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**Introduction, The Context of Learning**

[We are considering various quotes from the Talmud and the Quran to include here]

[quote from Talmud]

[quote from Quran]

**Why this book?**

The dominant discourse in the British government points to failures around multiculturalism. Recent debates surrounding faith schools in the UK have focused on the failure of policies supporting multiculturalism to deliver community cohesion and tolerance in a democratic society. Faith schools are an entrenched part of UK society and the agenda for parental choice suggests a continual expansion of schools based on a religious ethos. By examining how parents and faith school leadership are engaging in the wider community we can better determine how best they can prepare their children for challenges of the 21st Century. The jury is out on the vision and success of multiculturalism in Britain. It is clear that the scale between assimilation and integration is contested and very personal and therefore difficult to build into the wider public policy.

This book is intended to convey the important role that community engagement can play in faith schools as they create environments supportive of 21st Century Learning. This book does not address, however, some of the areas that are relevant to debates around faith Schools and their role within the UK education system. We do not address the nuances of performance results within faith schools, Further, it is important to state that in this publication we are not advocating or denigrating faith schools and we do not view them as a threat to multiculturalism per se. Rather, what we aim to convey is:

1) The experiences of some Muslim and Jewish schools within the UK,
2) a more detailed understanding of Jewish and Muslim concepts of community, and
3) a call for alternatives in for preparing children for the skills and knowledge needed for the 21st Century.

Jewish and Muslim schools have particularly faced public scrutiny in Britain, and though they are two very different types of communities, what they share is that they are magnets for intolerance and criticism, often in the form of Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. This book helps fill the gap in our understanding of these particular faith schools, exploring the role they play in sustaining their own religious heritage but also engaging with the wider society. We selected these faiths in part because of a dearth in the literature and also because they are established and visually discernible minority groups. We do not seek to compare or contrast one type of faith school with the other, rather we look to how each type of faith school operates with respect to community engagement within the landscape of faith schools.
In the Parker-Jenkins & Glenn research discussed below, the tension between schools promoting a distinct identity and the competencies required for effective participation in a democratic society is highlighted, and evidence provided of religious and educational practices within a Muslim and Jewish framework demonstrates that engagement with the wider community is taking place at a number of levels. From this data we propose a theoretical model as a framework identifying different levels of engagement and providing a tool against which faith schools can evaluate achievements to date and identify future direction.

Overview of the Case Study

The main aims of the Parker-Jenkins & Glenn (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2008) research were to address why, how, and in what ways religious/cultural sustainability is regarded as critical to the school’s raison d’être and what are the experiences of engagement and estrangement or alienation with and from the wider community? The fieldwork took place between 2007-2008, involving a case study of nine schools in the Midlands, London, the Home Counties and Northern England, with over 100 stakeholder participants. This involved analysing the experiences and challenges of the children, parents, teachers and representatives of the community and the choices they made in curriculum, after school activities, school ethos, leadership training, perspectives around the concept of community. We acknowledge as authors that this type of sampling is problematic, in particular, the school sample was small and the findings cannot, therefore, be said to be representative of the views of all Muslim or Jewish students, teachers or parents. The educational institutions in this research were established with different philosophical underpinnings, but they were all providing a “tailored” design for their own contextual needs and challenges (such as cashless digital scanning to receive lunches in the canteen in order to provide a sense of equality for children from low income homes; A weekly school assembly where parents are invited to attend).

Within our research, we were particularly interested in evidence of Antisemitic or Islamophobic attacks or hostility towards Jewish or Muslim school communities. Both types of schools developed mechanisms to keep their schools safe and all had levels of security, higher than the average non-faith school. Our research revealed hostility predominantly in the form of verbal abuse towards children outside of school. Whilst “voluntary-aided” rather than “voluntary controlled” status provides faith schools with greater levels of autonomy (Lankshear, 2001), the further addition of independent Jewish and Muslim schools formed part of the sample to add to the exploration of “self-exclusion” reflected in different levels or degrees of social engagement. We focused specifically on full-time, faith-based, education at primary and secondary level, i.e. compulsory schooling for 15-16 year olds in independent and state-funded, “voluntary-aided” schools (Lankshear 2001). Theses schools are distinct from classes provided through supplementary education in the form of Madrassahs theologically driven education or Yeshivas schools Orthodox Jewish religious learning institutions. Being full-time the selected schools had greater opportunity to develop education through extra or enhanced resource availability, and strong pedagogical development by engagement with regulatory frameworks, quality assurance bodies and mechanisms. While some groups are prompted to engage across and within religious boundaries, and to participate in wider civil society and processes
of governance, others seek to distance themselves from other religious traditions and secular culture. This formed a key area of inquiry in our research. Individual interviewing and focus groups were chosen as the main research method because of their use with questions of a sensitive nature (Cohen et al 2000; 2008), particularly concerning personal identity (Gunaratnam, 2003). The schools demonstrate degrees of engagement with the ‘community’ at local, national and international levels on the basis of their own religious and political agendas (Parker-Jenkins and Glenn, 2011). These efforts are also reflected in the admission policies which admit Muslims and Jews from different backgrounds (eg. converted/reverted Jews and Muslims); providing an important dimension to the terms ‘plurality’ and ‘cohesion’ within their faiths.

Organization of the Book

In organising the book, we provide the overall objectives of the book followed by brief presentations key concepts here in this introduction. Chapter 1 provides a historical perspective on faith schools; their origins in the England and Wales based on Christian and Jewish traditions, and the expansion of the educational landscape to include other faith groups such as those based on an Islamic ethos. The historical patterns of accommodation between church and state are with brief reference to other European countries drawing on examples from Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Netherlands. Separation of church and state is discussed with reference to France and the development of a secular educational system. The evolution of Jewish and Muslim schools in the UK is also examined in preparation for the later chapters on the nature of these particular schools. Chapter 2 is concerned with faith schools and social policy, introducing the debates around diversity and cohesion in contemporary multicultural Britain. This is in the context of post 9/11, rioting in northern cities in England (2001), and the 7/7 bombings in London (2005). From this time, UK government policy aimed to promote greater community cohesion in society. The role of schools was seen as central to this initiative and state-funded school were required to evidence their role in promoting community cohesion (DFES, 2007). This chapter examines policy movement from community cohesion under New Labour to the coalition government’s notion of the “Big Society”. Chapters 3 and 4 examine the religious and cultural conceptions of community of the Jewish and Muslim faith groups and their differences based on ethnic, linguistic and sectarian lines. We also here look at instances of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism that sample schools experienced and will assess how these schools have coped with and responded to such incidents. The findings of this chapter will then lead us, in Chapter 4, to promote community engagement as a more promising and productive perspective in assessing the relations of minority faith schools with the outside world than community cohesion. We unearth experiences of hostility of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, 2009, Runnymede 2007), and how faith communities seek to keep themselves safe from the wider community. We look at what all schools can do to help develop better relations between groups in preparing children for the 21st Century. Building on our own model of ‘community engagement’ rather than ‘community cohesion’ we examine practical curricula suggestions for what skills children need to develop tolerance and engagement with other groups in the 21st Century. This leads to the final chapter of this book where we
provide an overview of the discussion and looking forward, we suggest what government should be doing in light of the alleged ‘failure of multiculturalism’.

Having provided an introduction to the central aims of the book, we introduce below the key terminology and some of the theoretical background to faith schools and concepts of community within Judaism and Islam that will be used to present our thesis.

**Key Debates on Faith Schools**

Key questions that are debated in the context of faith schools include:

- How do or can faith schools contribute to community engagement
- How do internally strong communities cohere around certain ideas?
- What barriers or challenges do faith schools face in this regard; and

How in a British school system, do Jewish and Muslim faith schools successfully prepare young people for living and leading in a diverse world? In answering these questions we also point to the way forward. Now that the ‘community cohesion’ agenda (DFES, 2007) has been abandoned, there is a void in current policy with regard to promoting greater community engagement. We need to examine how 21st Century skills can help prepare children in faith schools with a defined ethos to be prepared for living in a multicultural and fast changing society.

**Multiculturalism in Britain and the role of Faith Schools**

Sacks (2007) posits the theory that multiculturalism emerged as a reality based on the large extent of migration towards Western countries from non-Western countries, which in turn led to the idea of “one nation, one culture” (Sacks, 2007:35). Emigration and arrival of new communities to the UK have been part of the discourse on multiculturalism and government policy. A key principle in multiculturalism has been respect for cultural difference, and that ethnic and religious minorities will only give their consent to the political institutions of the wider society on the basis of being appreciated and promoted by the state (Lynch 1988, Craft and Beddard 1984, Berger, Galonska and Koopmans 2004).

Supporters of faith schools argue that these educational institutions are well placed to contribute to the common good because they can provide children with a moral and religious framework that engenders confidence in their own identity and helps them to be respectful of the beliefs and values of others (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005). Conversely, critics claim these schools make little effort to integrate, promote intolerance and “fundamentalist ideologies’ and are detrimental to a harmonious society (Berkeley 2008, Dawkins 2001).

Both Jewish and Muslim school communities are following the steps of previous denominational groups, notably Anglican (Brown, 2003; Lankshear, 2001) and Catholic (Hornsby-Smith, 2000; Catholic Education Service, 1997), in establishing schools permeated by faith. Muslim schools have tended to be the group targeted for greatest criticism in trying to follow this denominational school tradition, accessing the public purse, and in some cases teaching a “radical” Islam and more divisive teaching (Parker-Jenkins, 2002). As we know from research into Catholic schools
(O'Keefe, 1997; Catholic Education Service, 1999) and into Jewish schools (JPR, 2002), there are different levels of engagement with the wider community by faith schools and their self-exclusion can be constructed to demonstrate deliberate social isolation (O’Keefe, 1997), sometimes in the form of ethnic/religious defence (Husain and O’Brien, 1999). Both Muslim and Jewish schools achieve cultural sustainability through the medium of education; and both experience hostility unlike other faith groups in the form of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia (Runnymede Trust, 1994, 1997, 2007; Allen and Nielsen, 2002; and The Community Security Trust, 2012).

**Parental Choice in the UK**

Theoretically, we employed Denham’s (2001) notion of “self-segregation by choice” as it relates to “cultural sustainability” within schools. For the purpose of this discussion we defined cultural sustainability as the passing on of traditions, customs, and values through the family, and the extent to which it is possible to operate in a non-Islamic or non-Jewish state. Overall, the research was set within the context of debates with in the UK around multiculturalism.

These issues also permeate this discussion as we highlight the tensions in the practice of parental choice, introduced in the UK. The school choice model has been a key concept since the 1980s underpinning the view that access to schooling is a basic right and duty and that it should be reflective in a parents’ right to decide on results, faith, location, or proximity to home. The result of increased parental choice is itself contentious, with claims that it privileges the middle classes (Webber and Butler, 2006, Taylor 2006). Within the policy context, the Education and Inspections Act (2006) helped reinforce the emphasis on individualism, and political parties along the spectrum hesitate to challenge this view (Gorard et al 2003). The ‘problem of choice’ (Weekes-Bernard, 2007), is that it also leads to the segregation of children on the basis of religion which, critics say, undermine attempts to create a more harmonious or tolerant society.

The theme of choice based on religious belief permeates this book. The significance of parental choice is reflected in human rights law, for example, the European Convention on Human Rights (1947) to which the UK is a party, states that in matters of education, countries must respect the religious convictions of parents (Council of Europe Article 2, Protocol 1). Dronker et al (2010) examined 24 countries and found that parental choice on behalf of their children led to two key patterns: upper middle classes opting for private education and middle class and lower-middle class exercising choice which led to segregation. From a UK perspective, political parties across the spectrum have signalled support for choice in education and this becomes more contentious when selection is based on religious considerations. Also, the commitment by the last Labour government to expand faith schools helped increase the numbers of educational institutions for children based on a number of religious tradition (DfE, 2013). Both Jewish and Muslim schools have benefitted by this climate of support and despite criticisms that the separation of children based on religious identity is divisive (Berkerley 2008), there is no indication that parental choice in this matter will be restricted. As we see in the book, Jewish and Muslim school communities have developed an ethos which helps reflect shared religious values and supports compatibility between the home and school.
Within the UK most faith schools form part of public sector education, in terms of funding, resources, and support for professional development among other areas. However, the state can still exercise control over private sector institutions, through curriculum standards, leaderships and teaching requirements and Ofsted inspections, despite the fact they receive no public funding (Dronkers et al. 2010). Dronkers et al. (2010) argue that in fact parental choice was a direct result of changing economic and social spheres amongst the middle classes. Competitive education strategies ‘permit access to new social positions and limit competition from members of the working classes’ (Dronkers et al. 2010). Since the 1950s education policies in the UK have purposefully encouraged parental choice in order to improve a bureaucratic and uniform education system.

Despite projects like 'Accept Pluralism', an EU funded project which sees some religious schools as part of the challenge to diversity and intolerance, there is a strong push for greater understanding across EU countries towards knowledge and skills within religious communities (Triandafyllidou, 2012).

A key claim by faith schools is that education is central to living as a Jew and as a Muslim in the UK and beyond. Tailored educational learning is central to religious identity, practice and we would argue, to the suit of 21st century skills that will prepare children. Communities actively perpetuate and socialise according to faith-based values and traditions. Thus, importantly, we do not claim faith schools exist to defend against external pressure but to help preserve cultural identity and build on a suite of skills that help prepare children to navigate and lead.

There has been a shift from the concept of multiculturalism to community cohesion (Cantle, 2006) as an ideology within the Liberal State (MacMullen, 2007). The failure of multiculturalism to deliver equitable outcomes in society and an attempt to look beyond this concept are echoed elsewhere, for example, by Hollinger (1995) and Kincheloe and Steinberg’s (1997) work on critical multiculturalism. More recently, there have been political statements in France, Germany and the UK that “multiculturalism has failed” (Yamed 2004; Kudani 2002). The emphasis on “bonding social capital” (Coleman, 1994; Pugh and Telhaj, 2007) assists in promoting shared values within the school community and a cooperative practice between the school and the home. The depth of social capital built within and extended beyond faith schools is a matter of degree, which is what we aim to highlight throughout the book.

**Faith schools vs. faith-based schools**

The clergy was instrumental in initiating schooling based on denominational lines hence the descriptor 'denominational schools'. Under the legislative change of 1870, religious groups could not afford to meet the educational needs of the country, and “voluntary aided” or “voluntary controlled” schools were given financial assistance from the government based on Anglican, Catholic and Jewish lines (Lankshear, 2001). Similarly, this terminology was used in the 1944 Education Act, and confirmed in the 1988 Education Reform Act. Up until the 21st century, the terms 'voluntary' or 'church' school have been used interchangeably but they are not synonymous: there
are a few voluntary schools that are not religious foundations, and there have been some voluntary aided Jewish schools since the last century (Miller 2001).

The use of the term 'faith schools' has gained currency since the report 'Schools Building on Success' (Department for Education and Employment, 2001) which declared its support for 'the number and variety of schools within the state system supported by the churches and other major faith groups' (p. 48, emphasis added). In terms of the shifting nomenclature used for religious schools, no one term adequately conveys the range of schools now being encouraged to develop, but for the purpose of our discussion we are using the term 'faith school' to include all those educational institutions which aspire to inculcate religious beliefs into children, and to perpetuate a particular style of life.

**Reviewing “Community Cohesion”**

For this book we have used the definition of community cohesion in the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Guidance to Schools (DCSF 2007a). This refers to working towards a society in which:

- There is a common vision and sense of belonging by all communities.
- The diversity of people's backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and valued.
- Similar life opportunities are available to all.
- Strong and positive relationships exist and continue to be developed in the workplace, in schools and in the wider community.

In the UK schools played an important role in promoting community cohesion. The ways in which community cohesion has been understood, and played out in policy and practice, was largely based on historical events and political perspectives.¹ Up until 2008 schools had a distinctive role in promoting the community cohesion agenda. Schools were asked:

“How to avoid the corrosive effects of intolerance and harassment: how to build a mutual civility among different groups, and to ensure respect for diversity alongside a commitment to common and shared bonds.”

(DCSF, 2007: 3)

A legal responsibility was placed on all maintained schools in England to promote community cohesion and on Ofsted to report on this.² This new duty built on existing legislation and defined schools’ ethical and social responsibilities as follows:

---

¹ The political context which shaped the British Government’s agenda on social cohesion were the 7/7 bombings in London and the riots in Northern towns in England in 2001 (Cantle Report 2001; HMSO 2006). Trust was broken in many communities and issues about diversity and opportunity in a complex multi-racial society came to the fore.

² The duty on schools to promote community cohesion came into effect on 1 September 2007 (DCSF, 2007).
• The curriculum for all maintained schools should promote the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society, and prepare pupils for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of later life.\textsuperscript{3}

• Schools have a duty to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people of different groups.\textsuperscript{4}

The national goal was to ensure that ‘all pupils understand and appreciate others from different backgrounds with a sense of shared values, fulfilling their potential and feeling part of a community, at a local, national and international level’ (ibid. p. 2). Schools were encouraged to build community cohesion ‘by promoting equality of opportunity and inclusion for different groups of pupils within a school and promoting shared values (ibid, p.6). In practical terms, this was to be achieved through teaching and learning; work to raise standards and ethos, and engagement with the community and extended (i.e. wider public) services.

Within the lofty aspirations of community cohesion, a school’s contribution to society was seen to be through “the community” and its extended services. These broad themes were particularly relevant to faith schools, since schools were seen as a venue for young people to interact with people from different backgrounds (DCSF, 2007). All schools in the UK were obliged to foster community cohesion, but there was a particular emphasis on faith schools to implement the government initiative. They were singled out for criticism as a result of their self-imposed segregation - “commitment to the promotion of cohesion is not universal, and for many faith schools, not a priority” (Berkeley, 2008: 5).

The concept of cohesion in this simplistic form is particularly complicated for faith communities. As Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011, highlight in their study on the ‘Levels of Community Cohesion’ in the UK it is unclear what should be cohered around and whose values should underpin cohesion. What are the deliverables and how should we recognise them? The various definitions of community imply that cohesion does not simply mean within a community but politically it implies beyond the immediate community (Parker-Jenkins et al., 2005). For many ethnic groups, the only valued status is framed around a White Christian perspective, and as a result is rejected. Instead what has emerged is disillusionment with and fear of the ideologies of integration and assimilation (Parker-Jenkins, Hartas and Irving, 2005) and a risk of “alienation,” in the name of maintaining identity or fear of others, thus to separate or dis-engage (Beckerman and McGlynn, 2007).

In 2008 the legal obligation for schools to demonstrate what they have been doing to promote community cohesion was removed. This may be viewed by some schools as one activity less that they have to contend with in the light of other government requirements. But good practice in the past need not be lost or abandoned but built on with the opportunity now to freely develop this aspect of education. Now that the policy of community cohesion has been abandoned school communities may be

\textsuperscript{3} Education Act 2002, Section 78.

\textsuperscript{4} Race Relations Amendment Act 2000.
understandably confused as to what they should be doing in the absence of clear government policy. Confusion over the “Big Society” initiative which has been launched and relaunched adds to this confusion. For this book we have used the definition of community cohesion in the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Guidance to Schools (DCSF 2007a). This refers to working towards a society in which:

- There is a common vision and sense of belonging by all communities.
- The diversity of people’s backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and valued.
- Similar life opportunities are available to all.
- Strong and positive relationships exist and continue to be developed in the workplace, in schools and in the wider community.

**Community Engagement**

We adopt the definition of “community cohesion” in terms of ‘promoting greater knowledge, respect, and contact between groups within the community, and developing a greater sense of citizenship’ (Pearce, 2005). “Community engagement”, on the other hand, is defined as the ability or willingness of different communities to live alongside and with each other, and to meet, work and be educated with those outside of their own community (Gaine, 1995). Associated with these concepts is that of “alienation,” meaning withdrawal, self-imposed segregation in the name of maintaining identity or fear of others, thus to separate or dis-engage (Beckerman and McGlynn, 2007). For many minority ethnic groups (Dadzi, 2001), the promotion of assimilation, where names are Anglicised and the only status that matters is framed around a White Christian perspective, is rejected. This is one of the reasons why faith schools emerged, disillusionment with and fear of the ideologies of integration and assimilation (Parker-Jenkins, Hartas and Irving, 2005).

With respect to community engagement, a comprehensive literature review shows effective strategies for schools to support and engage with families (Statham, Harris, and Glenn, 2010) there needs to be a holistic approach to securing community cohesion and family wellbeing involving all service providers working together. The Children’s Plan notes that schools are ‘well placed to become a focal point for the local community and to foster better relationships between diverse communities’ (DCSF 2007b, p.73). Little evidence in the literature exists about the impact of school admission policies on community cohesion (Statham, Harris, and Glenn, 2010). Measuring the variables or assessing over an agreed definition of cohesion is challenging.

The removal now of the legal obligation to demonstrate what schools have been doing to promote ‘community cohesion’, as highlighted above, may be viewed by some schools as one activity less that they have to contend with in the light of other government requirements, or as an opportunity to look at alternative approaches to preparing children for living in a multicultural society. We propose the term ‘community engagement’ which we argue is a more helpful term than ‘community cohesion’, which is the language of aspiration and rhetoric.
The ‘Big’ Society

The new Conservative/Liberal-Democrat coalition government has not formally revoked the community cohesion policy but has "signaled its preference for achieving the integration of British ethnic minority communities through the Big Society narrative rather than that of community cohesion" (Rowe et al, 2011: 4). The Big Society initiative in the UK places an emphasis on people and communities and away from the State with notions of autonomy, strong civil society, and providing for oneself (Inside Government 2013a). Contrary to the previous government it assigns only a minimal role to the state in promoting integration and social cohesion (DfE, 2010). However, what the current government shares with the community cohesion agenda is a commitment to common values and ‘Britishness’ and a rejection of ‘permissive’ multiculturalism.

21st Century Skills in Practice

The impetus for 21st century skills largely falls on schools to develop a skills-based pedagogy. Under section 78 of the Education Act 2002, schools are seen as locales for the ‘physical, mental, social, cultural and moral development’ of young people. The debate over whether Faith Schools provide the adequate development that prepares young people for adulthood and gives them the ability to operate effectively in a multi-ethnic, multi-faith society is filled with both praise and concern. On one side Faith Schools are praised for giving pupils strong sense of personal worth and their ability to prepare pupils to be good citizens (OFSTED 2009). As a result religious schools create an atmosphere that is conducive to learning. Moreover, schools with a high social capital have a significant advantage which explains the successes of many faith schools – they have a ready-made sense of community. Effective communities combine the capacity to bond with the ability to bridge (Farrar and Otero, 2007). Work experience and placements were just one example we found in our case study of how faith schools help pupils develop 21st century skills and prepare them for adulthood.

