The Possibility of the Christian Religious Education of Adults: Indoctrination, Preaching, Nurture, Education

by

Janet Goodall, STL

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Education

December 2005

Acknowledgements

As with any undertaking which has spanned five years, this research could not have been completed without the support of a wide group of people.

Encouragement from colleagues in what was then the School of Continuing Education in the University of Nottingham, and the support of the School during the first years of the research was invaluable. I am also grateful to the Roman Catholic Diocese involved for the permission given to use it as the field work and also for the support shown by individual members of the diocese.

A wide and indeed eclectic group of people have been generous enough to allow me to refine my ideas over time. I am grateful to various groups of students in the School of Continuing Education and the (Anglican) Diocese of Southwell, the attendees at the 2001 and 2003 Stapleford conference, where parts of this work were presented as seminars and received useful feedback. Members of various internet communities, particularly *Karl's Forums*, and the newsgroups *uk.religion.pagan*, *alt.religion.wicca*, *uk.religion.christian* and *alt.pagan* have been genial in discussion of educational issues with "the Christian in the corner" ; thanks are also due to the members of various email lists.

Individuals have also been generous with their time and ideas, including former and present colleagues in the formal and informal sectors. My thanks are also due of course to my supervisor, Professor Mal Leicester who has guided an often erratic work through to completion.

The final and most heartfelt thanks are due to my family. Without their support and confidence, I could never have begun this work and certainly would never have completed it.

Abstract

This thesis sets out to answer a central question: is it possible to engage in the Christian religious education of adults without resorting to indoctrination? It looks first to the concepts in the literature connected to the Christian religious education of adults. This literature deals with education overall, the education of adults in particular, and then education as it relates to faith.

The concepts of indoctrination, preaching and nurture are then examined as they relate to education. A visual representation of the relationship between these concepts is offered, showing that there is a progression from indoctrination, through preaching, nurture, to education understood in a pure sense, which has only the intention of facilitating (any) worthwhile learning.

Alongside this work based on conceptual analysis from the literature, field work undertaken in a Roman Catholic Diocese in England and Wales is used to support the research. The field work is an illustrative snapshot, rather than representative; its purpose is to illuminate the conclusions reached in the first part of the research.

In both the questionnaire and interview section of the field work, data was obtained from three groups of respondents: administrators, tutors and participants. This grouping covers all those involved in the Christian religious education of adults in the diocese, and allows triangulation of data.

The results of the field work is then related back to the chart proposed from the literature review, and conclusions drawn about gaps in the literature and proposals made for further study. Overall, the data from the field work support the conclusions of the first part of the research, with minor adjustments.

1. Introduction

"Because we've lived for too long with an uncatechised laity" (Administrator B).

1.1. *Introduction*

Provision in adult, religious education is considered an important part of the life of the Roman Catholic Church at both international and local levels. This research will investigate both the theory behind such provision and the practice in a particular section of the field.

The hypothesis here is that the Christian religious education of adults is not *necessarily* an instance of indoctrination, or, to put it more positively, it is possible to be involved in the religious education of adults without being either a facilitator of indoctrination (for administrators), an indoctrinator oneself (tutors/teachers) or being indoctrinated (students). To test this hypothesis, the appropriate literature relating to both religious education and indoctrination has been conceptually analysed, and conclusions drawn from this literature. Fieldwork was undertaken for the sake of both illumination of the conceptual analysis and to ground it in practice. Both the conceptual analysis and the fieldwork are supported by my experience as a reflective practitioner in the formal and informal sectors.

1.2. *Context*

My involvement in this area has been a spur to this research. In qualitative research, the influence of the researcher on the data must always be a consideration (Pendlebury et al. 2001; Potter 2001), therefore I introduce my

relationship with the Christian religious education of adults, and some of the issues which that involvement has raised for me which relate to this research. My involvement in the field also enables the use of semistructured interviews; as Zwieg makes clear, this technique requires detailed knowledge of the situation (as cited in Burgess 1984). It is also a technique with which I am familiar and practiced due to my employment as a research fellow.

I have been involved in catechetics (the common word for informal, Christian religious education in the Roman Catholic Church)[1] for almost thirty years. During that time I have worked with a variety of ages, from pre-school children through to adults[2]. During this time, I have been involved in adult education in the formal sector (Appendices 6.1 and 6.2). The interaction between these two activities, and the tensions discerned between them have contributed to the choice of my research topic[3].

