*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SED (1987a) *School Management and the Role of Parents*, Edinburgh: SED.
- SED (1987b) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 1990s*, Edinburgh: SED.
- SED (1992) *Upper Secondary Education in Scotland (Howie Report)*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SED (1994) *Religious Education. A Report by HMI*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- Shap (1989) *World Religions in Education*, Shap.
- SJCRE (1975) *Religious Education: Primary School Handbook*, Edinburgh: SJCRE / Church of Scotland.
- SJCRE/SRC (1991) *90's RE. Quality and Effectiveness in RE*, Glasgow: SRC.
- Skeie, Geir, (1995) *Plurality and Pluralism: a challenge for Religious*

- Education, in *British Journal of RE* 17, no 2, pp84-91.
- Smart & Horder (1975) *New Movements in Religious Education*, London: Temple Smith.
- Smart, N. (1968) *Secular Education and the Logic of Religion*, London: Faber & Faber.
- Smart, N. (1970) *The Religious Experience of Mankind*, London: Fontana.
- Smart, N.(1981) *Beyond Ideology*, London: Fontana.
- Smart, N. (1995) The Values of Religious Studies, *Journal of Beliefs and Values* v16, no2, pp 7-10.
- Smith, J.W.D.(1975) *Religion and Secular Education*, Edinburgh: St Andrew Press.
- Smout, T.C. (1987) *A Century of the Scottish People: 1830-1950*, London: Fontana.
- SOED (1973) *Secondary School Staffing. A Report*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SOED (1977) *Assessment For All: The Dunning Report*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SOED (1977) *The Structure of the Curriculum in the Third and Fourth Years of the Scottish Secondary School. The Munn Report*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SOED (1978) *Learning and Teaching in Scottish secondary Schools. School Management*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SOED (1991) *Circular 6/91. Provision of Religious Education and Religious Observance in Primary and Secondary Schools*, Edinburgh: SOED.
- SOED (1992) *National Guidelines - Religious Education 5-14*, Edinburgh HMSO.
- SOED (1993) *National Guidelines: Structure and Balance: 5-14.*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SOED/Scottish Catholic Education Committee (1994) *Religious Education - 5-14 Roman Catholic Schools*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SOED/SCEC (1987) *Management Matters*, Glasgow: SRC.
- SQA (2001, 2002) *RMPS Panel, Principal Assessor Reports*, Edinburgh: SQA.

- SRC (1981) *Report of the Working Group on RE and RO*, Glasgow: SRC
Regional Education Committee.
- SRC (1988) *Curriculum Structures for Secondary Schools*, Glasgow: SRC.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Newbury
Park,CA:, Sage.
- Swan Report (1985) *Education for All: Report of the Committee of Enquiry
into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*, London:
HMSO.
- Teece, Geoff, (1997) Why John Hick's Theory of Religion is important for RE,
Resource 20/1, pp 3-6.
- Teece, Geoff, (1998) Citizenship Education and RE: Threat or Opportunity?
Resource 21/1, pp 7-10..
- TES and TESS, Weekly Educational Newspaper London/ Edinburgh.
- Thatcher, Adrian & Peterson(2000) *Spirituality and the Curriculum in Europe*,
London: Cassell.
- Titscher, Meyer,Wodak and Vetter (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse
Analysis*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Warnock Report (1978) *Meeting Special Educational Needs: Brief Guide*, London:
HMSO .
- Weston, Barrett, Jamieson (1992) *The Quest for Coherence*, Slough: NFER.
- West Riding (1966) *West Riding Agreed Syllabus*,Yorkshire, West Riding.
- White, J. (1982) *The Aims of Education Restated*, RKP.
- Wilcox et al, (1984) *The Preparation for Life Curriculum*, Croom Helm.
- Wilson, B. (1982) *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, Oxford: OUP.
- Wilson, Diana (2000) Spiritual Development: Some Frequently Asked
Questions, *Resource 22/2.*, pp4-6
- Wilson, J. (1971) *Education in Religion and the Emotions*, London:
Heinemann.

- Wilson, J., 1998 RE and Achievement, *Resource* 20/2, pp9-14.
- Wolcott, H.F.(1990) *On seeking - and rejecting - validity in qualitative research*, New York: in E.W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds): *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp121-152). Teachers College Press.
- Wood, A. (1989) *Religions and Education*, Shap.
- Wragg, T. (1980) *State Approved Knowledge? Ten Steps down the Slippery Slope*, University of Exeter: School of Education.
- Wright, A. (1993) *Religious Education in the Secondary School: Prospects for Religious Literacy*, London: David Fulton.
- Wright, A. (1996) Language and Experience in the Hermeneutics of Religious Understanding, *British Journal of RE* 18/3, pp166-180 .
- Young, MFD, (1998) *The Curriculum of the Future*, London: Falmer Press.