Although on the whole we found positive evidence of community engagement and 21st century skills in the schools in our case studies, there were a few areas of concern. ICT did not seem to be a priority in many schools, and it was often taught by a non-specialist. Most pupils mainly learn ICT skills and home, and even then used it mainly to communicate with other young people within their own religion. A further concern was raised at a number of Muslim schools regarding language skills. A significant majority of pupils spoke English as a second language, and did not speak English at home. A final concern was the genderisation that was evident in both Jewish and Muslim schools. In Jewish schools, girls from a young age were typecast in the ‘Jewish mother’ role during religious festivities. There were major concerns at Muslim schools that young girls are getting married at 17 or 18 and not reaching their full potential.

There are also concerns that a narrow curriculum prevents young people from participating in a pluralistic society outside of their own family and community
(Policy Exchange). Opponents of faith schools maintain that children are raised in a segregated community, unaware of others outside of their faith group and that this can lead to intolerance (Berkerley and Sevita, 2008; Dawkins, 2001). Although Berkeley (2008) contends that pupils in Faith Schools gain valuable communication and collaboration skills as a result of a value-based education and strong ties with the community, this, he suggests, is not enough to prepare young people for living and working in a multi-faith society, because of the limited opportunities for young people to mix with people of different backgrounds.

**Concept of Diversity**

Enrolling children from a diverse background is seen to increase engagement with wider social issues and enables young people to understand different cultures and backgrounds. However, this is a very fixed idea of what diversity it. Within Judaism and Islam there is a huge range of religious observance and ethnic background, and this needs to be reflect in how we view faith schools. One of the Muslim schools in our case study had pupils from six different ethnicities and ten different languages were spoken in the school. Furthermore, 50% of the staff were not Muslim. At one Jewish school in London that accepted pupils from outside of the Jewish faith – it was in fact a child from an Asian background that won the annual prize for Hebrew.

Because, education is an agency for cultural reproduction in both the public and private domains and our study focused on minority communities which do not fit easily or neatly into the dominant national discourses (Parker-Jenkins 1995, 2002. The book raises philosophical concerns relevant to policy formation about government policy and the alleged failure of “multiculturalism”. Further, the book challenges the assumption that Muslim and Jewish schools withdraw or self-segregate from the wider community and illustrates the way they engage and conceptualize local and wider communities and social engagement.

**Performance and Faith Schools**
The presence of religious state-funded secondary schools in England impacts the educational experiences of pupils who attend neighbouring schools, whether through school effort induced by competition or changes in peer groups induced by sorting. National administrative data estimates pupil test score growth models between the ages of 11 and 16, with instrumental variable methods employed to avoid confounding the direct causal effect of religious schools. There appears to be significant evidence that religious schools are associated with higher levels of pupil sorting across schools, but no evidence that competition from faith schools raises area-wide pupil attainment. (Allen and Vignoles, 2009; also See generally Gibbons and Silva (2011); Yeshanew et al (2008); Schagen (2005); Pettinger (2012)) Voluntary Aided’ (VA) status gives faith schools majority representation on the governing body and therefore control over the employment of staff, buildings and repairs, and school admissions (Gay and Greenough, 2000).
Chapter 1: Faith Schools: Historical and Legal Background

Individuals may belong to a number of communities during their life time. These include communities of family, kinship or school or religious belief. For some people, two communities overlap in the form of religion and the choice of school, and decisions concerning membership of these groups are informed by the way they construct their lives. The relationship between Church and state has been instrumental in the historical development of public education in England and Wales. Schooling based on Anglican, Catholic and Jewish teaching has been supported in the UK for some time. In this chapter we provide an historical and legal perspective of religious schooling in England and Wales, highlighting the role of the clergy in establishing academic institutions based on Christian lines, and the use of government funds to support their development. This provides a framework for understanding the guiding principles behind present policies relating to religious education. Furthermore this chapter explores the extent to which present concerns about faith schools as a possible threat to social cohesion are not new in political discourses. Finally a variety of national contexts are also examined to help demonstrate how other countries have responded to religious pluralism and schooling.

The discussion is organized as follows: We begin by looking at the origins of mass education and the role of the church in England and Wales in initiating formal education for all children after which we address

- The Evolution of Jewish and Muslim Schools in England and Wales
- Faith Schools in Scotland, Northern Ireland
- Netherlands; and
- The Secular Tradition in France

Denominational Schooling in England and Wales

Educational provision in England and Wales established on denominational lines dates back to the Middle Ages and faith-based groups have continued to preserve this tradition. By the 19th Century, major social and economic upheaval due to the direct consequences of the Industrial Revolution called for social policy enactment. Education was considered an important agent of social reform to assist the nation in its economic endeavours. Government at this time was, however, somewhat ambivalent about its role in the provision of educational services. Furthermore, the Victorians were deeply suspicious of government involvement in daily events and feared the growth of state intervention into what had, hitherto, been a purely private concern (Curtis and Boultonwood, 1966).
Prior to 1850 what provision there was for educating the “poorer classes” (people legislatively classified as those who supported themselves by manual labour see. Warlen1976:117) was by virtue of the charity schools founded by such l as the British and Foreign School Society of 1810 and the National Schools in 1811. Throughout England and Wales the clergy initiated schooling as a means of carving out their evangelical crusade. While government began subsidizing education to a limited degree in the form of treasury grants in 1833, it did not assume the role of instigator for educational provision, and free universal free schooling was not implemented until the following century (Armitage, 1964). Instead faith groups were instrumental in promoting education with a strong inculcation of religious values (Wolffe, 1994) and they began a tradition of denominational schooling which has continued to the present day. Furthermore, when the state did choose to venture into providing education for all children, the clergy continued to have influence: indeed, education and Christianity were inextricably linked in the public mind (Tropp, 1957).

The Catholic Church was also instrumental in establishing schools in England and Wales. Emancipation in the 1830s gave Catholics the possibility of establishing their own school and obtaining state funding (Grace, 2001). The major purpose of the Catholic church in voluntarily establishing schools was to induce children into the faith matters of the curriculum, and staffing policy were considered of major importance with a desire to have freedom from government interference (Hickman, 1995, O’Keefe, 2000, Stannard 2001; CES,2003). This formed part of the challenge facing Catholic schools today, which, like Church of England schools, are still having to redefine themselves and their mission within and beyond the school community (Catholic Education Service 1998, 1999, 2000; Conroy 1999; Longmore et al. 2000). As well as adapting to accommodate non-Catholics, Catholic schools are also perceived as providing high academic attainment, in keeping with other faith schools. Today in the UK there are over two thousand Catholic schools, which stand alongside Church of England schools as a central feature of faith-based schools accommodating approximately 10 per cent of children of school age (DES 2013).

By the 1860’s it was clear that faith-based groups alone could not adequately meet the needs of the nation in voluntarily establishing schools. At the time arguments were presented for both the expansion of church schools and the creation of a wholly secular system. The Elementary School Act (1870), which established a primary school system for all, was seen as a compromise in that voluntary schools were allowed to continue with state funding. This was augmented by the establishment of state schools run by local school boards (Lankshear, 1996; Locke, 2001). Christianity was still taught but schools were forbidden to promote one denomination over another, and parents had the right to withdraw their children from religious instruction. At the end of the 19th century, the voluntary sector had established around fourteen thousand schools representative of religious groups, including the Church of England, Catholic, Methodist and Wesleyan groups (Archbishop’s Council Church Schools Review Group, 2001:6). Further, categories of denominational schools were designated in the Education Act (1944) with various levels of government control but generally referred to as ‘voluntary’ schools (Arthur, 1995; Francis and
Lankshear, 2001). Schools were offered the option of either increased funding and control, hence 'voluntary controlled schools', which became common practice among Church of England schools (Arthur, 1995; Lankshe, 2003), or less support and state interference with greater independence, known as 'voluntary aided', a status assumed by the majority of Catholic schools (Grace 2001a; O’Keefe 1999, 2000).

Importantly, the 1944 Act did not specify religious affiliation. The relevant clauses of the Act provided for different levels of support and state intervention, but they did not specify which denominational groups could be included in the scheme. Hence, Jewish schools have received state funding through the procedure of obtaining voluntary aided status (Miller, 2001), and more recently so have Muslim, Sikh, Greek Orthodox and Seventh Day Adventist schools (Department for Education and Skills, 2013). Other minority groups may also wish to avail themselves of this right in the future, which is consistent with government thinking on the matter. As faith-based communities have initiated schooling and expanded provision, their role has been increasingly underpinned by legislation which has helped reinforce their place in helping to establish a national system of education in England and Wales, beginning in the 19th century, and continuing up until the present (Cush, 2003).

Between 1986 and 2002 there were 16 Education Acts in England and Wales and the partnership between Church and state continued to develop through various reforms and changes (National Society, 2003a). The School Standards and Framework Act (1998) is particularly noteworthy because it contains a number of provisions which bring faith-based school communities substantially into the decision-taking process. The Act created four categories of schools within the state system in England and Wales:

- Community schools (formerly County schools);
- Foundation schools (formerly Grant Maintained schools);
- Voluntary Aided schools; and
- Voluntary Controlled schools.

All community schools must implement the locally Agreed Syllabus as a basis for religious education and may not have a 'religious character' (Jackson 2003b). Schools within the other categories may have a 'religious character' based on the school’s trust deed or traditional practice. All schools which have a religious character, may have a collective act of worship reflective of the religious group concerned, but only those designated voluntary aided may have denominational religious education. This legislation also aims to make decisions a matter for collective agreement at both national and local levels and for the Church to work in partnership with government.

A number of statutes concerning faith schools are directly relevant to the expansion of this category of school. The Education Act (1996), highlighted above, has relevance to all independent schools, and is an important piece of legislation in that new faith schools have tended to become independent first and then apply for state funding. This is what has happened in the case of Muslim and
Sikh schools, for example, and is likely to be followed by other minority groups (Parker-Jenkins et al. 2005).

This is within the context of competing discourses about the wisdom of having faith schools (Dawkins, 2001, British Humanist Association, 2012) set against the valuing of having alternative sites for learning and religious expression (Grace 2003, Pring 2005, Short 2002) which we highlighted earlier in the introduction. Halstead and McLaughlin (2005) state:

“...children who have a strong self-identity and who are treated fairly and justly by the broader society are much more likely to grow up into tolerant, balanced and responsible citizens”(p.67).

The 1996 Act defines a school as one in which there are more than five pupils of compulsory school age, and as such a school can and has been established in a person’s sitting room www.legislation.gov.uk/Fewer than five pupils and the arrangement is seen as constituting the ‘education otherwise’ category as stipulated in the Education Act (1944), that is, education taking place at home on an individual or small-group basis rather than as a school. If there are more than five children then an application is made to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to be registered as an independent school. In order to do this the institution has to comply under a number of headings. These relate to the suitability of the premises, accommodation regarding the age of the pupils and facilities if boarding children. 'Suitable and efficient' teaching and learning is also required, and the curriculum should be generally broad and balanced. Independent schools do not have to teach the National Curriculum, nor do they have to employ qualified teachers. There is a body of regulations that independent schools are required to comply with which contrasts with the public image of them being totally unregulated institutions (see e.g., Rosenthal, 2004) It is not the purview of this text to address the specifics of the curricular requirements imposed on faith schools, rather we discuss in more general terms in chapters 3 and 4 the nature of the curricula in Jewish and Muslim schools.

In terms of inspection and accountability, state-funded faith schools are inspected like all other maintained schools except in terms of religious education. The social, cultural, spiritual and moral aspects of the school are covered under Section 23 of the 1996 Act. After September 2003 reports on independent schools were to be placed in the public domain and available on the Office for Standards in Education website (Ofsted, 2013). The framework provides that these reports be specific with regard to premises, welfare and arrangements for the school having a complaints procedure. Also relevant in discussing the legal context of faith schools is the School Standards and Framework Act (1998). This provides for the creation of School Organization Committees consisting of representatives of the Local Education Authority, governing bodies and the Learning and Skills Council. In the absence of an agreement, an adjudicator appointed by the Secretary of State takes a decision.

In considering candidates for the position of head teacher of a voluntary controlled or voluntary aided school a governing body may 'have regard to the
candidate's ability and fitness to preserve and develop the religious character of the school'. [5] More recently, this has been reiterated under the Independent Schools (Employment of Teachers in Schools with a Religious Character) Regulation (2003). Preference may be given in connection with the appointment, promotion or remuneration at a faith school of teachers 'whose religious opinions are in accordance with the tenets of the religion or the religious denomination specified in relation to the school' or 'who give, or who are willing to give, religious education at the school in accordance with those tenets' [5].

Likewise, the admissions policy for pupils is informed by religious considerations. We here note that the ability for wide-ranging religious considerations to be taken into account by a faith school in admissions was curtailed in 2009 by the Supreme Court ruling in the JFS case (R on application of E v Governing Body of JFS and the Admissions Appeal Panel of JFS [2009] UKSC 15), which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. We will also return to this point later in this chapter with reference to Catholic schools in Scotland.

The expansion of faith schools can also be seen as part of a government strategy to extend the provision of a category of schools which it sees as being successful in terms of parental support and academic attainment. At the beginning of this chapter, we looked at the early faith schools in Britain dating back to the 17th Century, and their relationship with the state in building a national system of education. The development of schooling has also been impacted by the waves of immigrants to Britain. In the post-1950s era there has been further migration, this time from the Caribbean, Asia and East Africa particularly, and has led to the establishment of several new faith communities. The new faith schools emerging from these communities have been established in the last 20 years which mainly serve the children of first- or second-generation immigrants, and some have succeeded in obtaining state support since 1998.

The educational landscape in England and Wales now reflects faith schools from a variety of religious backgrounds. For the purpose of this book, the focus is on those established by Jewish and Muslim communities.

**The Establishment of Jewish and Muslim Schools in England and Wales**

The Jewish education system in England and Wales can be traced back to the mid-17th century. Following the re-admittance of Jews into England in 1656 (Romain, 1985), Jewish day schools were established alongside synagogues, notably the Creechurch Lane 'Talmud Torah School' in 1657 and the 'Gates of Hope School' in 1664 (Black, 1998). As we saw earlier in the chapter, there was an urgent demand to meet the need for an educated workforce in the 18th and 19th centuries, and the establishment of Jewish schools such as the 'Jews Free School' in 1732 helped to respond to this call (ibid). Today there are over 100 Jewish schools in England and Wales, 38 of which operate full-time with government funding (Department for Education, 2013).

The history of Muslim schooling in the country has been associated with the struggle for parity with other faith schools, along the lines of that afforded to
Christian and Jewish institutions. As Hewer (2011) notes there have been Muslims in Britain for centuries, but issues of accommodation within the educational system did not arise until the post-1950’s migration period. In addition, the obstacles Muslim communities have faced have been magnified because their supporters are predominantly representative of differing ethnic minorities, and this wave of immigration raises ‘complex issues of colour, race and religion’ (ibid p. 515).

The 2011 Census revealed that in terms of religious affiliation, there are just over 2.7 million Muslims in the United Kingdom and just under 280,000 Jews (Office of National Statistics, 2011). Due to immigration, there is a cultural heritage from different communities; most notably Ashkenazi Jews (from Eastern Europe) and Sephardi Jews (from the Near East and the Iberian Peninsula), and major Jewish centres established in London and Manchester reflect this cultural diversity (Schmool and Cohen, 1998). In terms of Jewish schools, there are 96 full-time Jewish educational institutions in the United Kingdom; 41% of them are state-funded, serving approximately 30,000 children of compulsory school age (5 – 16) and representing 50% of the Jewish pupil population (Miller, 2007, 2012). (We look at the categorisation of Jewish schools in more details later in chapter 3). Within Jewish schools, “Pikuach,” an inspection service launched by the Board of Deputies of British Jews in 1996, is the UK Jewish community’s response to the Government’s requirement that religious education be inspected under the framework set up by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). In 2007, the Pikuach report placed emphasis on learning about other faiths reflecting, the government agenda to address issues of social cohesion (Miller, 2007). Similarly, guidance can be sought from the Association of Muslim Schools on inspection services for those institutions based on an Islamic ethos (AMS-UK 2013).

Statistically, Muslim schools have been the most expanding faith-based group. Twenty years ago there were approximately 25 Muslim schools in the United Kingdom, some beginning as small groups taught in parents’ homes or above a mosque (Parker-Jenkins, 1995). There is huge diversity within Muslim schools in the UK based on sectarian, ethnic, linguistic, generational and socio-economic distinctions among Muslim school communities. They include mosque schools, supplementary schools, Madrassahs, community schools with a majority of Muslim pupils, Dar ul-Uloom schools and Muslim schools affiliated to the Association of Muslim Schools (AMSUK, 2013), and private/Independent and state-funded/voluntary-aided schools. (We highlight this point later in chapters 4 and 5). Today there are approximately 160 schools in this religious grouping, and they are mostly Sunni, which reflects the fact that only 10% of Muslim communities in Britain are Shia (AMSUK, 2013). Of the Muslim population in the UK, approximately 350,000 are of school age (ibid). Collectively, Muslim schools are part of the approximately 7,000 state funded faith-based schools in England, which include just under 5,000 Church of England and other Christian schools, 2053 Catholic, 38 Jewish, 11 Muslim, 4 Sikh and 1 Hindu, Seventh Day Adventist, Quaker and Greek Orthodox institutions; representing a third of all state funded schools (DfE, 2013). The obligation to teach the English National Curriculum (DfEE/QCA, 1999) only falls on those schools in receipt of public funding, but the majority of Jewish and Muslim schools incorporate aspects of the national framework into their curriculum (Parker-Jenkins and Glenn, 2011).
However, faith schools are inspired by various understandings of Islamic principles and have developed - since the immigration of the 1960s - increased dissatisfaction with community school provision (Walford, 2001; Hewer, 2001; Parker-Jenkins, 2002).

Both Jewish and Muslim school communities claim they are following in the steps of previous denominational groups, notably Anglican (Brown, 2003; Lankshear, 2001) and Catholic (Catholic Education Service, 1997; Hornsby-Smith, 2000), in wishing to have a school system permeated by faith. Yet Muslim schools have tended to be the group targeted for greatest criticism in trying to follow this denominational school tradition (Finney and Simpson, 2009), and accessing the public purse. In some cases they have been accused of teaching a “radical” Islam (Dawkins, 2001; Times Educational Supplement, 2001).

As we know from research into Catholic schools (O’Keefe, 1997; Catholic Education Service, 1999) and into Jewish schools (Short and Lenga, 2002), there are different levels of engagement with the wider community by faith schools and their self-exclusion can be constructed to demonstrate deliberate social isolation (O’Keefe, 1997), sometimes in the form of ethnic/religious defence (Husain and O’Brien, 1999). Both Catholic and Jewish school communities are vulnerable to prejudice and xenophobia not experienced by other denominational school communities in Britain today (Runnymede Trust 1992 and 2007, Community Security Trust 2013, Finney and Simpson 2009). Notwithstanding geographical, historical, and cultural differences, the parallel growth of both Jewish and Muslim schools in the United Kingdom highlights fundamental issues of community engagement and religious identity.

Currently, there are a wide range of faith schools receiving state funding, the majority of which are more correctly described as ‘voluntary controlled’ and ‘voluntary aided’, an important distinction, which we discussed earlier. There are also a variety of other types of schools: for example, academies and “foundation” schools that may or may not have religious sponsors and the remaining “community schools” that tend to be non-denominational (Education and Inspections Act, 2006). We should also make mention here of ‘foundation schools' and City Technology Colleges (CTCs): these are owned by trustees and may or may not have a religious ethos. (Edwards, Gewirtz, and Whitty) There is understandable confusion over the status of some CTCs where the sponsor is associated with a religious group. In this case, the institution is not deemed as a faith school, yet its sponsorship and importantly the composition of the governing body may reflect a religious tradition.

So far in our discussions we have traced the historical development of faith schools, the proposal for their expansion and the legal framework in which they operate. Supporters claim that it is not about privileging faith schools but about giving opportunities for new providers of education, especially in disadvantaged areas where schools are seen to be ‘failing’(as we will further discuss in the following chapter). Where there are existing independent faith schools, the government sees advantages in bringing them into the maintained sector.
Having provided a historical background to faith schools in England and Wales, discussion turns now to other national contexts, which will provide a useful comparison in order to understand faith school trends and the different degrees of school autonomy.

**Faith Schools in Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Netherlands and the Secular Tradition in France**

**Scotland**

Education in Scotland has been influenced by religious traditions in keeping with developments south of the border, predominantly those related to Protestantism and Catholicism. There are distinctions to be made between the Scottish variety of Catholic education and its counterparts in England and Wales, and Northern Ireland. The distinctive nature of this education system is according to Conroy (2001) a consequence of three important and interrelated features of Scottish history. The first is the religious history of Scotland and its impact on the evolution of educational provision. Secondly, the particular patterns of migration which affected Scotland, especially from the end of the 18th century through to the early part of the 20th century, and thirdly, the distinctive legal and legislative history of Scotland has been important in producing subtle differences in major Education Acts of the late 19th and 20th centuries.

There are claims that Catholic schools in Scotland are no longer relevant since most of the children in attendance are no longer practicing Catholics (Conroy, 2001). Bruce explores this debate, noting that allegiance to Catholic Christianity is allegedly dangerous to the good functioning of the state because it is divisive and anti-social. (The concerns, from Protestants, expressed in terms of Catholic education posing a threat to cohesion and the state are the very same as ones being expressed today regarding Muslim faith schools). Conversely, Conroy counters that in 21st-century Scotland, the health of a liberal society depends on the toleration and accommodation of difference. According to Conroy, the reason for antagonism against Catholics in Scotland is rooted in the continuing legacy of the bitter anti-Catholic sentiment evident in the country, which dates back to before the 1918 Act. The reason for this in part is the belief as stated above that Catholic schools employ discriminatory employment practices. Proponents counter this by arguing that they seek to employ teachers who can contribute to developing the ethos on which the school is founded, in keeping with other faith-based groups. They also, state Davis (1999), provide the possibility of alternative ways of constructing and making sense of the world. This resonates with arguments put forward for the establishment of other denominational schools in the UK in the 21st Century, for example Muslim, Hindu and Sikh institutions (Parker-Jenkins et al 2005). Furthermore,

It should be noted, that although there is one Jewish school, a small number of Episcopalian schools (McKinney, 2008) and attempts to establish a Muslim school (www.cs.stir.ac.uk), debates about the relevance of faith schooling are
predominantly focused on Catholic education which provides the main form of state-funded faith-based education in Scotland.

**Northern Ireland**

Northern Ireland has a long history of conflict based on a struggle between those who wish to see it remain part of the UK, mainly Protestants, and those who wish, predominantly Catholics, to have a united Ireland. The majority of people still live in single identity communities either Protestant or Catholic and 97% of Northern Irish population attends religion-specific schools (Church, Visser and Johnson, 2004; Gallagher, 1995).

When discussing faith schools, Northern Ireland is often singled out as a particular case to highlight the controversy associated with educating children in segregated institutions based on religious difference. General discussion about religion and education in liberal societies can be applied to Northern Ireland, but Wright (2003) suggests its particular political and cultural context demands that it be treated as a special case. Due to the intertwining of cultural, religious and political identities in Northern Ireland, debates about the role of religion in education have been strongly influenced by local and historical factors.

Historically, a national system of education at primary school level developed in Ireland in the 19th Century and initially, a multi-denominational system was envisaged but political unrest reflected the divergent interests of Protestants and Catholics with regard to their affiliation to the United Kingdom (Gallagher and Cairns, 2011; Cairns and Darby, 1995). A parallel religious school system eventually developed reflecting the political mood of the time. While the separate school system continued, various intervention strategies were planned and the 1990s was a time of government initiatives for promoting better community relations.

The essence of the debate concerns the right to a separate education in the pluralist society, against the role that separate schools are perceived to play in perpetuating division and sectarianism (Grace, 2003; Short, 2003; Gallagher, 2004; Berkeley, 2008). Supporters of faith schools argue that such schools are well placed to contribute to the common good because they can provide children with a moral and religious framework that engenders confidence in their own identity and helps them to be respectful of the beliefs and values of others (Halstead & McLaughlin, 2005).

In Northern Ireland, where more than 92% of Protestant and Catholic children are educated with co-religionists (Department of Education Northern Ireland, 2012), controversy over the role of a parallel education system in perpetuating division has been reignited by fears regarding the fragility of Northern Ireland’s peace process (Hayes and McAlister, 2009). Low-level community violence and increased polarisation in Northern Ireland have once more placed the spotlight on the separate school system. Against calls for more integrated schools
(Alliance Party, 2009) there are questions regarding the efficacy of community relations policy in education (Education and Training Inspectorate, 2009).

Netherlands

The socio-historical context surrounding the issue of faith schools in the Netherlands shares three crucial features with England. Firstly, both countries are essentially Protestant nations who discriminated against Catholics in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century. Secondly, in the Nineteenth Century both countries lifted the restrictions on the Catholic faith and granted Catholics full citizenship, a series of events that in both countries became known as the Catholic Emancipation. Thirdly, both countries acknowledge religious pluralism and share a tradition of state-supported faith schools (need to provide reference).

What makes the Netherlands different from England is the significant religious segregation that characterized Dutch society until well into the 1970s. This phenomenon, called Verzuiling (Pillerization), manifested itself not so much territorially as institutionally with each religious and non-religious group (Catholics, the two main branches of Protestantism, liberals and socialists) forming its own societies concerning almost every aspect of public life. Thus, from the end of the Nineteenth Century these groups began to establish their own schools, sport clubs, political parties and broadcasting corporations etc. This segmentation of society was greatly enhanced by the increasing political clout of the Catholics and the Gereformeerden, members of a strict branch of the Dutch Reformed Church comparable to the Free Presbyterians (Lijphart 1977). It was the alliance of these two groups that eventually managed to overcome liberal opposition to the idea of faith schools in the country being financed with public means. The revised constitution of 1917 marked the end of a century long Schoolstrijd or school battle between these opposing sides. It sealed the victory of the confessional forces with the famous Article 23, which guaranteed full public recognition and financial support for the establishment and maintenance of privately governed denominational schools based on religious or ideological principles (Vermeulen 2004). From this time, faith schools and those based on certain pedagogical principles, for example, Montessori ( ), Steiner ( ) and Jenaplan ( ), became fully state-funded, contrasting markedly with their equivalents in England which were only partly state-funded (Lankshear 2001).

Walford (2002) states that the reason for the establishment of new faith schools in the Netherlands is the perceived disjuncture between what parents wish to teach their children in the home, and the match with that at school. Currently, there are 7960 number of primary and secondary schools in the Netherlands which include 2408 public schools, and 4893 private schools (of these private schools 2303 are Protestant, 2322 are Catholic and 741 are other private education institutions) (Netherlands Central Bureau of statistics 2011).
The position of faith schools in France is related to its historical position towards secularism in public institutions. In 1789, the events of the Revolution led to the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, which weakened the power of the Catholic Church as much as other institutions of the Ancien Régime. (Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789), see Van Kly (1994)

The Church continued to play a key role in maintaining social stability and national loyalty in France during the 19th Century. However, an increase in hostility between the Church and State relations in France was brought to a head by legislation in 1905 (1905 Separation Act, see Gunn and Drake (2008)). The Separation Law signaled a change in direction and introduced a range of administrative and procedural measures which effectively entrenched Church-State separation and a desire for the separation of these two worlds. The principle of secularism in education was reaffirmed in the preamble to the 1946 French Constitution, later incorporated into the current 1958 Constitution:

'France is an indivisible, secular, democratic and social Republic. It shall guarantee equality before the law of all citizens without distinction according to origin, race or religion. It shall respect all beliefs. ((Bloemburg & Nijhuis, 1993; Roelsma-Somer, 2008; Teunissen 1990)In her discussion of faith schools in France Deer (2005) states that religion, atheism and agnosticism have played a central part in the political and intellectual shaping of the country. The educational reforms of the Third Republic at the end of the 19th Century informed the basis of the definition of state schooling in constitutional terms and also inform today's debates about education in France. After the First World War when the Republic became the established and accepted form of democratic government, 'the dichotomy between faith/private and secular/public schools became established'(see e.g. Secularism today: a progress report/National Consultative Commission on Human Rights, 2003.

Discussion of faith schools in France needs to be set within this historical context and the on-going debate over the role of religion and the operation of secularism and secular institutions in public life. More recently, there has been controversy surrounding the wearing of “hijab” or head covering by Muslim pupils. The ‘hijab’ has become associated with social policies of integration and assimilation, despite the fact that many of the Muslim girls concerned had been born or had grown up in France.

The position taken by the French government and public schools towards the wearing of the hijab states Jones, is not simply a reflection of anti-Muslim sentiment nor even a recently-devised attempt to target the Islamic headscarf. Rather, it represents a contemporary manifestation of an historical policy of secularism whose original purpose was to prevent religious and political ideologies and activities from influencing public school students and curricula. However, Muslims in France have argued that despite expressions of secularism, the Catholic Church has been privileged over other faith groups and the pattern continues (Deer). In broader debates around visual dress and faith, Jones notes that the 2004 law effectively redefined secularism in a narrower sense, restricting and penalizing students choices in relation to their clothing or manifestation of religious symbol which potentially conflicts
with the right to freedom of religious expression. In doing so, the law radically changed the previous legal regime, imposing an outright ban on the wearing of visible religious signs and eliminating the degree of judicial discretion and flexibility which administrative courts could exercise in assessing the circumstances of each case and reaching their decisions. As such, under the new legislation,

“Muslim girls wearing the headscarf may be expelled from school whether or not they have engaged in political or proselytizing activities, disrupted teaching or disturbed public order” (ibid.).

The original objective of the policy of laïcité in France was to prevent (religious) indoctrination and promote religious equality. It could be said that this original objective has been forgotten, resulting in an excessively strict application of laïcité and in a sense in a replacement of religious with secular dogmatism.

Identity and Schools
It has been argued that France particularly has been struggling with this manifestation of religious belief in the face of what is viewed predominantly as a secular school system (Nielson, 1995; Mookerjee, 2005; Hadden, 2006), and there has been a struggle to balance policies that protect secularism with policies that protect religious identities. The 2004 law (NEEDS REFERENCE) on secularism has changed the delicate judicial balance which French administrative courts, particularly the Conseil d'État, had worked to achieve throughout the 1990s. According to Jones, the law compromises rights which secularism and the Republic are supposed to uphold. This has significant implications for the doctrine of secularism in France and cultural and community values. As such, he maintains, the issue of wearing the 'hijab' can be judged negatively, as a suppression of the schoolgirl's right to manifest their religious beliefs by wearing the headscarf, or positively, as a protection of pluralism and secular cultural values. In France, these events constitute a modern day challenge for secularism, signaling that there are important questions to be asked about the nature of contemporary secularism in society and the place of religion and schooling.

Summary
This chapter has provided a brief overview of the establishment of faith schools in the UK, Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Netherlands and France. What these all share is a desire to maintain religious/cultural identity perpetuated through the institutional ethos which contributes to the raison d'être of the institution. A number of themes emerged including the allegation that faith-based education in a plural society allegedly leads to a fragmentation, and Northern Ireland is cited as a key example. This is countered by supporters of religiously affiliated education who argue that faith schools are not antithetical to a harmonious social order; in some cases, they can promote social cohesion and help pupils perform well academically. This is the 'bonding leading to bridging social capital' argument as presented by Putnam ( ). Lastly, the situation which prevails in France has traditionally been separation of church and state. Yet, the tradition of
secularization in the public domain is being challenged by religious groups who wish to manifest their faith at school and beyond.

Having provided an historical perspective in which to locate faith schools, we look next at two specific religious communities, those based on an Islamic and Jewish ethos, which were the focus of the research project underpinning this book discussed in the Introduction.
Chapter 2: Faith Schools and the Wider Community

As this book explores the role of Jewish and Muslim faith schools in both sustaining group identity and maintaining links with the wider community, addressing the on-going debate on faith schools and their effects on community cohesion is clearly relevant. The emergence of the community cohesion policy in the early 2000s has put this debate in the limelight, but the debate itself originates from the 19th Century when public education organised by the state started challenging the monopoly of the church. In exploring this debate, this chapter will first discuss and explore the empirical evidence for these main arguments before engaging with the policy trends from the 1990s onwards and their consequences for the controversy on faith schools. We will also explain in the subsequent sections how our study contributes to this debate and to the policies on integration and cohesion.

The debate on faith schools
The charges waged against faith schools in terms of their inability to promote social harmony are the same as the arguments that common school advocates use to further their cause. In brief, the latter hold that the common school, defined as a publicly funded non-religious institution, promotes an overarching identity and a culture of learning by maintaining a neutral ideology and by enrolling children from a wide variety of social, ethnic and religious backgrounds (Dewey, 1916; Feinberg, 1998; Pring, 2012). This ‘ideological neutrality’ is not understood as complete cultural relativism but as a school ethos founded on several core values including respect for diversity and equal treatment. This diverse intake is further argued to foster more encompassing identities and an engagement with wider social issues because the setting of the classroom is assumed to yield a harmony of aims, aspirations and knowledge across social and ethnic groups. In short, having a multicultural classroom provides pupils with a great ability to navigate different cultural and backgrounds. Ensuring that young people are constantly exposed to other beliefs and exercising restraint in promoting a particular ideology creates the space for independent enquiry and allows pupils to arrive at a deeper understanding of the social world. Together the qualities fostered by state funded schools are seen as essential in underpinning the cohesion of liberal democratic societies.

It is on these points of socialisation and student composition that the opponents of faith schools (e.g. Dawkins 2001; Toynbee 2001; British Humanist Association 2002) base their arguments. Faith schools are accused of practicing an all-encompassing (or ‘thick’) socialisation, or – to use a stronger term-indoctrination, in that they ask students to accept certain religious beliefs (as a totality of beliefs, values and prescriptions) as true and good (Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005). This can have the effect of numbing independent inquiry and promoting a narrow-minded outlook, which in turn could yield narrow sectarian
identities and intolerant attitudes towards people of other persuasions (Vogt 1997; Pring 2005; Brighouse, 2006; see also the discussion in Haydon 2009 and Everett 2012). In short, because of the socialisation they practice faith schools promote a divided society composed of citizens with intolerant views towards other groups.

Faith schools are also thought to be divisive through their intake. The argument is that by their very nature they are serving particular groups of children, and even if they do not select on the basis of faith this will inevitably lead to segregation along religious and ethnic lines (Conway, 2009). In other words, faith schools, by offering a “restricted non-common educational environment...that is precisely intended for a particular group within society and not for society as a whole” (Halstead and MacLaughlin, 2005: 63), are seen by opponents of faith schools to lead to “educational apartheid” (Herbert 2001: 11).

Indeed, it has been observed that Catholic, Muslim and Jewish schools in Britain have a particularly homogenous intake, and have resisted plans by the British government to reserve at least 25 per cent of places in state-maintained faith schools to children of all persuasions (Everett 2012). In 2008 one particular Jewish school attracted considerable attention when the school was taken to court by a parent claiming the school practiced racial discrimination in its admission policies (The Guardian 2009 – the JFS case will be discussed in more detail later in this book).

Aligned with ‘contact theory’, there is a notion that isolation breeds prejudice (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), the opponents of faith schools argue that this segregation, in turn, fuels inter-group hostility and undermines a sense of commonality. Richard Dawkins (2001), for instance, contends that faith schools have played an important role in sustaining the sectarian divide in Northern Ireland. In a similar sentiment a key report published by the Community Cohesion Review Team chaired by Ted Cantle (commonly known as the Cantle Report), while not referring explicitly to faith schools, sees the existence of separate institutions, as supporting an environment where different ethnic and religious groups lead ‘parallel lives’, as a key factor explaining the racial disturbances in the Northern English towns of Bradford, Burnley and Oldham in the Summer of 2001 (Community Cohesion Review Team 2001: 9).

Conversely, advocates of faith schools have criticised the claim that faith schools indoctrinate. McLaughlin (1996: 147; 2009), for instance, has argued that many forms of religious education conform to the tenets of liberal democracy because they are based on religions characterised by “openness with roots”. In his view this ensures that the schools serving these religions teach the ‘other’, encourage dialogue and thereby contribute to independent thinking and democratic citizenship.

At this point it is useful to introduce the typology of religious doctrine developed by Race and Hedges (2008: 17). According to these authors, religions and branches within a certain religion can be distinguished by their understanding of salvation. Those entertaining an “exclusivist” conception of salvation believe that access to paradise is restricted to members of the faith. This conception is often
associated with fundamentalist and intolerant sects. Respecting people of other faiths would, in this understanding of salvation, be unthinkable and immoral as it would imply “sentencing them to eternal damnation” (Everett 2012: 46). Others have an “inclusivist” understanding of salvation, meaning that the best way to salvation is through the faith in question, but paths through other faiths are possible as well if these are part of God’s plan. Finally, some faiths have a “pluralist” conception of salvation: one’s own faith is only one among many equally legitimate trajectories to salvation.

McLaughlin’s openness with roots religions can be said to fall within these last two categories. They refer to religions welcoming members of other faiths and encouraging their members to open up to and show a commitment to the wider society. According to Grace (2003: 152) the Catholic Church can be classified as inclusivist from the Vatican II reforms of the 1960s onwards, as these reforms have made the church “more open to debate and dialogue and to relations with the wider society”. Hick (1995) agrees and observes that the main Christian denominations in the UK today (the Church of England and the Catholic Church) can be considered inclusivist, serving the wider community and endorsing values which are compatible with liberal democracy. Indeed, a report commissioned by the Church of England observed that Anglican primary schools were doing as well as non-faith primary schools in reaching out to the wider community (Jesson 2009). Using Ofsted data, it also found Anglican secondary schools to actually outperform non-faith secondary schools in countering discrimination and in promoting community cohesion and equal opportunities. However, some Evangelical denominations, such as Pentecostalists, and some branches of Islam “are more likely to be found in the exclusivist category” (Everett 2012: 46), which raises the question whether faith schools serving these communities are capable of promoting independent inquiry, tolerant and inclusive attitudes and engagement with the wider society.

The claim that faith schools are by definition segregating has also been challenged. According to Bryk et al (1993) it is precisely the social justice mission of Vatican II which motivates Catholic schools in America to serve the wider community in metropolitan areas and thus to open their doors to people of all kinds of persuasions and socio-economic backgrounds. Expanding on this Grace (2003) concludes that contemporary Catholic schools in America stand out for their very diverse intake, socially, ethnically and religiously. Similarly, in England, Anglican schools have traditionally served the wider community and are known for their very diverse make-up in large urban centres (Everett 2012). Studies from the Netherlands also support the view that faith schools need not lead to educational apartheid. To the contrary, public secular schools are argued to be slightly more segregating as they mainly serve secular communities and are less appealing for ethnic minorities,(Karsten 1994; Dijkstra et al 2004). In the words of Dijkstra et al (2004: 71, 72):

“Still, many children of immigrant workers would prefer religious to public schools. This preference for religious schools is due in part to the greater openness of Catholic and Protestant schools to accommodating religious values, even those of religions other than their own, such as Islam.”
In a further critique of anti-faith school rhetoric Halstead and McLaughlin (2005) have questioned the assumed link between the promotion of a religious ethos in faith schools (i.e. ‘indoctrination’) and intolerance. They argue that a sound moral basis may well have to be in place for the ability to tolerate other religions:

"There is a sense, then, in which toleration presupposes being confident in one’s own beliefs and values and having a clear self-identity. Perhaps this is just as important as actually being educated alongside children from different faiths and worldviews, and this is something that faith schools are well placed to provide." (ibid. 70)

They further argue that the cultural relativism fostered in (some) common schools leaves children insecure and without a moral compass. By implication such schools would not be in a good position to foster tolerant attitudes and behaviour. Akhtar (1993: 43) similarly argues that separate faith schooling helps a minority experiencing a cultural threat to "gain the confidence and security it needs in the early days of its establishment". He postulates that this confidence, once attained, will then later on further the minority’s integration in the wider society.

It has also been noted that the proposed relation between segregation and prejudice – or, vice versa, the link between diversity and tolerance – is anything but a given. Kokkonen et al (2010) and Janmaat (2012), for instance, have highlighted the limited value of contact theory in its classical form proposed by Allport. Allport (1954) has argued that intercultural contact can only be assumed to lead to more intercultural understanding and overarching identities if it occurs on the basis of equality, is frequent, lasting and intensive, involves common experiences and objectives, and is closely monitored by a person in a position of authority. In diverse contexts where these conditions are not in place, cross-cultural interaction can actually yield opposite outcomes. Although the educational setting of the school meets many of these conditions, we cannot assume that culturally diverse schools will always generate higher levels of tolerance than ethnically homogenous schools. Indeed, examining the civic values of young people in England, Janmaat (2012) and Keating and Benton (2013) did not find a positive link between classroom ethnic diversity and inclusive views on immigrants.

In addition to these theoretical critiques, a number of studies have also assessed more empirical critiques by exploring whether faith schools lead to greater prejudice and inter-group hostility. As we see below, research comparing mainstream Christian faith schools to non-faith schools in western societies generally found either no difference or a difference in favour of the former. In the United States Greeley (1998) found that Catholic youth attending Catholic schools were not only less prejudiced than public school students, they were also less prejudiced than Catholic youth in public schools. Another example concerns the research by Elchardus and Kavadias (1999) in Flanders (Belgium) among students enrolled in public and Catholic schools. Holding social background and achievement constant, as Greeley did, they found no difference between students in Catholic and public schools in their attitudes towards ethnocentrism and authoritarianism. These findings in a sense should not surprise us in view of the aforementioned evidence about the value-thin socialisation taking place in most Christian faith schools in western societies.
Interestingly, some research in non-western contexts also found that faith schools need not necessarily engage in the promotion of exclusionist and intolerant sectarian identities, as argued by the opponents of faith schools. Exploring how schools engage with the issue of cross-sectarian social cohesion in Lebanon, Shuayb (2012), found that it was actually the non-faith public and private schools which shunned this issue and allowed no room for debate, primarily to maintain order and prevent conflict. In contrast, a number of private faith and secular schools addressed this issue comprehensively, as evidenced by their inclusive approach to student admissions and staff employment, extracurricular activities involving other faith groups and democratic practices inside the school. She further found that students across the schools with these varying approaches to social cohesion did not differ in terms of their trust in people from other religions. The students in the schools with a more comprehensive approach to social cohesion expressed higher levels of trust in cross-sectarian secular parties and lower trust in sectarian parties (ibid, p 149).

Yet, it would be premature to conclude that faith schools, whatever their type and location, are not divisive in any way. Very little is known, for instance, about minority faith schools (e.g. Jewish, Muslim and Hindu schools). The little research available yields ambivalent findings. In comparing two Catholic, one Evangelical, one Muslim and two non-faith schools in both the private and public sector in England, Everett (2012), found on the one hand no difference between levels of tolerance towards other religious and minority groups. On the other hand, she does note that in the Muslim school students were considerably more un-accepting of members of their own faith violating religious prescriptions. This, she argues, may well have been the product of the value-thick socialisation practices in the school (involving restrictions on a critical examination of the Qur'an) and of the perceived need to maintain intra-community cohesion in a wider secular society viewing the Muslim community with suspicion. She emphasizes, however, that her findings concern a unique case and cannot be generalised to all Muslim schools in Britain.

This book builds on this research by exploring in detail how a number of Jewish and Muslim faith schools are engaging with community cohesion. It will assess whether these schools have a segregating effect by looking at their admission and selection policies and will examine their school ethos and links with the wider community in order to determine the kind of socialisation these schools are offering. It is innovative in focussing not just on faith schools themselves but also on the response of the wider community and the ways this response contributes to or poses problems for the maintenance of minority religious identity and for interaction of the Jewish and Muslim faith schools with the outside world.

**Faith schools, integration and cohesion: whimsical British government policy**

What have been the policy trends of the last 15 years and how have these affected faith schools? What criticism have these policies evoked and how does
our study address the shortcomings identified? These are the questions this section seeks to answer.

The expansion of maintained faith schools, in particular for minority faiths, was politically cemented by the formation of a new Labour government in May 1997. Up until 1997 all maintained faith schools were Christian or Jewish (The Guardian 2001) but 15 years later there are also 11 Muslim, 4 Sikh, 1 Hindu school and 1 Greek Orthodox school (Inside Government, 2013a). Labour was keen to promote maintained faith schools as they were believed to improve educational standards and formed a key element of the government's efforts to expand parental choice. They were also a symbol of the discourse on multiculturalism prevailing in policy circles at the time. A key assumption of this discourse was that ethnic and religious minorities will only give their consent to the political institutions of the wider society on the basis of being appreciated and promoted by the state. The political integration of minority groups was thought to be achieved via a ‘detour’: they first need to be socialised in their own cultures before they can feel part of the receiving society (Berger, Galonska and Koopmans 2004: 492).

In addition to raising educational standards, parental choice and the recognition of minority faiths, the government was committed to combating exclusion, enhancing equal opportunities and fostering the social and political participation of all groups in society. As a result, the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) which obligated schools to promote racial equality and eliminate unlawful racial discrimination from their own practice, and made citizenship education statutory in secondary education. Citizenship education was expected to “equip young people with the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an effective role ... in the life of their schools, neighbourhoods, communities and wider society as active and global citizens” (ACT 2012).

The post 9/11 era led the Labour government to rethink its policies on multiculturalism and integration. In brief, the change reflected a shifting emphasis away from the recognition and appreciation of diversity to the promotion of unity, shared values and loyalty to British society, as captured in the new policy coined “community cohesion” (McGee 2005; Flint 2007). The new policy was largely informed by two influential reports, commonly known as the Cantle and Ouseley reports, which asserted that racial segregation and the institutions maintaining it provide a fertile breeding ground for racial hostility, crime and radicalisation (Independent Review Team 2001; Ouseley 2005). Unintentionally perhaps, these reports put the spotlight on minority faith schools, and particularly those serving the Muslim communities, as possible nurseries of separatism, extremism and fundamentalism. Indeed, in a controversial contribution, David Bell, the head of the school inspectorate for England and Wales (OFSTED), suggested that Muslim faith schools were taking insufficient action to socialise children in the norms and values of British society (The Guardian, 17 January 2005). The new focus on community cohesion also reinvigorated the debate on faith schools more generally by giving a greater voice to the opponents of faith schools. Sociologists such as Alibhai-Brown (2000) and Young (2003) added to the misgiving by associating faith schools

---

5 Cheong et al (2005: 2) even labelled it as “a return to assimilation”
with a dysfunctional and diffusive multiculturalism erecting group boundaries and reifying minority cultures.

To clarify what the government means by ‘community cohesion’ the Home Office (2001) defined it as:

“A shared sense of belonging based on common goals and core social values, respect for difference (ethnic, cultural and religious), and acceptance of the reciprocal rights and obligations of community members working together for the common good.”

As we can see, this definition - alongside the emphasis on common values and an overarching identity - still includes the phrase ‘respect for difference’ which is reminiscent of multiculturalism. A notable omission from “community cohesion” policies is that they do not address deprivation, inequality and exclusion. Upon receiving the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (COIC) report, which stated that “integration and cohesion policies cannot be a substitute for national policies to reduce deprivation and provide people with more opportunities” (COIC, 2007: 21), the government modified the definition to incorporate these notions. Thus in their ‘Guidance to Schools’, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), advised:

"By community cohesion, we mean working towards a society in which there is a common vision and sense of belonging by all communities; a society in which the diversity of people's backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and valued; a society in which similar life opportunities are available to all; and a society in which strong and positive relationships exist and continue to be developed in the workplace, in schools and in the wider community.” (DCSF 2007)

The 2006 Education and Inspections Act obliged all maintained schools to promote community cohesion from September 2007 onwards. Schools are free to fulfil this duty in ways they find most appropriate and the aforementioned document offers various strategies and examples of good practice (DCSF 2007). From September 2008 Ofsted started to inspect schools, using a given set of criteria to judge how well they performed this duty. We will discuss the concept of community cohesion further in Chapter 6 in order to advocate an alternative perspective, community engagement, which in our view represents a more neutral 'bottom up' approach in documenting a school's interaction with the wider community.

The new Conservative/Liberal-Democrat coalition government has not formally revoked the community cohesion policy but its continued support for it can be said to be lukewarm at best. According to Rowe et al (2011: 4) the government “signalled its preference for achieving the integration of British ethnic minority communities through the Big Society narrative rather than that of community cohesion”. The Big Society initiative - which in the words of PM David Cameron involves “taking power away from politicians and giving it to people” (Inside Government 2013b) - captures notions of autonomy, strong civil society, providing for oneself, and laissez faire. In contrast to the previous government it assigns only a minimal role to the state in promoting integration and social
cohesion. Hence, it comes as no surprise that the new Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, expressed his intention to:

“...sharply reduce the bureaucratic burden on schools, cutting away unnecessary duties, processes, guidance and requirements, so that schools are free to focus on doing what is right for the children and young people in their care.” (DfE, 2010: 9)

One of the victims of this drive to ‘clean up bureaucratic excess’ was community cohesion. As of 1 January 2012 Ofsted was no longer required to inspect schools on how well they performed this task (DfE, 2012). Given this relaxation, schools can significantly be expected to take promoting community cohesion less seriously. However, what the new government crucially shared with the community cohesion agenda was a commitment to common values and ‘Britishness’ and a rejection of ‘permissive’ multiculturalism. To underline its commitment to unity and security, it continued, for instance, the “Prevent” programme in a modified form (HM Government 2011). This programme was set up by the previous Labour government to combat extremism and the radicalisation of disadvantaged youth. It generated a widespread feeling in the Muslim community that they were identified as a "suspect population" and could therefore legitimately be spied upon (O’Toole et al 2012; Guardian 14 July 2010).

Although this short review of policies has shown how inconsistent government policy has been over the last 15 years, it has also identified one clear trend: the change from multiculturalism to the promotion of shared values and security as a means to enhance cohesion. It is precisely this shift, and the concurrent change from welcoming minority faith schools to viewing them with suspicion, that has attracted considerable criticism. Harrison (2004) and Flint (2007), for instance, warn that the emphasis on shared liberal values risks designating minority faith groups as the source of problems of cohesion and obscuring the role that ‘inequitable power structures’ play in sustaining alienation and division. Burnett (2004) takes this critique to another level by arguing that the community cohesion policy represents a deliberate move by the government to criminalise ethnic minority youth and to maintain white privilege. He notes that the Cantle report singularly focussed on isolated communities as the cause for the outbreak of the violence in the Summer of 2001 and consistently overlooked

“...the wealth of research documenting the discriminatory imposition of formal police powers upon certain Asian communities, the rising levels of unemployment and residential segregation within certain Asian communities and the intrusion of an increasingly insistent far-Right ideology.” (ibid, p. 10)

A bit further on he accuses the Home Office policy makers of “either ignoring or subverting [the] recommendations [of the Macpherson Report] on institutional racism” (ibid, p. 10). In other words, the riots of 2001, in his view, were not caused by rising fundamentalism among minority faith groups but by a combination of the dominant group trying to maintain racial hegemony and the subordinate groups of colour no longer accepting to be excluded and discriminated against. This notion of minority youth revolting against perceived injustice is echoed by Young (2003). Who also claims that second generation
immigrant youth, far from turning their backs on liberal values have internalised western ideas of equal treatment and social justice. In his view, the dissatisfaction amongst this group and the outbreak of violence in 2001 has a lot to do with

...the paradox that (...) as the second generation become culturally closer to the ‘host’ and their economic and political aspirations concur with the wider society, at that point, they face both cultural exclusion because of racism and prejudice and become aware of the limits of their economic opportunities in the deprived areas in which they often live (ibid p. 455).

Others would concur with the view that problems of community cohesion are driven by issues around social deprivation. A number of studies have found strong links between neighborhood socio-economic status (SES) and key indicators of cohesion, such as interpersonal trust, civic participation, and attitudes towards out-groups. The lower the neighborhood status, the more distrusting people are, the less they organise themselves and the more hostile they are towards out-groups (Li et al. 2005; Oliver and Mandelberg 2000; Ross et al. 2001, Letki 2008; Laurence 2011). Oliver and Mandelberg (2000: 576) explain this link by pointing out that low neighborhood SES is invariably accompanied by “petty crime, concentrated physical decay, and social disorder”, and that this in turn leads people exposed to these circumstances to develop feelings of anxiety, powerlessness, alienation from neighbours, and suspicion towards outsiders. They further observe that economic hardship triggers inter-group competition over scarce resources, which only contributes to a hostile posture towards out-groups. Letki’s (2008) study is interesting as it focussed on England and Wales and used data from the Home Office Citizenship Survey, a nationally representative survey including data from over 15,000 individuals and 839 neighbourhoods. This data was collected between March and October 2001, which was precisely at the time when the disturbances occurred in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham. Letki also finds that when ethnic diversity and neighbourhood SES are put together in one explanatory model only the latter shows a strong and significant link to various dimensions of social capital (neighbourhood attitudes, sociability, organizational involvement, individual help). In other words, it is socio-economic deprivation that yields community breakdown, not diversity. In Letki’s view, the reason why diversity is often put forward as the culprit of social ills is that it coincides with deprivation in many cases. This coincidence and the way that the media report on social troubles lead people to “racially code” offenders and welfare recipients and “result(s) in the perception of diversity as undesirable” (ibid. p. 121).

This concurrence of diversity and deprivation is precisely what characterised (and continues to mark) the environments where the disturbances erupted in July 2001. Oldham, Burnley and Bradford stand out as working class areas with particularly high unemployment levels in the Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities (Bagguley and Hussain 2008). Four of Oldham’s wards are in the 100 most deprived wards out of a total of the 8,400 wards in the UK as measured by the index of deprivation (Halsall 2012, p 82). The Cantle Report recognised this deprivation, noting the deep sense of disadvantage felt by some communities and the “far from equal opportunities with respect to housing, employment and education” (Independent Review Team, 2001, p. 11). Yet it
argued that the existing special arrangements and programmes aimed at tackling the needs of disadvantaged groups only reinforced a sense of grievance and thereby led to more division. It therefore called for a programme “busting myths”, bringing people together and fostering a greater sense of citizenship based on common values and principles (ibid. 11, 12). Others, however, have suggested a more cynical reason for the eagerness among policy makers to embrace the recommendations of the Cantle Report: focussing on citizens self-organisation and community cohesion as the medicine to overcome problems of cohesion provides ““an attractive (and cheaper?) alternative for tackling social exclusion and regeneration [than costly social programmes]” (Forrest and Kearns 2001: 2139). This reason might all the more apply in the current age of austerity. Whatever the reason for the readiness of policy makers to heed Cantle’s advice, the community cohesion policy, according to McGhee (2003), has marginalised earlier policy aimed at combating exclusion and deprivation, such as the aforementioned Race Relations Act.

In addition to scholars arguing that the real underlying cause of community breakdown is exclusion and deprivation, some question the assumption that separate institutions for different minority faith groups contribute to division. Grace (2003) and Flint (2007) point out that a similar charge of divisiveness was waged against Roman Catholic schools in the United States and Scotland in the early Twentieth Century. Regarding the latter, Flint quotes a committee of the Church of Scotland stating, in 1923, that these schools serving the poor Irish immigrant community would only divide Scotland racially, socially and ecclesiastically. Yet, this prediction has not materialized. From the moment Roman Catholic schools were integrated in the state sector in 1918, sectarian tensions have gradually diminished due to the success of these schools in eliminating the “historical educational disadvantage suffered by Catholics of Irish descent in Scotland” and thus in reducing educational inequalities with the protestant majority (ibid. 261). Grace (2003) has noted that very similar reservations have been expressed against Catholic schools in the US historically. Yet, as noted before, Catholic schools in the US have actually been found to be conducive for the common good, invalidating the critique that they are divisive. These historical precedents teach us to be cautious in accepting the dire consequences of minority faith schools as a given truth.

On the other hand, it would also be premature to assume that the historical experience of catholic schooling can be generalised to schools serving other religious minorities. We have already noted that reforms by Vatican II saw Roman Catholicism adopt a more inclusive understanding of salvation and consequently open up to the wider society. If minority faiths have inflexible and exclusivist notions of salvation, to which they cling tenaciously, faith schools serving these communities may well be divisive. According to Hurst (2010), another reason why the historical trajectory of Catholic schooling may well be unique is that Catholicism is supported by a hierarchical structure of authority, which other religions and denominations, such as Islam and Evangelical churches, lack. It is this central authority that urged parents to enroll their children in maintained Catholic faith schools “ensuring a seamless continuity for parents between home, school and church” (ibid. 96). In contrast, in the
decentralised world of Islam, there is no concerted effort to establish a network of maintained Muslim faith schools across the country. Rather, parents are expected to send their children to the local madrassa (the Mosque school) for religious socialisation. The effort is on ensuring that the non-Muslim maintained schools to which Muslim parents send their children will take the religious sensitivities of these children into account.

Jewish and Muslim faith schools, as the object of the current project, do share one crucial similarity with their Catholic predecessor: a sceptical if not sometimes outright hostile wider environment. The aforementioned studies on catholic schools have highlighted the resistance that such schools coped with in Scotland and the United States at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. Parker-Jenkins (2002) has noted the very same posture towards Muslim schools by showing the reluctance of the government, until the takeover by Labour in 1997, to grant Muslim schools a maintained status despite a considerable number of applications for such a status. Yet, the reception by the wider society is not just manifested at the policy level. It is expressed in many social domains, including the media, local institutions and civic society, and life on the street. Due to the dramatic events noted before, this attitude of the wider society has clearly deteriorated with regards to Muslims.

The current study therefore assesses the stance of the wider environment in all these domains and explores how Muslim and Jewish faith schools, in their turn, respond to this posture. This is particularly important in view of the possibility, suggested by Everett (2012), that a hostile posture of the wider environment, real or perceived, triggers a defensive reaction among minority groups, a reaction characterised by a strict maintenance of group cohesion and heavy policing of members internally. Malik (2005) notes the possibility that such hostility, e.g. Islamophobia, is even consciously constructed by the religious minority in order to perpetuate a siege mentality, cultivate a sense of victimhood or to quell legitimate criticism. A study of the response of Muslim and Jewish faith schools to (alleged) out-group hostility is all the more pertinent as to our knowledge none of the existing studies of Muslim and Jewish faith schools have addressed this issue head on. Everett (2012) surmised that external hostility might account for the tight in-group bonding of the students in the Muslim school in her sample (as expressed by their intolerance towards faith group members breaking the rules), but could not conclusively demonstrate this. Conducting ethnographic fieldwork in an independent Muslim girl school, Rizvi (2010) observed that the school consciously blended Islamic education with the national curriculum and sought to emphasize similarities with the latter rather than differences. She also noted the many links that the school maintained with the wider community through interfaith dialogues, visits to synagogues and churches, and community events such as campaigns and fund-raising events. The students attending the school were found to be of very different national and social backgrounds. Most interestingly, they displayed a remarkable sense of agency as expressed in their active involvement in creating and recreating their ‘British Muslim’ identities and in negotiating, choosing or abandoning what they perceive as ‘cultural’ rather than ‘religious’. These findings suggest that Muslim faith schools do not adopt a defensive in-ward looking posture characterised by a strong disciplining of faith group members in response to a (perceived) hostile
environment. Yet, as Rizvi readily admitted, the school she researched may well not be representative of other independent Muslim schools. It may be more difficult, also for researchers of Muslim backgrounds themselves, to get access to schools that are more isolationist in their curriculum and school practices.

In sum, neither historical nor contemporary research on faith schools serving minorities has found clear indications of such schools contributing to inter-group conflict. Nonetheless, we can conclude only tentatively that minority faith schools are not divisive as there is so little research examining the interaction of such schools with the wider environment. Existing research has also, by and large, ignored the posture of the wider society towards minority faith schools and the role that has played in fanning or diffusing tensions.

---

6 In this light it is worth mentioning that community of British Muslims can draw on some institutional support in its struggle against Islamophobia. The Islamic Human Rights Commission, for instance, has actively engaged with parents, community leaders and schools to combat faith-based hostility. One of its strategies has been the provision of information packs with specimen letters challenging prejudice and verbal abuse (Halstead 2005)
Chapter 3: Jewish Perspectives and conceptions of community

“Community values the ‘we’ as well as the I, it restores the dignity of agency and responsibility, and above all it tells us where to begin if we seek a better world. For some time I have felt the ever urgent need for a national conversation to seek a more effective interaction between our schools and families, governments and local communities-between our institutions and our local sources of moral energy “ (Sacks, 2000:15).

Jewish Concepts of Community

The Jewish education system in the United Kingdom can be traced back to the mid-17th century, when day schools were established along with synagogues; in 1855 the first Jewish day school received state funding (Miller, 2007).

Within Judaism, there are a number of different words for community each with a slightly nuanced meaning

- Kehila-
- Aida-
- Am-people
- An eruv is used to delineate space around a certain distance from a synagogue to a home to a  (used in Judaism as a religious boundary) Geographic space is important.

The evolution of communities, whether supported by the state or not, is relevant to our understanding of the way in which school communities outlines the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. How did teachers understand the term ‘community’ within a school? Reaching in or building a community where learning is paramount to driving successful students, is strengthened by ethos, heritage, and approach to knowledge. Accountability through an internal inspection called the Pikuach framework, aims to monitor and evaluate Jewish Schools.

Efforts to retain and enrich religious-cultural identity within Jewish school communities happen in a number of ways; inviting parents to be partners, shared decision-making, outreach work and linked activities. The internal efforts to creative a cohesive community is met with a vision and rules around how to engage outside of these school communities. The introduction of a statutory duty to promote community cohesion has been greeted with ambivalence by teachers. The Jewish community answers to the definitions and interpretations around ‘community’ through the position statement ‘Jewish schools and Cohesion’ (Date).

The importance of a this religious concept of kehilla-centered approach to school is seen as a reciprocal interaction between the individual and the people and settings in
which an individual finds him or herself within the course of daily activity. These developmental contexts are defined both on a micro level, i.e., individuals with whom and settings within which the individual interacts directly (e.g., a teacher in a classroom), and more broadly, as systems that include the individual, but with which he or she has no direct contact (e.g., the school governing board, parents of schools friends, etc.).

Families and communities are not institutions but schools are. To build an environment where learning flourishes the literature is clear that building social capital supports learning. School based strategies, to secure engagement in learning is one aspect that support building social capital within a school. The school community ‘reaches in’ - engages with parents, schools might have regular visits from outside the school to support and showcase the school. The dominant models of education in the UK focus on relationships (Desforges, 2003) in which students learn and Jewish schools are strongly built on notions of relationship.

This Chapter aims to:

- Overview of the history and development of Jewish faith-based education in the UK
- Concepts of community within Judaism
- Diversity within Jewish school communities in the UK
- Challenges and experiences of hostility

Changing Context

Francis and Robbins (2011) distinguish between three kinds of faith schools: (i) state-maintained schools, ‘traditional’ independent schools and ‘new’ independent schools. The provision of faith education through state-maintained schools was ascertained under the Education Act 1944. Faith schools under the Education Act 1944 account for a third of state-maintained primary schools and a tenth of state-maintained secondary schools (Francis and Robbins, 2011). ‘Traditional’ and ‘new’ independent schools, alternatively, developed directly out of religious communities by organisations and individual benefactors wishing to secure a religious connection. A handful of Jewish schools claimed voluntary-aided status at the time of the Education Act 1944, more recently a number of schools from other faiths have been added to this category (Francis and Robbins, 2011). Among the ‘new’ independent schools are those founded by the Islamic community, some of which are linked to the Association of Muslim Schools UK.

In a DCSF commissioned survey of 149 RE teachers in primarily CofE and Roman Catholic schools, Francis and Robbins (2011) sought to identify the influence of personal (age, sex and church attendance) and professional factors (years teaching,
CPD and qualifications) in shaping the attitudes and values of RE teaching. Using the five recognised aims of RE, defined as ‘understanding’, ‘values’, ‘community cohesion’, world religions’ and ‘nurture’, Francis and Robbins (2011) asked teachers to rate the importance of each item. The two aims that were rated most highly by teachers were ‘to promote understanding of religion’ and ‘to promote learning of world religions’. ‘Promoting community cohesion’ was only attributed the fourth most important aim.

“Overall, faith schools are concerned with enabling pupils to reflect on ultimate questions, to think critically about religion, and to understand the influence of religion in society, rather than shaping the religious and spiritual commitment of their pupils.” (P.231)

The study also found that (i) the main aims of RE promoted in the new faith schools are indistinguishable from those within the CofE schools and (ii) personal and professional factors are largely irrelevant in predicting teachers attitudes to RE. In both cases

Jewish schools in the United Kingdom tend to differentiate themselves through an added nomenclature, such as Liberal/Progressive, Modern Orthodox, Ultra Orthodox, or Zionist, depending on the communities’ interpretation of Jewish identity (Miller, 2001). Conversely, schools based on an Islamic ethos in the United Kingdom are normally identified under the collective term “Muslim School” although there is huge differentiation within them based on sectarian and cultural factors (Parker-Jenkins, Hartas, & Irving, 2005, Parker-Jenkins 2008). Elsewhere in Europe they are described as “Islamic schools” (Walford, 2001). Within the Muslim sample schools, selection was based on an Islamic ethos, which ranged from “orthodox” to more “liberal” in terms of interpretation of religious texts; all five were Sunni due to the absence of any based on a Shia tradition (Association of Muslim Schools, 2009).

Both primary and secondary numbers of Jewish schools have risen significantly over the past three years. The estimated number of Jewish students in the UK as of 2013.

| Maintained and Independent Faith Schools by Religious Character (as of May 2013) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                                               | Jewish Schools    | Muslim Schools    |
|                                                               | Primary       | Secondary |
| Voluntary Aided                                              | 27            | 6       |
| Academy Converters                                           | 3             | 4       |
| Free Schools                                                 | 3             | 1       |
| Free Schools (Proposed)                                      | 2             | 1       |
| Non-Maintained                                                | 1             | 1       |
| **Total Maintained**                                         | **47**        | **15**   |
Here we provide a brief description of the research (Parker-Jenkins and Glenn, 2008) which examines Jewish and Muslim conceptions of the concept of community.

Another significant shift has been the changed policy on Academies. Academies are attractive to faith based communities as there is more autonomy. A number of Jewish schools have either become, or are in the process of becoming Academies.

Experiences of hostility and evidence of Anti-Semitism
There is evidence of hostility towards students and a lack of acceptance by the wider community found in schools (Parker-Jenkins, Glenn 2008). Security for Jewish schools in the UK is taken very seriously and guided by the Community Security Trust (Community Security Trust, 2013) and with financial support from parents.

In terms of disengagement or self-segregation, there is a fear of assimilation (versus integration) into British society, and this is seen as one of the main factors preventing minority groups from integrating fully with the host society:

“…here we are a community; we are all together in the same situation, so it just builds up your self-esteem. Being in this society... you are not anything....here we are together...and we don’t have to face anything” (Muslim Girls’ Focus Group).

Significantly, we found that hostility from the wider community was experienced more by children, rather than adults who frequently dismissed or underplayed the issue. For example, a Jewish teacher in a Modern Orthodox Jewish primary school said:

“I don’t think many of the children come anti-Semitism their day to day lives. If it exists it is very subtle, too subtle for them to pick up on”.

Probing this point further, adults in the study would, however, list incidents of hostility, such as verbal abuse outside school. Some of the responses were more graphic, “you get the occasional comment …someone may say ’Dirty Jews’ or ‘Yid lid’. Similarly, male pupils reported hiding the name of their school on their blazer when on public transport because they were afraid of bullying and that they had received derogatory comments about their male circumcision. In this instance we are not talking about bullying: there needs to be differentiation between anti-Semitism and racism, which is different from common forms of bullying between children. There is a fine line here, but bullying with reference to circumcision is a specific attack on a person’s Jewishness, distinct from other types of bullying (EUMC, 2009).
Similarly, the wearing of the hijab is frequently associated with Muslims, and based on Islamic identity (EUMC, 2009: Runnymede Trust, 2007: CST, 2013).

One head teacher in our case-study schools was convinced of overt prejudice:

“There is lots of evidence of anti-Semitism in the wider society…. If I ask most of my parents do they have non-Jewish friends I would say at least 70% probably don’t have a single non-Jewish friend. A large number of our families associate within not a religious, but within an exclusively Jewish social community, all the people they see and most of the people they know are Jewish”. (Progressive-Liberal Primary Jewish School, Home Counties).

However, this lack of adult engagement may not entirely be due to overt prejudice but other issues, for example, choosing not to associate with people outside of the faith community or due to the limitations of geographical location.

Antisemitism is defined by leading scholars on the complexity of this area, as “a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews” (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, 2009:1). Julius (2010), the forthright expert on English Anti-semitism, argues that contemporary Anti-semitism has moved attacks on Jews. Since the late 1960s a new type of Anti-semitism has emerged which configures Anti-semitism with anti-Zionism and treats the State of Israel as an illegal Jewish enterprise (Julius, 2010). The blurred boundary between political and religious discrimination is highlighted by many authors.

“There is that other layer, that we are a Jewish school, and it is about doing it in a way which says we want school to be safe, we want the children to be safe but we are not scare mongering. We do have a security officer and we take it very seriously”. (Male head teacher, Modern Orthodox, London)

A parent governor noted on this issue:

“When it was set up as a Jewish school we were told we had to have security. Originally it was going to be done by parents but that was never going to happen. In the end it was suggested that the parents put in extra money in their voluntary contribution so that we have a paid hired security guard” (Jewish Liberal-Progressive, Primary School, Home Counties).

Asked whether this was as a result of any particular incidence she said, “No, because it a Jewish school and that is what Jewish schools do” (ibid).

Children were being targeted in a way that again appeared to be more than bullying between children, as we noted earlier in the chapter, and they may be affected by xenophobia, anti-Semitism, racism, and it may not always clear to the adult world what is going on. Instead it may be something that is just between children, sparked by their school uniforms, or an incident on the way to school. If children are being targeted in this specific way we need to consider how it may repeated in other ways, and how improving the context of learning might be addressed.

One head teacher of a Jewish school provided an explanation about the situation with reference to the wider community,
“This was a huge Council estate which was built after the war, and they had to house a lot of people, so they built a lot of new towns…it was filled with white working class people. Very National Front, very racist. …What we have got two communities living intermingled with each other that are very different. The way the Jews have dealt with it is by not mixing with their neighbours, so they don’t send their children to the local school round the corner. Two Jewish schools have opened in the area, and the Jewish don’t mix with their neighbours” (V.A.Modern Orthodox Jewish Primary School, London).

The issue of “self-segregation” (Denham, xxx) was pursued further:

“What I am saying is that we work very hard to have our children mix with their neighbours, but our parents have chosen very strongly not to have their children educated with them, so they choose this school, partly because of the Jewish vision, but the main reason the parents choose this school is because we have nice children here, they mix with other Jewish children”.

When clarifying whether that is a form of self exclusion, the head teacher of a Jewish school said

“Absolutely. They are aware of the fact that they can complain about the slightest thing here, which would be a nothing elsewhere.” (Progressive-Liberal, Home Counties)

Geographic space

Geographical space is also an important element to the Jewish concepts of community. Judaism is not a solitary religion and religious events depend on communities and space. The ‘eruv’ is used for religious purpose in people homes, and gives a sense of geographical proximity in which people can carry on the Sabbath. A certain distance around a community from the Synagogue is delineated by a physical boundary or rope or string. Which helps to define a boundary around a community.

Gender

Gender issues are signalled both Jewish and Muslim schools as part of the religious-cultural emphasis on separation of the sexes particularly after puberty. Gender is another distinct feature of Jewish communities. Male centered leadership is clearly predominating in Jewish communities. However, in Jewish schools there are more women in leadership roles. Furthermore, women are the main educators with the majority of teachers being female.

In the UK, the educational setting is deemed a central place where “community cohesion” should and can be developed. There has been a shift in the way we
understand hostility from minority groups and towards minority groups. Now discrimination and racial prejudice discourses take a more cultural overtone.

**Antisemitism**

‘Islamophobia’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ are different ontologies of racism and can be viewed as a visceral ‘animosity towards strangers’ that encompasses religious, racial and ethnic discrimination’ (Weller, 2011). They are both contemporary racisms, mutations of changing historical circumstances and the deep-seated psychological fear of difference (Werbner, 2012). Hostility is a real challenge to engagement and broader social cohesion. Children are more vulnerable than adults to incidents of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, yet little research or evidence uncovers this, incidents go unreported or stay between children and parents. This has implications for the way cohesion is to be understood and practiced in school communities.

Our study, (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2008) looked at how anti-Semitic and Islamophobic hostility surfaced towards Jewish and Muslim faith school communities and towards children. How does this bode for faith schools in the post-2001 era and contribute to the emerging debates around multiculturalism?

The experiences of Jewish school communities and the challenges they face which undermine or threaten efforts at greater community cohesion and engagement. Jewish school communities seek to maintain internal community coherence and protect against threats of identity erosion and other forms of hostility and xenophobia.

From this case study of schools, a number of key overlapping issues emerged which were layered and complex, and related to the experience of hostility, and challenges of security to keep themselves safe from the wider community.

The key areas of discussion highlight:

- Experiences of hostility and evidence of Anti-Semitism
- Community Protection and Safety
- **Adult and Children Experiences**

The historical development of Jewish and Muslim schools within the UK earlier in chapter 2; here we provide the rationale for the project that has informed discussion throughout this book. While the Jewish and Muslim groups have different cultural and historic roots, they are similar in that they both are minorities seeking to sustain cultural heritage in the face of assimilationist trends. Both communities often operate in a self-imposed form of “segregation,” creating a type of cultural enclave, frequently locally based, whilst engaging with the wider community on their own terms. The obligation to teach the British National Curriculum (DfEE/QCA, 1999) only falls on those schools in receipt of public funding, but many Muslim and Jewish schools incorporate aspects of the national framework into their curriculum (Parker-Jenkins, Hartas and Irving, 2005, Fallah 2012).
Sacks (2007) argues that multiculturalism emerged as a reality based on the large extent of migration towards Western countries from non-Western countries which in turn led to the idea of “one nation, one culture” (p. 35).

As in the USA (Larkin, 2007) and in Europe (The Independent, 2007), all schools in the UK have to be vigilant to potential attacks, and there is evidence of an increase in violence in British schools. However, Jewish and Muslim schools are particularly vulnerable to hostility that can be defined as anti-Semitism or Islamophobia (Runnymede Trust, 2008). This was evidenced in our research. For example, a female Muslim teacher working in a Girls’ Secondary School in the North of England stated:

Here there are many, many Sikh women that have been attacked because people assume they are Muslim. I don’t know what your religion is, but if you went out in this dress, people would assume that you are Muslim just because you have a headscarf on and they would have a go at you.

She added further with reference to community relations:

Certainly xenophobia has increased since 9/11…and here at the moment there are two issues, one is Palestine and Israel…and then there is Afghanistan, Iraq and America and so forth, and that is a separate issue. But it seems that they have joined the two together and they are using the word “terrorist” for everything and anything.

This was further illustrated with reference to the role of some sections of the media:

For example, if I go tonight and burn a shop and someone knew it was me, in the newspaper it would more than likely say a “Muslim terrorist.” If a non-Muslim, they would say it was an arson attack. Only last week there was a man who said he had a rucksack with a bomb in it, but he was white, so what the police did was shoot him with rubber bullets… this [other] guy was walking up and down and he looked like an Asian. If he had a beard and he actually said he had explosives in his bag. They would have used live bullets on him…that is Islamophobia.

Choice in dress may render individuals from religious groups vulnerable to hostility as described by this Muslim schoolgirl when she was wearing a hijab:

“…I was outside of [a Northern city] and we were coming back to [our city] and we were going past a pub, obviously I had my hijab on and I was sitting in the back of the car with my dad and it was summer so the windows were down, and they said ‘Aye Pakis go back home’, it was really offensive but we couldn’t exactly do anything, so my dad said just ignore it so we just went on … it is quite common” (Muslim Girls’ Secondary School, Northern England).

Modood (1998) advocates for differences to be recognised in the public domain as part of “ethnic assertiveness” and moving away from the discourse of cultural assimilation:

“Equality is not having to hide or apologize for one’s origins, family or community but expecting others to respect them and adapt public attitudes…so the heritage they represent is encouraged rather than contemptuously expected to wither away” (Modood, 1998: 213).
As such, the obligation or burden of change is not expected to be one way, and is echoed in the work of Finney Simpson (2009). Added to the backlash against the failure around benefits of diversity, Muslim schools and communities have become more exposed to public scrutiny (Werbner, 2009), and a perceived threat to social cohesion in Britain (Ahmad, 2011).

Respondents in the Muslim schools in our research noted the perception that some of the broader community feared them and they were seen as linked to extremism, radicalism and terrorism. By the broader community they generally meant people who were not Muslim. Interestingly, within both Jewish and Muslim school communities they also referred to members within the same broad religious group who shared very different views. For example, one Muslim school described itself as ‘Orthodox’ and acknowledged that other Muslim schools in the region distanced themselves and saw this institution as practicing a more rigid or ‘fundamental’ interpretation of Islamic principles which placed more restrictions on the curriculum and engaging with the non-Muslim community. Similarly, within both the Jewish and Muslim school communities there were differing opinions about each other: some sought assistance to support inter-faith dialogue for their pupils through linking with schools outside of their faith. This was partly informed by the legal obligation on schools at this time to demonstrate their role in promoting community cohesion under legislation at the time (Education and Inspections Act, 2006: DfES, 2007). Conversely, others chose not to associate with other religious schools, or those within their own faith, which they described as ‘too liberal’ or ‘too orthodox’ and instead focused on developing their own ethos.

Within our study there was no consistency in views surrounding hostility, many parents saying that it was inevitable that their children would face these issues in their lives. Importantly, we found that children were more vulnerable than adults to incidents of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism; a point we return to later in the chapter, and incidents went unreported or stayed between children and parents. Despite these omissions or differences in perception, we found evidence of mechanisms put in place within the school to ensure security and protection from the wider society.

From a Jewish school perspective, children’s experiences outside of the school community differed from that of adults. For example, one female head teacher stated:

“They may experience very basic things, like if they were on a bus or somewhere in town, from their peers or if they wanted to go to another school and because we have a special uniform they would stand out, and someone may have a go because they standout. We did have some experience of this when we were on the other site, because that was a white area and we had issues when they were outside going home”. (Jewish Liberal-Progressive Primary School, Home Counties).

Issues of safety impact on the experience of schooling for both Jewish and Muslim children, and these matters, rather than notions of religious identity, may underpin “choice,” in school. The perceived sense of insecurity that many parents feel has led them to choose religious schools as safe havens from racism (Parker-Jenkins, 2002, Hewer, 2001). For example, one non-Muslim teacher in a Muslim school discussed
taking her pupils on school visits: “since the bombings [2005] we have to take them in a minibus, before we may have caught the train... it’s a security thing.” Similarly, security for Jewish schools in the UK is taken very seriously, guided by an organisation called the “Community Security Trust” (CST, 2012), which respondents in our study frequently cited. One Jewish head teacher of a voluntary aided primary school in a remote part of the countryside said, “We take advice from CST as to how secure we should be,” explaining further:

“If you went to the school next door you have to press the buzzer and say who you are, you wouldn’t be faced with CCTV cameras. This is what we have been advised to do.... we have to be vigilant all of the time.”

We noted that before entering the school there was a security officer and three doors as part of the security, similar to arrangements we found in Muslim schools. When asked whether the level of security in the school was about anti-Semitism specifically, one head teacher said, “it is, but it is more so...we have to be vigilant all the time” (Progressive-Liberal Jewish Primary School). By being ‘vigilant all the time’, this suggested that they were prepared for hostility from any quarter and not just outside of their own group. However, the Community Security Trust (2013) which informed their security arrangements is an organisation which specifically monitors and advises on anti-Semitism the broad society.

We asked if this arrangement was a demand or expectation of parents:

“No, it is not that, you would find that in any Jewish school. Basically there is the CST, The Community Security Trust, and they are the central organisation for security in the United Kingdom and one of their people who works for them is responsible for all the Jewish schools, so we take advice and guidance from him as to how secure we should be.(Jewish Liberal-Progressive Primary School, Home Counties).

When asked whether the level of security in the school was about anti-Semitism specifically, she continued,

“It is, because it is more so. If you went to the school next door you have to press the buzzer and say who you are. You wouldn’t be faced with CCTV cameras. This is what we have been advised to do, most of... I would go as far to say all Jewish schools in this country have CCTV cameras, they may not be quite as sophisticated as what we have got but ...I think that there is a double message; we want the children to be safe regardless of it being a Jewish school and having people at the gate. I mean I get e-mails possibly 2 or 3 a month saying just beware that a child was approached or this person has come in to a school, this is from the authority not from CST, so we have to be vigilant all of the time.”

Adult and Children Experiences
For some of the children travelling by themselves outside of this “social community” there were negative experiences. Some teachers challenged whether these hostile incidents were in fact based on anti-Semitism/Islamophobia or on “normal” behaviour
among school children. Similarly, there was difference in opinion as to what constituted hostility or a security issue. For example, adults in the study would point to security as far as the safety of the school building was concerned, or people entering the property without security clearance, but not with the regard to the issue of verbal ‘bully’. Yet children reported having to deal with verbal abuse from outside their school and when they travelled on public transport.

For example, one Jewish teacher argued:

“I’m not surprised in the slightest that it does happen, but at the same time I wonder what these Jewish children on the buses are doing to wind other children up? I am Jewish and I’m all for Jewish people but at the same time they can’t be just sitting there quietly. I don’t believe they are. Confident Jewish kids think they are it. I am sure they do wind people up…Are they, Jewish kids sitting on the bus saying ‘you f’ing Christians’?” (Progressive-Liberal Primary Jewish School).

This view that bullying is standard behaviour “just between kids and their school uniform” may underplay the xenophobia experienced by children. From a Jewish perspective, a teacher in a Jewish voluntary aided Modern Orthodox Primary school said that pupils might have questions like, “sometimes to do with Israel or the problems in the Middle East”, asking “why are so many people against our tiny little country?” Probing as to whether anything had happened in their school community which was deliberately anti-Semitic in nature, she added

“You get the occasional comment made in the street perhaps; someone may say ‘Dirty Jews’ or ‘Yid Lid’. We report everything; we have to report every racist incident. Likewise we also take [into account] any racist comments within the school. Since I have been here there have only been two racist incidents with the children”

Asked whether this school was different and whether other schools were affected,

“I think it’s a lot more when they get to secondary school, when they are travelling to and from school on their own, when they are at the shopping mall on their own, here they go everywhere with their parents, or they go to play football that’s supervised. (ibid).

This was validated by children in the focus groups who experienced hostility outside of school once no longer in adult company. One female Jewish teacher said,

“Anti-Semitism, we don’t actually discuss it as such, we learn about the Holocaust, we are going to do a big project in it. We have Holocaust Memorial Day that’s a national thing. …I don’t think many of the children come across anti-Semitism in their day to day lives. If it exists it is very subtle, too subtle for them to pick up on” (Modern Orthodox Primary School, London).

However she added,

“It’s, being proactive rather than reactive and I think that is what is important about security. You can’t wait until something happens before you do
something…it is not a culture of fear it is just a recognised culture within Jewish schools all over”.

This contrasts with the experience of children in the same school who felt secure inside their school communities but vulnerable beyond the school gates. For example, we were told by one pupil in a focus group of an incident which happened to a family when they were home and their house was attacked in a “very, very Jewish area”. Similarly, the children reported their vulnerability when outside of school and travelling on buses. We took what some children said at face value when they told us they were afraid to show the name of their school, or let the school colours indicate which school they attended. A female teacher confirmed this with reference to her own generation:

“I have friends that went to big Jewish schools, but they all travelled down together, they were in a big group. They were probably a bit intimidating themselves. I think from a Christian or Jewish school, [I] don’t think it makes a difference” (Jewish Liberal-Progressive Primary School).

Pursuing this question of whether such incidents happen in all schools, she responded

“I think these things go on… if it wasn’t a Jewish school and it was a school for something else, they will find a reason, and other people will find a reason to fight their school’.

Tension between schools as normal was discussed with other community members, and the view was raised that the bullying that children reported may not necessarily be interpreted as anti-Semitic but just “standard stuff” going on between kids. A head teacher of primary school felt. “I don’t think that the kids really understand it, they don’t understand what anti-Semitism is at that age”. When we shared with her the fact that the children were being called ‘you f’ing Jew’, she said “yes, that is anti-Semitic”. Other comments these children received was ‘you have a circumcised penis’ which again suggests it was “deliberately anti-Semitic”. Where do you draw the line between what is “normal” bullying that happens between children? She stated:

“Are they using the fact that they are Jewish as a weak spot,… finding their weak spot? But what are the Jewish kids doing back, what are their weak spots? ..I’m just playing devil advocate…I remember what some of the Jewish friends used to be like on the bus and some of the things that I heard, and the language I heard”. (Jewish Liberal-Progressive Primary School, Home Counties)

This suggests that previous generations have received similar verbal abuse. Interestingly this teacher said “I haven’t felt any anti-Semitism…I leave here at 3 o’clock, so don’t really come across it”. The fact that she left in a car was a factor in her perception, and a distinguishing feature we found between adults and older children who travelled to and from school by public transport, and journeyed into town by themselves. For example, a parent reflected

“As far as my son is concerned, yes he does come home occasionally not from school but from other activities and he does mention the fact that he has been picked upon because he is Jewish, they ask him ‘are you Jewish?’ and he says
Incidents of anti-Semitism in the UK are categorized by the Community Security Trust (CST), which outlines some in Equality and Human Rights Commission (2011), the number of anti-Semitic incidents has fluctuated since 2000 (peaking in 2009), but the general trend has been upwards and the 2010 figure was the second highest recorded since 1984 (CST, 2011: 10). The Equality and Human Rights Commission (2011) highlights the persistence and dangers of anti-Semitism and outlines the complexity of these trends. We specifically look to how Jewish Schools contest and define practices around external threats. The Runnymede Commission report, ‘A Very Light Sleeper’, examined the persistence and dangers of anti-Semitism in the 1990s. Approaches to the relationships between anti-Semitism, anti-Judaism and more general understandings of discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity and/or of religion have been complex and sometimes contested.

Understanding Jewish denominations
The Board of Deputies categorises Jewish denominations according to synagogues affiliation (Graham & Vulkan, 2010):

**Strictly Orthodox** includes synagogues within the Charedi Jewish community (Graham & Vulkan, 2010). Charedi Judaism is the most theologically conservative form of Judaism and is strictly adherent to halacha (Jewish law). Halacha guides every aspect of a charedi lifestyle; from medical services to dress, educational systems to money and family life to diet.

**Central Orthodoxy** is a ‘modern and inclusive branch of Judaism, fully committed to the traditional practices of orthodoxy’ (United Synagogue, 2013). As a movement it converges the observance of Jewish law and values with the secular, modern world – ‘Torah im Derech Eretz’ (Torah with the way of the land”).

**Masorti Judaism** as a whole is traditional, but ritual and practices differ from one community to another, particularly in regards to women’s active participation in services (Masorti Judaism, 2013). Masorti Judaism validates a multifaceted approach to Jewish life, and aims to encourage inquiry and debate. Gemilut Hesed (kindness) and tzedakah (charity) are key values of the Masorti movement.

**Reform Judaism** is a living and evolving faith that conserves Jewish tradition whilst keeping an open, positive attitude to new insights and changing circumstances (Reform Judaism, 2013). Ritually Reform Judaism is egalitarian; men and women can sit together in the synagogue and women are included in a minyan. Modern ethics and values play a crucial role in Reform Judaism especially democracy, human rights and social liberalism.
Liberal Judaism was founded in the UK in the early part of the 20th century and is the sister movement of Reform Judaism in North America. It is a distinctly progressive movement that ‘affirms the dynamic, developing character of our Jewish religious tradition’ (Liberal Judaism, 2012). It is a fully egalitarian movement that stresses the inclusion and involvement of men and women in all aspects of Jewish life and ritual. Liberal Judaism places a strong emphasis on ethical conduct and sees Tikkun Olam (repairing the world) as a fundamental mission for all Liberal Jews. It primarily uses English in its services and uses organ music to create a more inclusive form of worship (Liberal Judaism, 2012).

Sephardi Jews are descended from Jews who lived in the Iberian Peninsula and still follow the customs and traditions of the region (Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, 2013) and as a result Sephardi Judaism is a distinct cultural tradition rather than a separate denomination.

Pluralist Jewish schools:

Jewish denominations and Schools
JCOSS as the first cross-denominational school. Most schools fit into central orthodoxy, even though the students do not. Some Jewish schools are linked to synagogues but most high performing Jewish schools

Teacher Quality
There is diversity within Jewish school communities in the UK, schools range in denominations orthodox, liberal/progressive and ethnic background Ashkenazi, and Sephardi cultural heritage, and supplementary schools such as Yeshivas and synagogue education, affiliation to the Jewish Educational Trust, National Jewish Agency. Community coherence and education continuation is a key aim of faith schools. Teachers play a role as role models, not just delivering information or pedagogical experts. Various efforts in the interfaith work often points to practices in education circles. Relate literature on school improvement and teacher quality within Jewish schools. The London School of Jewish Studies (LSJS) is becoming more involved (REFERENCE with web site) in teacher training and professional development. New professional networks and development opportunities for teachers and school support staff have emerged through the Institute of Professional Development for Jewish Schools (IPDJS) and via the Jewish Educators Network.

Why do Jewish Parents send their children to Jewish Schools?
The notion of ‘community’ plays a part in how school communities respond to this concern. The framework for how schools can incorporate activities promoting community cohesion into their curriculum incorporates the view that 21century skills are at the heart of ways to shape the skills that st
Cohesion within a faith is an important factor to ‘bridging and bonding’ (West-Burnham, et al, 2007) activities within schools in this instance as a head teacher of a modern Orthodox school explained:

“We are very conscious of thinking of the wider community on 3 levels; (i) the Jewish wider community…that includes Orthodox, Ultra Orthodox, Non-observant, Progressive, Liberal, (ii) a wider community, other faiths, and then (iii) a wider general community - English society in its multicultural mixed-up self.”

Within the Jewish schools, one teacher in a Liberal school reported that their engagement stretches from links to the local neighbourhood to the global “and everything in-between both Jewish and non-Jewish”. Similarly, a governor of a modern orthodox Jewish school said that they were involved in the community in every aspect and their children visited local churches. Visiting and connecting or twinning with different schools, particularly those of a different faith was an approach used by most of the schools in our study. The role of cheesed activities, seen to be community service, active citizenship and social cohesion are deeply important to schools as marked out in recent Pikuach (Jewish religious school inspection) reports (Miller, 2011).

Some Jewish schools expressed concerns that the duty for schools to evidence ‘community cohesion’ was difficult to implement from existing human and financial resources; some schools accessed external resources and a range of existing national programmes in order to help them comply with the duty. The experience of those schools that were inspected on the duty differed significantly. The fact that the duty was inspected for a period between 2008 and 2011 focused many teachers’ attention on this area of school life and many positive improvements in practice resulted.

Admission Policy
The UK Supreme Court ruling over Jewish Free School (JFS) (2010- double check exact ruling) admissions changed the Jewish school landscape. Applicants for most mainstream schools now need to provide a Certificate of Religious Practice (CRP). This has had the effect of bringing many people back in contact with synagogues at a time when the growth of Jewish schools was sometimes blamed for their absence. Disquiet with the JFS ruling coincided with the emergence of a new grouping, the National Association of Jewish Orthodox Schools, (NAJOS) (Website). The United Synagogue’s Agency for Jewish Education and MST (a centre for training strictly Orthodox teachers) both closed down. Leo Baeck College’s Centre for Jewish Education reduced its personnel and reviewed its involvement with schools. As a result NAJOS has established itself as a voice for many schools in the strictly Orthodox sector. Some have welcomed it as validating existing concerns and a stimulus to further activities, whilst others viewed the view the need to demonstrate the impact of their cohesion strategies as cumbersome. The introduction of a statutory duty to promote community cohesion has been greeted with ambivalence by some teachers. Some have welcomed it as validating existing concerns and a stimulus to further activities, whilst others viewed the need to demonstrate the impact of their cohesion strategies as challenging. The JFS Case rulings provides interesting new opportunities for schools and their local synagogues to work together. The CRP devised at the recommendation of the Chief Rabbi, for example, includes ‘Gemilut
Chasadim’ – involvement with community activities – as one of the criteria of entry requirements. A number of schools have developed very successful parent education programmes to help build bridges between classroom and home. This was an area that many SSIG members felt should be expanded and supported further. They recognised that a Jewish school’s remit goes far beyond teaching children during the school day (JLC, 2011).

Characteristics of Jewish Schools

Leadership
The headship of a Jewish school is now seen as an attractive career development choice. The changing nature of the role of headship (reference updated leadership info) has brought a change in outlook from both within and outside the school.

Curriculum
The five recognised aims of Religious Education, required by state funded schools in the UK (DfE, Reference), is defined as ‘understanding’, ‘values’, ‘community cohesion’, world religions’ and ‘nurture’, the schools responded to these aims in myriad ways. Prayer is completely gendered, the role of gender in Judaism and Islam is spate. The aims to inculcate and socialise children to community life, through prayer and learning is fundamental to Jewish life. Do these values cross over with the agenda set out by various definitions and programs around 21 century skills? Chapter 5 broadens our understanding of these skills.

Dress
In faith based schools clothing and prayer are fundamental to the way in which learning and teaching are carried out, religion is expressed through clothing. School uniforms often reflect this with religious symbols on school uniforms or kippah (head covering) for boys and often skirts for girls. This separation of gender is integral to a school ethos. A notion of space as gendered common in many faith and is imbued in the school ethos of some Jewish schools.

Text vs Source in Curriculum
Community within both Judaism and Islam is built around text (REFERENCE). This is unique to religious communities, a text is to religious communities as sources are to the secular world. Within both faiths, ‘sources’ are disembodied, atomistic, the power is from the content, whereas a ‘text’, is bound to a tradition and value is placed on who is saying and in what context it is recognized. This notion is related to community preservation, as community is preserved by its texts, not subservient to its sources. (REFERENCES)

School Ethos
A common misnomer (REFERENCE) is that faith is not ideological it is socialising. If the ethos around education is for wealth creation, training for work, pragmatic skills, is it pragmatic or ideological in purpose? Jackson argues for religious **philosophy** ( ) In many communities in Judaism, religious commitment is more important that intellectual content and rigour. Acculturation is argued by some to be more important
than the knowledge itself. (References). Are skills just about training? self-actualization?

**Indoctrination and education**

Every structure of society has values some are non negotiable, some are entirely personal, and some are half half, secular westerners has notions of Indoctrination that are non negotiable, such as underage sex. Some believe that we lost something, like modesty or self respect- what is throughout religious curriculum and school ethos that is non-neogotiable?

The rhetorical discussions around identity are too myriad for this book. What is notable to our analysis of group identity when discussing “Jewish community or “Muslim Community” is that we are problematizing the notion that there is group identities have singular meaning. Hopkins (2011:533) highlights faith identities (especially Muslim identities) are typically depicted as fixed or uniform, however a more discursive construction of identity underlines the view that religious identities are “sites of ongoing struggle and contestation”.

(Bald et al, 2010) report by The Policy Exchange claimed that the British education system is not equipped to deal with the challenges posed by the increasing vulnerability of Britain’s faith schools to extremist influences. Furthermore Britain is lagging behind other liberal European democracies in addressing these problems and advise the Department of Education and Ofsted could create a dedicated Due Diligence Unit into the Department of Education, those seeking to set up new schools should be assessed at each stage, a commitment to British values of democracy, tolerance and patriotism should be part of the ethos of every school and British history should be a compulsory part of the curriculum. The Policy Exchange expresses a concern that Faith schools do not promote the British values or tolerance of other cultures in their schools. This is seen to, on occasion; contribute to a failure to prepare pupils for life in modern Britain. Islamic-run institutions are seen to be particularly problematic and antithetical to the basic values of tolerance and secular democracy. Current legislation was drafted without particular reference to ideological challenges and as a result does not protect all schools from extremism. Maintained schools are protected under the Education Act 1996 sections 406-7 which prohibits ‘the pursuit of partisan political activity’. The report also raised concerns that young people educated in faith-based schools limit the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils. In *R v Secretary of State for Education and Science ex parte Talmud Torah Machzikei Hadass School Trust*, Mr Justice Woolf held that in this case education is deemed suitable if it equips a child for life within the community of which he is member not the way of life of the wider community as a whole. As long as it doesn’t limit the child’s options in later life if he chooses to adopt a different culture or way of living.

The spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils in 51 independent faith schools was surveyed in a 2009 Ofsted study. Whilst most schools were deemed “fit for purpose”, eight schools were found to be displaying teaching material biased
toward one group. In one Muslim school, inflammatory language was used to describe the situation in Palestine. Similarly, in a Jewish school, a pupil’s writing used strong language to describe the events in the Middle East. Ofsted found that some of the taqwa and ihsan published material contained incorrect and biased information about other religions. Based on these findings Ofsted recommend that the provision for citizenship needs to be more clearly defined in legislation. As a result a practitioner group was set up by DCSF and non-statutory guidance on ‘Improving the Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development of Pupils’ was produced.

Berkeley (2008) argues that faith schools are coming under greater scrutiny as they are being asked to play a larger role in the community and prepare pupils to be active citizens and effective participants in the labour market. Furthermore, the strategic direction of faith schools must strike a balance between cohesion, diversity and equality. Berkeley suggests a number of ways in which this could be done: (i) End selection on the basis of faith – Faith schools should be open to all citizens and must value all young people, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, (ii) RE should be part of the national curriculum – The provision of religious education beyond the faith in faith schools is inadequate and (iii) Faith should continue an important role in our education system – Faith schools should offer choice to parents and diversity in schooling as a way of improving standards. Berkeley (2008) highlights that although debate about faith schools are often characterized by discussion of Muslim schools, they are only 8 Muslim schools in the state-maintained sector. For Berkeley (2008) the debate surrounding faith schools places too much emphasis on parental choice while children’s views are virtually ignored. Berkeley goes on to stress that giving young people the opportunities to shape their own education is crucial in helping them develop the ability for critical thinking and self-determination.

In summary, this chapter has drawn on research (Parker-Jenkins, Glenn 2008) examining issues of hostility and security. The schools in this study were operating on a number of levels: religiously, culturally and academically in response to parental choice and expectations. Difference lay between primary and secondary schools in that as soon as children were able to travel by themselves to school they were more vulnerable to hostility from others in the form of bullying and anti-Semitic and Islamaphobic verbal assaults. Muslim girls reported being targeted by members of the wider community in the form of abuse due to physical appearance and wearing the ‘hijab’ and among Jewish students wearing a ‘kippah’. The research uncovered in both primary and secondary level very concerning incidents of bullying and name-calling outside of the school and within the pupils’ recreation time, such as when they are on the way from school and the temple or the mosque for prayer.

Experiences and challenges in this chapter were explored from an internal perspective for Muslim and Jewish schools, but there are also challenges for the wider community in recognising and accepting difference without it being a threat. Likewise there are challenges for government at local and national level to make policy more effective
and for faith school communities to feel welcomed by the wider community. This theme underpins the next chapter, which examines the concept of engagement and the skills needed to equip children to lead in the 21st Century.
Chapter 4: Muslim schools and concepts of community

“The walls are going up around many of our communities, and the bridges are crumbling….We know what follows then; crime, no-go areas and chronic cultural conflict.”

There has been a significant advance, through empirical work and analysis, in our understanding of Muslim communities in the UK, their members’ everyday practices, commitments, concerns and interests, and the nature and forms of their citizenship and social belongings. There is great diversity in Islam with regard to traditions, denominations, points of view and schools of thought. Within schools the explicit task of improving mutual trust and confidence in Britain, is part of the conversations being had among the stakeholders of school communities. The different models and methods employed for training faith educators and leaders in Islam in the UK point to new attempts to improve standards.

This chapter explores:

- Current state of Muslim faith education in the UK
- Concepts of community within Islam
- Diversity within Muslim schools
- Examples from schools
- ‘Hidden curriculum’ and school ethos
- Islamophobia and schools

Schools based on an Islamic ethos in the United Kingdom are identified under the collective term “Muslim School” although there is huge differentiation within them based on sectarian and cultural factors (Parker-Jenkins, Hartas and Irving, 2005, Parker-Jenkins 2008). Muslim schools are aligned with various maslaks (denominations), for example Deobandi and Barelvi, and include Shia schools. Within the Muslim sample schools (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2008), selection was based on an Islamic ethos, which ranged from “orthodox” to more “liberal” in terms of interpretation of religious texts, willingness to engage with the National Curriculum when not legally obliged to do so, (i.e. not in receipt of state funding; and being prepared to provide knowledge of faiths other than Islam). All five were Sunni due to the absence of access to those based on a Shia tradition at the time of the study.

Children in the Muslim schools were predominantly 2nd or 3rd generation British Muslims from a diversity of backgrounds: for example, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Middle Eastern.

Despite the common criticism that faith-based schools are ghettoised or operating in self-imposed self-segregation/isolation, there are a diversity of responses to ‘engagement’ shown in both the formal and informal curriculum. The cultural focus in the curriculum, also called the ‘hidden curriculum’, which is part of a schools’ raison d’etre, bridges the respective religious notions of what cohesion means by
exploring Islamic and Jewish concepts of citizenship for example. Our research documented, parents expressing interest in having more inter-faith events and setting their own boundaries within the home even when this conflicted with the boundaries set by the school. There was no consistency in views surrounding hostility; many said that is was inevitable that their children would face these issues in their lives.

We also found examples of good practice and possible ways forward that were provided from the schools in the form of Inter-school visits, Interfaith religious festivals, Charity donations, and volunteer work/visits within and beyond their own faith group. Some schools linked, internationally (some with a school that is not of their faith) and consortia of schools shared festival and theme-based activities.

Personal identity is the sense of self as an individual and as part of a group interdependently. This strongly comes out in the ethos of creating a shared identity within a school. It is hostility from the wider community that is the real threat to community engagement and one that has not been sufficiently recognised in the literature. If left unchecked it could produce the very response from faith schools that the critics of faith schools see them making – i.e. a defensive posture and self-segregation. There seemed to be one overarching theme emerging from the data, namely ‘fear’, whether unfounded or not. There was fear felt by parents about their children being bullied in state comprehensive schools because of their origin. Similarly, fear of moral permissiveness in these schools was cited particularly by respondents in the Muslim schools with reference to adolescent girls. Importantly, parents and teachers in both faith communities expressed concern about their children losing their religion and group identity if they were educated in non-faith schools. The case study did not involve “ultra-orthodox” Jewish schools or Muslim seminaries since access was not granted and from which different or alternative perspectives might have been obtained. We have therefore tried to be more nuanced in our overall evaluation of the faith schools in relation to community engagement and recognize the complexity and layers of meaning.

**Concepts of Community**

Identifying with the Ummah the Muslim community throughout the world (including Sunni and Shia) is an element of building internal concepts and practice of community. Although huge differences exist among Muslims, the concept of one “community” or “ummah”, (Hulmes 1989:32) is one that is paramount. Within Islam the concept of the ‘ummah’ whereby differences in ‘customs and conventions of different region’s give way to the importance of unity and shared practice (Ashraf, 1993:3). The preservation and health of the ummah is considered an important aspect of the faith (Hulmes and Sarwar, 1992). As such, Muslim families may perceive their life predominantly within this concept of community, rather than as an independent family or a non-Islamic community.

Diversity within the UK Muslim schools is often overlooked. There are multiple dialects and ethnic backgrounds, nationalisits in one school, that reflect the sectarian, ethnic, linguistic, socio-economic distinctions among Muslim school communities.
The range of types of schools is also relevant, beyond voluntary aided or academy etc. mosque schools, supplementary schools, Madrasahs, community schools with a majority of Muslim pupils, Dar ul-Uloom schools and Muslim schools affiliated to the Association for Muslim.

Faith schools established on Islamic principles have developed since the immigration of the 1960s and the increased dissatisfaction with community school provision that resulted (Walford, 2001; Hewer, 2001; Parker-Jenkins, 1995, 2002; Hewitt, Brownhill and Sanders, 2007). As noted earlier in chapter 3, schools for “the masses” in Britain, as elsewhere, were established by the clergy due to government reluctance to ensure educational provision, and this tradition of denominational funding of schools has been continued more recently by Muslim, Sikh and Hindu schools (DCSF, 2012).

The needs of Muslim students include proximity to family, access to religious education, high level of resources which are adapted to Muslim ethos.

The case studies explored and the extent to which these are being met and

- experience of discrimination;
- attitudes to extremism
- levels of mixing between Muslim students and other students; and
- levels of cohesion imbued in curriculum, school ethos, for example the extent to which students perceive their institution to be one where students from different backgrounds get on well together.

School Governance
The choice of schooling for sustaining cultural identity, which was a key theme we pursued with members of Muslim schools. Haw (2009) cautions about, “the potential hazards of creating resistant identities” (p.376). In the debates around multiculturalism, Muslims and Muslim communities, in particular, have been singled out for criticism. Baroness Valerie Amos announced when launching the Labour party’s debate on community cohesion in 2006, that there were in the UK “suicide bombers with Yorkshire accents” (Labour Party Conference, September 26, 2006). She added that “Our challenge is to engage with and encourage the debate within the Muslim community” (ibid).(Finney & Simpson, 2009)) maintain that “she clearly signaled that the community cohesion agenda extends into national security” (p.108).

In a clear nod to Muslim schools the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills further noted that:

“Extreme violence in the name of Islam’ is more likely to be adopted by Muslims who live, study and socialize with other Muslims in isolation from the mainstream” (DIUS, 2008?).

The community cohesion agenda was followed by a new counter-terrorism strategy mapping regions across the country “for its potential to produce extremists and supporters for al-Qaida” (Dodd, 2008). Finney and Simpson (2009) dispute this myth, arguing that:
‘Muslims are not more likely to be charged with terrorism if they live in the areas of Muslim concentrations rather than in any other area of Britain” (p.189).

**Gender**

Islamic values of purdah (protecting Muslim women from contact with men from outside their family) are related to izzet (family honour) which some Muslims see as being borne by female family members (Peach, 2005).

This was a shared concern within Muslim school communities but the issue of gender was also an important consideration. In some cases the school was chosen because it could be relied upon to provide a high level of security, especially where female pupils were concerned. This was due to the need “to keep a safe environment; all females safe and secure. If you get one of the prospectuses you will see that it is all female education within a secure environment” (female head teacher Independent Muslim Girls’ Secondary School, Midlands). This extended to the employment of staff: “whenever an advert goes in the paper [it] always states that it is a genuine reason why it is only women applicants (ibid). Keeping girls safe outside of school also involved issues of safety as captured by this comment

“The head of science took a group out last summer and she waited until all the other schools went on holiday and she took a residential group. In the past we went down to London to see a play but because of the bombing, (we went a week before the bombings), the Governors have put a stop to that.” (ibid)

Further, “since the bombings [2005] we have had to take them in a minibus where before we may have caught the train” (ibid). When asked about the kind of security issues they might be afraid of, this Muslim head teacher reported “I think that is it looking at people who are obviously Islamic and maybe being, … suspicion”. We wanted to know if the chaperoning was because of Islamophobic fears or because they were girls, to which she responded,

“Possibly both, I think it might be a bit strong Islamophobic, but it could be, it’s just a security thing, you have to have a certain amount of teachers to students” (ibid).

This is in keeping with government guidelines for all schools (DfE), but we think a higher level of care was being emphasised in the Muslim schools regarding the female pupils. For example, “our literacy co-ordinators were all male and I did say at a meeting that they can’t come into the school” and if Ofsted inspectors visited the school, men were not welcome: “when we had an Ofsted [inspection] 3 years ago it was all women” (ibid).

“Those people who have tried to become part of the community have been rejected...,at the moment we don’t think we have been accepted by the majority of the community because we are always being undermined and if you are being undermined you have to associate with something else”. (Female teacher, Muslim primary school).
Leadership
Muslim Faith Leadership in the literature refers to both religious leaders and school leaders. The training and development of school leaders in particular is evolving in accreditation, leadership and

Accreditation Models and Standards of Teaching Practice
At present, the religious education provided in Muslim institutions for the 11–19 age range is not accredited outside Muslim communities. Some of the strongest evidence pointing to successful schooling is the quality of teaching and quality of leadership. The development of teaching standards and leadership standards has shown a strong commitment to wider conversation and debates around National Standards and faith based schooling within them in particular.

“The example of Muhammad in Makkah where he and his companions ‘lived as a distinct community with their own identity and pursued their own agenda. They would interact with Makkan society, but never integrated in to it. Our policy must be the same: yes to interaction, no to integration. To do this requires Muslims to establish an independent political and economic infrastructure’ (Hopkins & Kahani-Hopkins, 2004: 351).

Strength in minority status
The constructed and contested nature of Muslim identity and religious activity are linked to the way we understand production of relationships and views towards social capital. There are currently 55 schools confirmed to be in the inspection remit of The Bridge Schools Inspectorate. The schools are evangelical Christian or Muslim schools, serving faith communities, which provide a distinctive religious curriculum alongside secular studies.

Identity and School
The manifestation of religious identity in the form of increased wearing of the “hijab” can be understood in the context of an increase in resistance. Muhammad Abdul Kalam, spokesperson for the Muslim Safety Forum, commented that they were ‘very much concerned that Jack Straw’s comments will be picked up by elements of the community who want to spread Islamophobia’ (The Muslim News, 2006). Many Muslim and Jewish parents living

7 “Muslim faith leaders was chosen in preference to the term imams. The term imam has different meanings and implications in Shia and Sunni Islam, and in Sunni Islam most Muslim faith leaders known as imams are based full-time or part-time at a mosque. Faith leadership is exercised not only at mosques by people known as imams, however, but also at schools, universities, courses and conferences, and in youth settings, and by a wide range of religious scholars (alims and alimahs), teachers, instructors, youth workers, chaplains, writers and opinion leaders, including many women. To focus only on imams would be to miss the important leadership roles exercised by many others. The term Muslim faith leaders is substantially more inclusive”. (Communities and Local Government, 2010:10)
in the UK say they feel resigned to their children facing discrimination as they grow up.

In our research, ‘the hijab’ was often cited by Muslim girls as being the focus of attention attracting negative comments from the wider community.

“The point here is not that there is debate about diverse practices but that minorities, and particularly Muslims, are singled out as having behaviours potentially undesirable for British society, and that the responsibility for ensuring they ‘fit in’ lies with the minorities themselves” (p.95).

In broader debates around visual dress and faith in France, Jones notes that the 2004 law effectively redefined secularism in a narrower sense, restricting and penalizing students choices in relation to their clothing or manifestation of religious symbol which potentially conflicts with the right to freedom of religious expression. In doing so, the law radically changed the previous legal regime, imposing an outright ban on the wearing of visible religious signs and eliminating the degree of judicial discretion and flexibility which administrative courts could exercise in assessing the circumstances of each case and reaching their decisions. As such, under the new legislation,

“Muslim girls wearing the headscarf may be expelled from school whether or not they have engaged in political or proselytizing activities, disrupted teaching or disturbed public order” (ibid.).

The original objective of the policy of laïcité in France was to prevent (religious) indoctrination and promote religious equality. It could be said that this original objective has been forgotten, resulting in an excessively strict application of laicite and in a sense in a replacement of religious with secular dogmatism.

A Muslim student in the UK might later in university, experience more mixing and cohesion but as (Gilby et al. 2011) suggests, many Muslim students have friends who are not Muslim, some barriers to further mixing exist on University campuses, for example the focus of many student socializing activities is around alcohol, and Muslim students tend to study only a certain range of subjects.

Islamophobia and challenges to cohesion
Muir and Smith (2004) suggest that it is more apt to speak of ‘islamophobias’ rather than a single phenomenon. In the same sentiment Maussen (2006, as cited by Allen, 2007) stated that the term 'Islamophobia' groups together different forms of discourse, speech and acts, by suggesting that they all emanate from an identical ideological core, which is an “irrational fear” (a phobia) of Islam” (Allen, 2007). There is still a distinct lack of clarity around defining and Islamophobia (Allen, 2010). As a result, the original definition coined by the Runnymede Trust is used for the purpose of this book. We understand the concept of “Islamophobia” as “unfounded hostility towards Islam, and therefore, fear or dislike of all or most Muslims” (Runnymede Trust, 1997:1, Runnymede Trust 2007).
Weller (2011) finds that most normative definitions of Islamophobia are limited in their scope and fail to take into account the dimensions of hostility that the term denotes. Islamophobia can be both a subjective and objective term and must take into account the nuanced differences between religious, racial and ethnic discrimination. The tendency to reduce these differences to mere semantics has caused uneasiness with the discourse surrounding Islamophobia. To better explain these numerous dimensions of hostility, Weller (2011) uses the German term Fremdenfeindlichkeit (which roughly translates as ‘animosity towards strangers’). Fremdenfeindlichkeit reflects a visceral animosity that is rooted in history, culture and consciousness.

Hostility towards faith schools, in particular, thwart efforts to develop relationships, build trust, and encourage activities that increase engagement and a community of learning. In one school, the principal of an independent Muslim Primary School in the Midlands argued:

“Kids have to live and work in a society which they have to know something about. Just celebrating each other’s festivals is a very facile approach—it doesn’t teach respect. The kids who throw stones at me or spit at me in the street have been through a multicultural education and probably their parents have—you could say the educational system has failed them”.

The issues of hostility and security are linked in informing how the school communities saw themselves and responded in keeping safe from the wider community. Safeguarding the faith school community concerned: levels of security within the schools as we highlighted earlier; employing security officers, installing CCTV cameras inside and outside the school, maintaining parental involvement, and extending concern to E-security via ICT. Some authors contend that legislation protecting Muslims from discrimination in the workplace lags behind that of other groups (c.f. Modood, 2005a; Anwar, 2005).

**Protection and Safety**

Feelings of safety from the ‘outside’ community/ies concern all schools, but for the schools in our study their experiences mean they are obliged to take this very seriously. It is not the case, however, that only Jewish and Muslim schools may be vulnerable as examined in the work of Weller (2012), but we were particularly interested in those based on a Jewish and Islamic ethos. As highlighted earlier in this chapter, one of the things we wanted to discover was how Jewish and Muslim schools deal with anti-Semitism and Islamaphobia. It was difficult to get an exact sense of this. For example, some of the Muslim girls in our case study schools said they were used to being called a ‘Paki’ when they went to town, and they did not immediately separate their religious and ethnic identity. A number of writers such as Shain (2011) and (Divine 200) have highlighted the significance of ‘race’, ethnicity and identity in school children and the negative treatment they have experienced. School management in our study saw the issue in terms of protecting community members:

“We actually are responsible for developing a procedure for dealing with these issues. One within the Council, ....You have seen me, someone who
is different, and we say that this [hostility] is not acceptable and we have got procedures to deal with it. If it is directed to me I have to report it to my manager and they have to take action, if you can take action (School Governor, Muslim Secondary School, North of England).

When asked if they felt there was a sense of “strength in numbers” which provides protection, one female teacher working in a Muslim Orthodox independent primary school in the Midlands explained as follows:

“It depends on what area you are, if you were in this area then yes. If you moved away slightly, you are in a minority, if you were in town for example and you were shopping and people see you alone then people will have a go at you”.

In terms of whether this was associated with perceptions of terrorism, she contended that the hostility was related to a number of issues such as anti-Muslims fears since 9/11. It is noteworthy that associated with hostility from the outside community, was a perception of lack of acceptance, particularly among Muslim respondents. One female teacher in a Midlands independent Muslim primary school commented:

“Muslims feel under quite a lot of pressure...say today news come on and there is an explosion on a bus in London....it could be a petrol tank exploded but it seems that the fault only lies with Muslims and it doesn’t lie with anything else, we are the cause for everything.”

In addition, in terms of acceptance by the wider community,

“I have been here 34 years....those people who have tried to become part of the community have been rejected.....at the moment we don’t think we have been accepted by the majority of the community because we are always being undermined, and if you are being undermined you have to associate with something else.”

This view is reflected in the work of Modood (2005) in terms of a lack of belonging expressed by immigrants despite long-term residency in the UK. It may also be that there is pressure on minority groups to integrate which may also cause people to affiliate with their ethnic group. However, we believe that it is this perception and experience of being unwelcome rather than of attachment to their country of origin, that diminishes a sense of belonging in British society. For both Jews and Muslims, family ties and the presence of people with similar ethnic or religious backgrounds were seen as an important reason for moving to and valuing the locality in which they lived and from which they chose the school. Research shows that both migrants and established Muslim residents stated that they derived a sense of security from the presence of people sharing their religion, ethnicity or country of origin in their locality (Jayaweera and Choudhury, 2008).

The disproportionate attention that faith schools receive regarding cohesion is frequently grounded in a lack of knowledge of what takes place in these schools. As all state funded schools were obliged to demonstrate “community cohesion” in 2008, there was a need for embedding “community cohesion” into the policy
framework. However, as this critique of “community cohesion” suggests there is also a need to challenge policy and previous initiatives (Troya and Carrington, 1990; Gillborn, 1995; Gilroy, 1987).

From the pupil focus groups we heard of many examples of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia from the wider community and that alternatively, their school was a safe haven. For example, Muslim girls said that outside school they had their hijabs or head scarves pulled off accompanied by shouting like, “you f’ing Muslim.” This generated a sense of a “them-and-us” culture, and safety rested within the school and the community.
Chapter 5: Skills for Engagement

'We need...the first truly global generation; a generation of individuals rooted in their own cultures but open to the world and confident of their ability to shape it'

(Barber, et al., 2012:10)

Introduction
So far we have looked at the antagonism from the wider community experienced by some faith schools in Britain due to perceptions of self-segregation. We will now address what schools can do practically to promote positive relations both within British society and globally. Importantly, we look here at what all schools can do rather than assuming that responsibility rests only or predominantly with faith schools. We propose here, an alternative framework for engagement that schools can utilise, building on what they have already achieved and on additional strategies.

In this chapter we explore ‘community engagement.’ We define the term ‘engagement’ as the practice of mixing and working with and alongside others, for example family members, others schools, police force, etc. This can extend to the ability or willingness of different communities to live alongside and with other communities. By identifying and employing different levels of community engagement and providing a framework for it, schools can affirm and support an environment of ‘reaching out’ which goes beyond ‘tokenism’ and provides a true 21st century pedagogy. This chapter reflects the emphasis placed in building a 21st century schools system on schools being at the heart of their local communities (DCSF 2009a). To accomplish this, we look to other models which can help prepare children with 21 century skills and highlight implications for policy and practice in schools.

Towards Community Engagement
The literature supports the assertion that in order to effectively provide 21st century learning skills, a school should be permeable and able to learn and improve through full engagement with the local community: It is with this permeability that the interior community ethos of a school can effectively promote engagement which in turn facilitates the acquisition of 21st Century skills.

Our model of engagement extends to all stakeholders and is best operationalised at a number of levels within and beyond the faith grouping. As Farrar and Otero state:

“Guiding learning in the community, when the goals of equity, wellness and achievement are of equal importance, requires that all stakeholders build relationships with each other that increase educational opportunity and success, first for children and youths and then for all members of the community” (Farrar and Otero, 2007: 60)
Schools, and especially faith schools belong to communities – they do not stand alone. In an atmosphere of trust schools can be seen and view themselves as public spaces. This will encourage connection and in turn promote engagement and interaction within and beyond the schools. Schools must engage in order to help young people achieve their full potential as adults and to develop a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, in addition to this proposed model of ‘community engagement’ we also look at other models that schools could consider in preparing children for life in the 21st Century.

First however, we must consider and summarize why community engagement is important at all, Furbey et al. (2006) argue that engagement: (i) permits the sharing of people's associations with one another; (ii) provides a supportive context for relationships and associations; (iii) inspires trust and confidence; and (iv) creates a context in which schools can act developmentally and strategically. More simply put, community engagement permits faith communities, and by extension faith schools, to act as hubs for bringing people together engendering trust thereby. In the next sections, we will examine how trust relates to community engagement and provide a proposed framework for the conceptualization of it in the context of 21st Century Learning.

The Role of Trust
Trust is both a cause and consequence of community engagement. When networks are maintained and people develop a common understanding, trust emerges. Trust is nurtured through relationships, through information and through knowledge. The ‘Trust’ loop looks something like this:

- Schools gather information about their local community: the history, geography, key socio-economic factors.
- That information is then turned into knowledge and understanding: that is an appreciation of the challenges, riches and complexities of daily life.
- Knowledge and understanding become the bedrock for building mutuality – a shared affinity and allegiance between schools and communities about the education needs of young people.

A study of the practices of community cohesion in UK schools, challenged the assumption that little engagement is taking place among faith schools (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn) The study determined that all the case study schools (both those receiving government funding, under voluntary aided arrangements and independent schools) had some good strategies in place that reflected levels of engagement. All schools studied, demonstrated degrees of engagement with the “community” at local, national and international levels on the basis of their own religious and political agenda, challenging the assumption that little engagement is taking place among faith schools. There are concepts of responsible citizenship and charitable deeds within both the Jewish and Muslim cultures based around the concept of ‘doing the right thing’ (Miller 2011). The Jewish precepts of “tikkun olam” and “tzedakah” incorporate participating in society with courtesy and respect, social justice and charity. For Muslims one of the five basic duties within Islam, known as the ‘Five Pillars of Islam’ is “zakah” or welfare
contribution’ which provides the opportunity for contributing to society at a number of ways (Sarwar 1992:41). “Tikkun Olam”, “tzedakah” and “zakah” are expressed through charity and social action within and beyond their own faith group. This is reflected by the chosen charities of pupils in one Jewish secondary school were: ‘one British-based Jewish charity, one Israel-based Jewish charity, one non-Jewish, and one African.’ (Parker-Jenkins, 2008) Similarly, a Muslim school supported a range of charities including British, Palestinian, and non-Muslim charities (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011).

These, altruistic practices can be called upon to facilitate the positive force of community engagement in the context of religious hostility. For example, in a focus group conducted with students at a Muslim school it was observed:

“After the riots…they had different people from religions and different backgrounds come together to communicate and get to know things about each other’s cultures…., so you don’t have the barrier or end up hating each other.” (In personal correspondence with the authors, 2008)

It is fortunate that we need not rely on the aftermath of hostilities to create learning environments conducive to bonding and bridging for Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011 did determine that in order to promote children's understanding of the wider community both Jewish and Muslim schools were involved in a variety of different projects. A consortium of Jewish schools organised “Multicultural Weeks” whereby individual schools prepared work around a theme within cultural pluralism, and this was shared among others: for example, Chinese, Indian, and African-Caribbean weeks (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011). The Internet and electronic communication were also used, with adult guidance, connecting children of different religious backgrounds.

Reaching out to the wider community was perceived as highly important by one Jewish teacher, as “a lot of children that go to Jewish schools … don’t have a lot of contact with people in the wider world.” (in personal correspondence with the authors, 2008). An approach to address this was as follows:

“There is a school across the park and we have been to it on several occasions to do assemblies on Hanukah and the Passover. They have been here as well for Divali and Eid. We also did a project on Judaism for a non-Jewish audience.” (In personal correspondence with the authors, 2008)

It is an inclusive and dialogue-drive process which is about a commitment to creating dynamic, two-way partnerships and seeking and finding common ground. Community engagement brings the community into schools and moves out from the school into the community.

Initiatives designed to bring children together from different schools should be structured around cooperation and engagement. It is in this shared space of common ground that real community engagement can occur.
A Framework for Community Engagement
The schools studied by Parker-Jenkins & Glenn (2008) were involved in charitable events and curricula initiatives which linked them to the outside world on their terms. In this way, community engagement is achievable immediately. Dyson and Gallannaugh (2008), have also conducted work on community engagement suggesting that the concept can be explained in a number of ways. Gaine (2005) and Carroll (2003) have conceptualised it as being fully engaged, vicariously engaged, semi engaged, and under engaged. Building on this literature and informed by the 2011 Parker-Jenkins & Glenn study, we propose another model of engagement for schools. This is based on a spectrum which demonstrates the different levels of engagement:

- Significant interaction
- Strong evidence of different forms such as knowledge of and interaction with other faiths/wider community on a regular basis
- Due to one teacher or member of the school community but not sustained because that person has left or the strategy is discontinued
- A one off event such as a trip, assembly meeting, sports event
- A veneer but weak and of no consequence
- Ethnocentric, mono-cultural, Eurocentric in curriculum, school ethos

Figure 1: A Framework for Community Engagement (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011)

Applying this model, Miller (2011) described the engagement levels in Jewish schools as follows:

“Jewish schools in the UK engage the wider community at various levels of intensity between categories two to five. In the current political climate, there is no possibility for State schools of any kind in Britain to be at level six, that is, having no contact with others within and beyond the school community. Even those Jewish schools who feel strongly that they want to have as little as possible to do with the wider community show some weak engagement with people beyond the school gates. Conversely, very few Jewish schools exhibit “significant interaction”, although this may be more about having insufficient time and resources than a lack of interest or desire” (Miller, 2011:36).
It is also important to note that community schools of no religious affiliation should seek opportunities for pupils to mix and develop their own understanding and valuing of cultural diversity beyond their school community; parents, not just teachers or pupils, need to be brought on board in this initiative. Schools need to work hard to gain the support of parents, many of whom have chosen a faith school for their children precisely because they do not want them to mix with children of other backgrounds (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011). We suggest that the application of the framework described above is best achieved by incorporating it into a “school development plan,” identifying what has already been achieved, school priorities, establishing values and developing the curriculum. It should be possible for schools to map the different levels of awareness and commitment to action of different stakeholders within the school. This would avoid activities of engagement being carried out by only one group such as teachers and would require pupils and parents to have relevant opportunities. There is also evidence of associational engagement (Varshney, 2002) with more formal political and civic interaction. For example, having connections with groups in Israel or Palestine featured as important for schools as it also relates to groups within the same religious tradition (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011).

Defining and Assessing 21st Century Skills
The impetus for 21st century skills largely falls on schools to develop a skills-based pedagogy. Under section 78 of the Education Act 2002, schools are seen as locales for the ‘physical, mental, social, cultural and moral development’ of young people. The debate over whether Faith Schools provide the adequate development that prepares young people for adulthood and gives them the ability to operate effectively in a multi-ethnic, multi-faith society is filled with both praise and concern. On one side Faith Schools are praised for giving pupils strong sense of personal worth and their ability to prepare pupils to be good citizens (OFSTED 2009). Moreover, schools with a high social capital have a significant advantage which explains the successes of many faith schools – they have a ready-made sense of community. Effective communities combine the capacity to bond with the ability to bridge (Farrar and Otero, 2007). However there are also concerns that a narrow curriculum prevents young people from participating in a pluralistic society outside of their own family and community (Policy Exchange). Opponents of faith schools maintain that children are raised in a segregated community, unaware of others outside of their faith group and that this can lead to intolerance (Berkerley and Sevita, 2008, Dawkins 2001). Although Berkeley (2008) contends that pupils in Faith Schools gain valuable communication and collaboration skills as a result of a value-based education and strong ties with the community, this, he suggests, is not enough to prepare young people for living and working in a multi-faith society, because of the limited opportunities for young people to mix with people of different backgrounds.

Faith schools and others will have to grapple with the extent to which they are prepared to facilitate opportunities for their pupils to communicate with their peers from outside of their own community, and how to adequately preparing
them for life in the 21st Century. This will be based on their school ethos and what might best serve the school community interest but must also recognise the importance of providing their pupils with opportunities for meaningful engagement with the wider society. In taking such initiatives further there are implications for schools in terms of policy and practice.

Within this broad umbrella of what children need for future living we suggest 21st Century skills models. These models demonstrate that within teaching and learning, practitioners should focus on skill development and how it can infiltrate through the curriculum and teaching. The key question is what skills do children need for the future? We think the approach of 21st Century skills has particular value because there is a good synergy with the area of fostering better relations among different ethnic groups in society. The race debates appear outdated now and we need to consider how students may have better skills through the curriculum experience in schools. This would require a departure from the more simplistic approach to learning about religious diversity. In looking at being skilled in and for the 21st century, we need to look at where there is overlap between the content curriculum in 21st century skills models and the approach that faith schools take. Where do the 21st century models overlap with the aims of faith schools, and others, and what does this look like? How it is assessed? Importantly for our discussion, how does it relate to the framework of community engagement and the integration of community engagement into 21st Century learning? We suggest that schools that rank higher on the community engagement continuum are those that help children to develop the skills necessary to understand and engage with issues of tolerance of other communities. This would be a departure from the learning at the level of basic knowledge with lists of facts. Farrar and Otero (2007) share the concern that we have become too dependent upon pedagogy of memorisation. In response to this Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) propose a process of “deeper learning” where an individual becomes capable of taking what was learned in one situation and applying it to new situations. Skills must be transportable and transferable, young people should be readily available to transfer skills learned in one situation to another. Deeper learning enables young people to transfer learning into the real world and use this knowledge to solve new problems, rather than simply be able to store information or recall facts:

“We view 21st century skills as knowledge that can be transferred or applied to new situations. This transferable knowledge includes both content knowledge in a domain and also procedural knowledge of how, why, and when to apply this knowledge to answer questions and solve problems. The latter dimensions of transferable knowledge (how, why, and when to apply content knowledge) are often called "skills". (Pellegrino and Hilton, 2012, p. ???)

Whilst useful, knowledge of other communities by itself is not sufficient and what children need for the future are skills. A number of writers and organisations have been looking into what children need to know in the future within the umbrella term “21st Century skills” (see for example Anderson-Koenig, 2011, Pellegrino and Hilton, 2012 Barber et al., 2012, Suto, 2013). Below we summarize the salient points of these scholar’s models. Pellegrino and Hilton (2012) further illustrate that this blend of content knowledge and related skills
should be referred to as 21st century competencies and that 21st century skills and competencies are essential for:

- Educational achievement and attainment
- Professional accomplishment
- Health and relationships
- Civic participation

Young people must be able thrive and adapt in a changing workplace and develop skills that are deemed critical for success in higher education and the workplace. These skills include:

“being able to solve complex problems, to think critically about tasks, to effectively communicate with people from a variety of different cultures and using a variety of different techniques, to work in collaboration with others, to adapt to rapidly changing environments and conditions for performing tasks, to effectively manage one’s work, and to acquire new skills and information on one’s own” (Anderson Koenig, 2011: 1)

21st century skills are of particular important to faith schools in their ability to build capacity and develop leadership. A child’s development “is powerfully shaped by social capital, trust, networks, and norms of reciprocity within a child’s family, school, peer group, and larger community have a wider-ranging effect on the child’s opportunities and choices, and hence, on behaviour and development” (Putnam – need full reference). Levels of social capital have a direct effect on the educational and personal success of a child. Koenig provides a useful stating point is to ask, what do children need to learn to prepare for a demanding competitive world?

- Cognitive skills – non-routine problem solving and systems thinking
- Interpersonal skills – social intelligence required for relating to other people
- Intrapersonal skills – adaptability and self-management/self-development

(Koenig, 2011)

‘Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P-21)’, and the Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills (ATCS21) (see table 1) provide differing but complimentary guidance on the key skills necessary for pupils to achieve success in school and in the workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-21</th>
<th>ATCS21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work creatively with others</td>
<td>Ways of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clearly</td>
<td>Creativity &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical thinking, problem-solving, decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborate with others
Adapt to change
Be flexible
Interact effectively with others
Work effectively in teams
Guide and lead others
Be responsible to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of working</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration (teamwork)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for working</td>
<td>Information literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in the world</td>
<td>Citizenship – local &amp; global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life &amp; career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal &amp; social responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: P-21 excerpted from (Koenig, 2011), ATCS21 from (Suto, 2013)
A different conceptualisation is that provided by Florida (2005). Florida stated that we need to develop talent, technology and tolerance, the 3 ‘Ts’ model. Again this is useful to this discussion because it places an emphasis on the issue of ‘tolerance’ which theoretically was to be achieved through the now abandoned “community cohesion” agenda. But what does tolerance mean, how is it carried out and how can it be assessed? We are suggesting that the answer lies in helping children to develop the skills necessary to understand and engage with issues of tolerance of other communities.

Barber, et al., (2012) simplify an approach to preparing for 21c learning with reference to a helpful formula:
‘Well-educated = E (K+T+L)’

Overall, the formula E (K+T+L) is based on the view that a curriculum that combines knowledge with thinking and leadership underpinned by ethics better prepares young people for life in the 21st Century (Barber, Rizvi, & Donnelly, 2012). In this instance, the K stands for knowledge – meaning ‘Know How’ as well “skills such as those related to information technology, taking notes or making a succinct summary” (Barber, et al., 2012: 49). The T stands for thinking or thought - “the evidence shows overwhelmingly that when children are taught to think, and to reflect on how they are thinking as they learn their subjects, their performance significantly improves” (Barber, et al., 2012, p.__). The L in this model stands for leadership, “in the sense of being able to influence those around you in the family, community, workplace or classroom” (Barber, et al., 2012) As such, this model by Barber et al (2012) suggests that rather than there being a separate set of classes in ‘thinking skills’, teachers should be prepared to teach different approaches to thinking through their subjects, developing critical thinking skills to make decisions about key issues or different groups. This is a particularly useful strategy when challenging negative stereotypes and the mythology surrounding particular groups such as Muslim communities (Swain 2009, Finney and Simpson, 2009). Finally, E stands for ethics which can be informed by the way the school operates, “the way the teachers and students interact, and the way the school interacts with the communities it serves” (Barber, et al., 2012:51). For this reason, the E in the model lies outside of the bracket:
“As traditional institutions, such as the family or church, break down, increasingly schools are the only social institutions we can rely on to inculcate in young people the values or ethical underpinning on which our collective future depends. Of course, cultures vary and the origins of ethics vary too, some rooted in religious belief, others not, but there are nevertheless some values that are universal and vital: respecting opinions different from one’s own; respecting individuals equally regardless of their wealth, race, gender, sexual orientation or origin; recognising the diversity of life” (Barber, et al., 2012, p.__).

Implications for British Education Policy and Practice
Future education systems will need to innovate and think creatively about what children need to learn: the necessary skills as well as knowledge. The 21st century frameworks we have discussed have implications for the way schools are organised and the role of the teacher. Barber et al (2012) have written passionately about 21st Century skills and “the oceans of innovation” with a shift from the Atlantic to the Pacific Rim for guidance as to how education can be shaped. There will be implications for the school in terms of how curricular opportunities are provided, for example, 30 minute/one hour structures being replaced by half day/whole day sessions. Suggested approaches are to collapse the routine timetable altogether for two or three days every month or so, in order to break the students into teams and give them a cross-disciplinary task (Barber et al). Similarly the role of the teacher will need to change, becoming that of a facilitator rather than a pedagogue as traditionally understood (ibid). It is not the case that technology should replace the teacher but issues of cultural diversity, religion and belief are particularly important areas that require a skills approach with appropriate learning experiences for children to learn of and from each other and importantly not be threatened by other cultural groups. In this case the role is, ‘teacher as activator’ as Hattie (2011) who describes reinforces, extends and deepens students’ learning opportunities.

All the components are interconnected in the process of 21st century teaching and learning, and the elements represent “the critical systems necessary to ensure 21st century readiness for every student..... [and] to produce a support system that produces 21st century outcomes for today’s students” (p.49). The curriculum in this model is seen as a platform in the 21st century skills, distinct from school systems of the 20th century based on a restrictive curriculum with emphasis on assessment and league tables rather than the needs of the learner (Apple 2010). To accompany new types of learning, new types of assessment are required. This may be found in the proposed collaborative problem-solving tests for Programme for International Student Assessment in 2015 (OECD-PISA 2013). Overall, Barber et al (2012) maintain we must be ready for the society of the future and that some of the elements that will drive that change can be predicted.

The discussions have demonstrated ways in which children can be brought together using technology and learn about different value, beliefs and lifestyles. Practitioners will also need to involve themselves with this approach,
communicating with their peers in different ethnic and cultural communities and using education conferences for policy-makers and educators. Miller (2011) notes that of the reports commissioned and published by the DES and others, in 66 there has been an emphasis on policy perspectives rather than classroom practice. As well as a policy gap there is a practice gap where schools are left to determine whether they will engage further in ‘good practice’ and what possibilities are there moving forward to ‘enable pupils to meet each other across the globe’ (Miller ). As we have signaled in this chapter, the challenge will be for both teachers and parents to recognize the importance of responding to the messages of preparing their children for life in the 21st century. 21st Century Skills should be supported through teaching practices that create a positive learning community in which students gain knowledge and also develop intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies. Teaching training programs will need to help teachers develop visions of learning for transfer and how to put knowledge and skills into practice.

Faith schools are an essential part of this equation - “faith-based project and faith buildings are not always what they seem to be to outsiders – they made provide places and spaces where people ‘negotiate difference’ and ‘transgress’ the normal boundaries of interaction” (Furbey et al., 2007: 6). Within a faith-based context, pupils can be taught 21st century skills through school linking, intercultural programs, leadership links across schools and tutoring of schools between schools. These can lend themselves to more deeper and embedded aspects of the school.

An example of these initiatives in action is provided by the Tony Blair Foundation. A primary aim of this organisation is to recognise the significance of faith and that it can be distorted to fan the flames of extremism. As such the Foundation aims to “promotes respect and understanding about the world’s religions through education and multi-faith action” (www.tonyblairfoundation.org/accessed march 11, 2013). Practically, the Foundation supports and collaborate initiatives to educate and develop understanding about religion in the modern world. One of the programmes under this Foundation which is particularly relevant to this discussion is to ‘Face to Faith’ (ibid). This is a schools programme for 12-17 year olds. The programme Face to Faith connects students worldwide via a secure website where they interact and “discuss global issues from a variety of faith and belief perspectives” (ibid). Specifically, the programme aims

1. To promote cross-cultural understanding, equipping young people with key 21st century skills needed to live in a world of diverse faiths and beliefs.
2. To provide young people with the knowledge, skills and competencies needed for meaningful inter and intra-faith dialogue across a range of cultures, containing diverse and often conflicting views, and
3. To give students key mediation and negotiation skills so that they are able to hold meaningful and respectful interfaith discussions (need citation)
Conclusion
This research set out to investigate the ways in which Jewish and Muslim faith schools approached community cohesion. After the riots in England in 2001, the Government felt obliged to think strategically about how a level of community cohesion could be achieved in a multicultural society. Given the government agenda of financial support for faith schools, it is possibly more difficult to avoid new dividing lines or prevent the spiral of separation. In this chapter, we proposed a framework for schools to assess work that is being done within a “community engagement approach” which is a more practical and less aspirational approach to the now abandoned “community cohesion” strategy. Building on what schools have been doing to help their pupils engage with the wider world we discussed 21st Century skills models with a focus on the skills as well as the knowledge that children need, and importantly where there is overlap with the former ‘community cohesion; agenda and what schools might do practically in the classroom to help young people share their religious heritage and help reduce intolerance. Moving forward schools can maintain a commitment to foster harmonious relations, breaking down stereotypes of other religious groups and those of no faith.

At the micro-level, collaboration between school communities, makes it possible to ensure that engagement is maintained and developed further according to a school’s priorities. Schools are still at the early stages of engagement. Students need to build in the skills, the knowledge base and draw on the social capital from their religious communities.
Chapter 6 Conclusion, where reaching starts and stops

WE ARE SEARCHING BETTER QUOTES
“Integrating without assimilating.... is a challenge in a wider society”
(Miller, et al., 2011, p.40)

“A diverse society should not be thought of as a treat ...Diversity can be taken as an advantage rather than a disadvantage “ (Finney and Simpson 2009, p.173).

It is difficult to avoid new dividing lines or prevent the spiral of separation. The British government is attempting to balance competing interests between teachers unions, parental choice and political agendas while at the same time trying to cohere around a set of values to academic raise results. However, in the policy vacuum left by the movement away from the “community cohesion agenda” and confusion as to the meaning behind “the Big Society”, there is need for better understanding of good practice to focus students gaining skills needed to partake and lead in the 21st Century.

To explore these themes, this concluding chapter:

- Provides a brief overview of the overall discussions and cumulative arguments,
- Summarizes the update theorists around multiculturalism; and
- Proposes the way forward to support an agenda around education for 21st century skills.

This books set out to add nuance to the debates regarding the ways in which Jewish and Muslim faith schools approach the concept of community and the various models around engaging with the wider community. As notions of community are inherent to these two faiths, ethos around cultural sustainability and issues concerning Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, shed light on how the British Government approaches the issues around integration and multiculturalism. strategically and how schools endeavour to navigate these debates.

Overview of Discussions

Chapter 1 provides a historical perspective on faith schools; their origins in the England and Wales based on Christian and Jewish traditions, and the expansion of the educational landscape to include other faith groups such as those based on an Islamic ethos. The historical patterns of accommodation between church and state are with brief reference to other European countries, drawing on examples from Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Netherlands. Separation of church and state is discussed with reference to France and the development of a secular
educational system. The evolution of Jewish and Muslim schools in the UK is also examined in preparation for the later chapters on the nature of these particular schools. Chapter 2 is concerned with faith schools and social policy, introducing the debates around diversity and cohesion in contemporary multicultural Britain. Chapters 3 and 4 examine the religious and cultural conceptions of community of the Jewish and Muslim faith groups and their differences based on ethnic, linguistic and sectarian lines. We also examine unearth experiences of hostility of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism that sample schools experienced and will assess how these schools have coped with and responded to such incidents. The findings of this chapter will then lead us, in Chapter 4, to promote community engagement as a more promising and productive perspective in assessing the relations of minority faith schools with the outside world than community cohesion. We look at what all schools can do to help develop better relations between groups in preparing children for the 21st Century. Building on our own model of ‘community engagement’ rather than ‘community cohesion’ we examine practical curricula suggestions for what skills children need to develop tolerance and engagement with other groups in the 21st Century. This leads to the final chapter of this book where we provide an overview of the discussion and looking forward, we suggest what government should be doing in light of the alleged ‘failure of multiculturalism’.

Having provided an introduction to the central aims of the book, we introduce below the key terminology and some of the theoretical background to faith schools and concepts of community within Judaism and Islam that will be used to present our thesis.

Drawing on Jewish and Muslim school communities, the case study (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2008, 2011) has been a springboard to draw in different arguments about education policy and associated discourses. The schools in our research illustrated policy development on reaching out to other communities, in some instances before the Government directives made this obligatory. This is particularly important given the criticisms leveled at faith schools, as highlighted in Chapter 1.

The variety of ways in which the state has responded to religion and education was discussed in Chapter 2 from the traditional support for faith schools in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and the Netherlands to the French adoption of a secular policy aiming to separate Church and State. Based on the tradition of government recognition and financial support in the UK for faith schools, educational institutions based on a Jewish and Islam ethos were established in pursuit of equality before the law in terms of and developing education reflective of diverse values of the home.

Chapter 3 and 4 demonstrated insights into community engagement and the complexity of multiculturalism in practice. The difficulty of being accepted by the wider community was also discussed, and the experiences of hostility from the wider community. The failure to acknowledge racism in the form of Islamophobia and anti-Semitism, evidenced in the experiences of Jewish and Muslim communities, means that previous policy on community cohesion is
flawed, particularly the idealism of government policy and the emphasis on schools being the place where “community cohesion” could be fostered as evidenced through school inspections. We critiqued this policy further in chapter 6 and proposed that the concept of ‘community engagement’ was a more aspirational and adaptable solution. This was illustrated by examples of practice from our case study schools and highlighted in a framework for community engagement that all schools could use. The impetus to build social capital by engaging with the various stakeholders within wider communities should be strengthened to help prepare children for the 21st Century. The strategy in the “community cohesion” agenda was for political leadership at the national level to insist that schools assume responsibility to effect change. This was in the context of nebulous government policy, assessment lead curriculum, and an emphasis on accountability and measurability evidenced in league tables that does not necessarily translate into high level practice. An emphasis on school practices with an absence of corresponding focus on structural inequalities, limits government initiatives on “community cohesion”, for example, the underperformance of children from minority ethnic background, particularly of immigrant groups into the second and third generation (OECD, 2006).

Devine (2011) states that as institutions, schools are often at the coal face of experiencing social shifts directly through the changing nature of characteristics, and that “schools are located contradictorily between safe-guarding the past and what is 'known', as well as shaping the future” (ibid p.153). From a sociological perspective, schools are situated therefore between processes of production and reproduction, “mediating between diverse forces, often in the context of constrained resources and contrasting local dynamics” (ibid). This is true of all schools but particularly apposite for faith schools which have been established and supported because of their perpetuation of culture and traditions.

As religious communities reach in, so they are expected to reach out. Identifying the discourses underpinning the “community cohesion” and “Big Society” agendas demonstrates the interplay between societal/structural and group dynamics in the experience of religious communities and the wider society. There are, however, non-funded institutions, such as Madrassas an Yeshivas, in which the wide and varied examples of community engagement may not be evident or part of the hidden or overt curriculum. For all faith schools, however, there is a balance between necessary contact with the wider community and reaching in to develop their own ethos particularly in the light of ‘multiculturalism; which may be perceived as undermining their religious identity and promoting assimilation and values and aims around 21 century skills.

**The Failure of ‘Multiculturalism’ in Britain**

Along with many scholars and stakeholders within education, we have raised the point, throughout this book, that the jury is out on whether multiculturalism is failing in the UK. This is in the context of a number of events: The 2001 riots placed the spotlight on “Britishness”, Muslims and notions of citizenship (Cantle,
2001, Cantle, 2006, Fielding, 2005, Modood, 2010). The events of 9/11, bombings in London (Husband & Alam, 2011) and the Afghanistan and Iraq invasions (Richardson 2010) have raised further issues about identity and citizenship. Against this backdrop, schools in the UK have been obliged over the last decade to demonstrate how they are developing community cohesion, and this has formed part of the school inspection’s protocol. The focus has centered on faith schools who have been criticized for adopting an isolationist stance, with Muslim schools particularly attracting criticism.

Trevor Phillips, Chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), has helped lead the debate on multiculturalism in the United Kingdom, in suggesting that as a policy it has failed to deliver an ‘assimilated society’ (Phillips, 2005).

“‘The disastrous doctrine of multiculturalism--- has promoted a lethally divisive culture of separateness, in which minority cultures are held to be equal if not superior to the values and traditions of the indigenous majority” (Phillips, 2005 p???)

However, there has been a shift in discourses of multiculturalism to ones of assimilation and to notions of citizenship and integration with a focus on “community and social cohesion” (Thomas, 2012, Werbner 2009). Finney and Simpson (2009) see this rhetoric as part of government and public-induced fear that ‘self-segregation” “maintains and exacerbates conflict” and, that religion rather than race has become the significant aspect of debates (p.92). Further, questions of integration are aimed at what minorities have to do to fit in, and as such responsibility lies with them.

What did multiculturalism intend to achieve? Is it the same as equality? Today multiculturalism in the UK is associated with fear of fundamentalism, particularly, Islamic fundamentalism. As a result, rather less attention is paid to other forms of radicalism and consequently other groups are not highlighted. Policies on community relations and the role of schools in supporting the government agenda on promoting greater cohesion have now reached an impasse. In light of the failure of multiculturalism, there is disagreement as to whether it can or should be revived. As such, the failure of “community cohesion” and multiculturalism has now left a policy vacuum. The new Conservative/Liberal agenda in the UK still espouses shared values and British identity, clumsily expressed in the “Big Society” initiative.

There is still a lack of understanding of identity (Brah, 1996), the concept of multiculturalism (Parekh 2000, 2002) and why the community cohesion agenda failed to achieve its objectives (Wetherell et al, 2007). Minority groups remain isolated and detached from British society. If multiculturalism means integration then it has failed. If it means reduction in alienation and greater community engagement then with that definition it has also failed. One of the key reasons why there is dissatisfaction with the notion of multiculturalism is the failure to understand the significance of social and structural inequalities.
Where do faith schools fit in a post-multicultural society?
Moving forward education needs to be viewed as both a preservative and reproductive process. There is also a need for a fresh perspective, new language and a new policy framework that reconceptualises a nuanced understanding of multiculturalism and community cohesion.

The raison d’être of faith schools is to preserve religious faith. Children are caught in the intersections between the different ‘cultural scripts’ of school and home (Devine 2011:165), and when these two institutions overlap the conflict can be diminished. If faith schools are to respond to government initiatives in the future, the cultural script needs to be acknowledged as well as the experience of hostility from the wider community (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011). This involves an acknowledgement of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and other racist behaviour. Children are particularly vulnerable to this, and parents in general select faith schools to avoid the experience of hostility (Parker-Jenkins & Glenn, 2011). Racism is an issue which needs attention at both a government and school level providing not only a statement of intent or mission but a clear strategy and review of practice.

Miller, et al., (2011) notes that British Jews are facing new and complicated challenges as they grapple with the issues of relating to the world around them. Importantly, “This challenge is not a phenomenon restricted to the Jewish schools of Britain; but the concept of schools and their relationships with the wider community is one which is especially preoccupying the British government...A further challenge is one of balance “of integrating without assimilating...playing a full part ...is a challenge in a wider society” (p.40).

The challenge for Jewish schools, she continues, is to develop young people who want to remain within a strong Jewish framework but also to connect them to the wider world. She feels that some schools have difficulty appreciating “the possibilities of integration without assimilation” (ibid). This is a particular problem “for strictly orthodox schools that seek to develop graduates who are deeply knowledgeable about Jewish text, values and practice, and who principally lead their lives within a strictly orthodox community” (ibid). This was evident in the difficulty we had in contacting “strictly orthodox schools” and their unwillingness to be part of our study.

Miller et al (2011) adds that “unfortunately, ignorance and mistrust of our neighbours are two of the biggest challenges to building cohesion” (ibid). Putting values into practice is not simple, and whose agenda school stakeholders are following is not always clear.

Importantly, in terms of community cohesion”, Miller, et al., (2011) raise the question as to “whose agenda” are we following? Specifically, “In the UK, at present, there are competing agendas in relation to community cohesion and engagement. On the one hand, many individuals and groups within the wider British society view faith schools as obstacles to community cohesion or engagement. On the other hand, there are plenty of individuals and groups who
view faith schools as a positive force for community cohesion and engagement” (ibid).

Looking to the future, simplistic policies on multiculturalism do not do service to the complexity and significance of identity based on ethnic, religious, linguistic, class and sectarian background. In the current economic climate it will be easy to move away from recognising difference and developing social harmony, as evidenced by the abandoning of schools’ need to evidence the promotion of “community cohesion” agenda after only 5 years (DFES 2012). As our proposed model in the previous chapter demonstrates, only short-term, tokenistic or lip service strategies are likely to have been achieved in the last 5 years, rather than a committed, long-term, substantive and sustainable strategy towards some measure of “community cohesion”. Schools which developed good practice may sustain policy in this area. For others, the competing commands of accountability, assessment and league tables will provide ample substantiation to abandon the “community cohesion” policy (DFES 2007). Yet the issue still remains as to how all schools, not just faith schools, should engage with the wider community.

Diversity
Finney and Simpson (2009) illustrate how Muslims are singled out as having behaviors potentially undesirable for British society and the responsibility for ensuring that they ‘fit in’ lies with the minorities themselves (p.95). This is a clear movement away from the talk of equality and celebration of cultural diversity of previous decades (Lynch 1988, Craft and Bardell 1984) to one in which diversity is seen as undesirable (Letli, 2008). Further, “by requiring behavioral change as the measure of integration, the ‘new’ approach harks back to assimilationist ideologies and societies” (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 95). If an assimilationist agenda placing responsibility for integration rests exclusively on the shoulders of minorities this is likely to be rejected. In short, “The concern is about newcomers, both new immigrants and children of former immigrants (ethnic minorities), in particular those who may therefore upset the applecart of the accepted ways of life” (ibid p.143).

This raises implications for policy across education systems in the UK which seek to respond to the reality of how the dynamics of cultural identity and citizenship expresses itself in schools. It is time for a new language and a new approach in responding to the reality of a multicultural society and global mobility.

Diversity on the basis of income and cultural background, exists regardless of ethnic pluralism but there are ‘fears that skin colour and diversity are threats to social cohesion ‘with an emphasis on “racial stereotyping “ (ibid, p.156). Some literature points out that integration is feared by some minority groups, if it means losing personal and cultural identity, and it is not acceptable to Jewish (Miller et al., 2011) or Muslim communities (Sarwar, 1994). There is no easy solution but according to Finney and Simpson (2009) people do not choose not to integrate:
'A spotlight on fair treatment, choice in housing, positive social behaviour, job availability and neighbourliness in areas that are changing their composition are more relevant to the goal of an integrated society. Britain’s changing ethnic composition, both nationally and locally, is evident and important, but it does not of itself constitute a problem’ (2009, p.137).

We need a fresh approach to multiculturalism which is both sensitive and sensible. There have been calls for a more “muscular or aggressive form of multiculturalism” i.e. to belong here is to believe and adhere to our values of what it is to be British. There is fear of Sharia law (Bhala, 2011) which is seen as opposed to what is valued in Britain and certain strands of Islam which preach about intolerance, for example of homosexuality, are criticised for being unacceptable in a British context. As part of this, there is a perceived fear of standing up to Muslim intolerance and aspects of Sharia law. However, to define all Muslims as intolerant is clearly wrong. The tension lies in hearing alternative views and safeguarding cherished aspects English culture. When we talk about multiculturalism, the debate is invariably in terms of Muslims (Firsing, 2012). Brummer ( ) suggests that the debate needs to be broadened by discussing the fear of extremism in any form as a menace to society, for example, ultra-Zionists and anti-abortionists within the Jewish and Catholic communities.

We propose a framework for schools to assess work that is being done within a community engagement approach. There is a policy vacuum in the post “community cohesion” era and the “Big Society” message is confused. According to Miller, et al., (2011) schools need to consider the balance between “diversity and conformity”.

"Moving forward schools can maintain a commitment to foster harmonious relations/breaking down stereotypes of other religious groups and those of no faith” (p.41).

We have shown how Muslim and Jewish schools have strong conceptions of community which in a continuum is used to engage and strengthen levels of education. Faith schools work hard through formal and informal curriculum to preserve their cultural heritage, tradition, values and practices, and to sustain them within educational environments. Schools are not neutral spaces and government agendas to change societal norms may be in conflict with those of the school community. Religious and ethnic communities have different capacities, both financial and social capital, to mobilise and influence. The trend has now shifted from multiculturalism to the promotion of shared values and national security as a means to enhance community cohesion. There is also a shift from welcoming minority faith schools to viewing them with suspicion. Bridging gulfs between people through sophisticated and embedded forms of engagement, underpinned by government policy, is part of the way forward.
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