The formal sector has experienced an ever increasing emphasis on documentable quality, the necessity for paper trails, and the rigours imposed by Subject Review (Cox 2000; Quality Assurance Agency 2000). In the informal sector of the Roman Catholic Church, I have experienced little of this: no documentary evidence of courses, no observation of teaching[4], the only evaluation of courses being the ubiquitous "happy sheet" (Thackwray 1997), no request for a curriculum vitae has ever been made of me[5]. Central records of courses and tutors were not kept in the diocese prior to 2003, and are still not seen as a priority. This is a deliberate decision on the part of diocesan officials. The reason for this is that adult education is seen as properly placed within the parishes, rather than imposed from a central authority: therefore parishes have been given the remit to find tutors, mount courses, etc., with the diocese available

for consultation (Personal communication, Adult Education Officer, Diocese, 2004). I have never been asked to submit a detailed syllabus to any Catholic body before teaching, in stark contrast to the practice in the formal sector; nor have I received any offers of support in teaching, such as observation and feedback[6].

There is an accredited adult education (or at least, post-16) programme available for use, for the coming academic year; this programme has not been adopted in the case study diocese.[7]

Considering the importance the Roman Catholic Church places on education and adult education in particular (see below) the dissonance in practice between the formal and informal sectors is interesting, if not puzzling. While it is true that even in the formal sector, there is sometimes a gap between professed belief in the need to support tutors and the reality experienced (Brookfield 1986; Cox 2000; Lee 1971) the gap between practice in the formal and the informal sectors, or at least between the formal sector and the region of the field work, continues to widen as the formal sector takes part in ever more quality initiatives.

It may be assumed that such practice in the Higher Education community is considered to be good practice, or working toward it (Quality Assurance Agency 2000). The lack of parallel structures in Roman Catholic Church based education is then interesting if not disturbing. Is there is a reasonable argument that this second kind of practice is, indeed, a different kind of "thing", a different process, requiring different processes surrounding it? It is possible that the approach taken to the Christian religious education of adults mitigates the need for such structures (see: Astley 2000a and below). It may be that there is an assumption that all those teaching in the informal sector follow perceived good

practice in the creation of modules, session plans, learning outcomes, assessment, etc., although this is difficult to sustain as a supposition in light of the lack of auditing structures; nor is it clear what agency or person would be making such an assumption; (see field work data on the structure of adult education in the Church as a whole and the diocese involved itself).

It is possible that what is perceived as good practice in the formal sector is not seen to have any place in the informal sector. This view is supported by questionnaire respondents who draw a contrast between "adult education courses and "teachers/tutors" and the provision offered by those within the church.

> "People seem to fear feeling inadequate if they attend Adult Education courses - embarrassed by how little they know. A teacher/lecturer does not help: it needs to be at a conversational level". (Aq20)

If this is the situation, however, the case must be made that Christian religious education of adults does not need to be supported by the same body of research and practice as other forms of adult education. This would mean that the Christian religious education of adults is a very special case of education, or that what takes place within the sector does not come under the general heading of "education". Neither experience nor the literature in the field would support such a conclusion. That the Christian religious education of adults is actually a subset of education overall (Lee 1971, and see below) is a hypothesis tested by this research.

It is possible that good practice in the formal sector is neither known nor experienced by those involved in Christian religious education of adults because these practitioners are not a part of the formal sector, and there is no conduit

between sectors through which this information could flow from one to inform the other. One aim of the questionnaire used in this research is to elicit statistical information about the number of tutors and administrators who are active in both sectors and so should be able to act as that conduit. It has been argued that part time teachers are at the margin of a marginalised sector in even formal adult education (Cox 2000); it is possible that the part time tutors used in informal adult education, that is, within the specific area of Christian religious education of adults, are at the margin of even this boundary.

The case has been made by Rogers that there are two cultures, one residing in "liberal adult education" and by implication in the informal sector and one in the institutions of higher education. The first is said to be constructivist in its view of knowledge, while the other concentrates on the transfer of objective knowledge, (Rogers 2000). This is of course a generalisation and acknowledged as such by the author, yet Rogers still calls for a dialogue between the two cultures. It is my hope that this research, on the informal provision of Christian religious education of adults, supported by the field work of provision in a particular diocese, will contribute to that dialogue.

Although the field work will, for reasons of manageability, be restricted to one Roman Catholic diocese, much of the literature concerning the Christian religious education of adults crosses denominational borders. Anglican, Roman Catholic and other Christian ecclesial communities[8] join together to present and advertise informal provision in this area, (cf. Christians Studying Together in Derby). There are particular nuances which relate to specific faith groups; those that are pertinent to Roman Catholic provision will be highlighted in the discussion of the results of the field work.

Although my own experience will be part of the validation applied to the data gleaned in this study, this research does strictly not come under the heading of "ethnographic research" as generally understood (Adelman 1985; Burgess 1984; 1985; Cohen et al. 2000; Walford 1998a), for a number of reasons. There will be no observation of teaching in this research, yet such observation is essential to research which may be called ethnographic (Adelman 1985). The respondents to interviews and questionnaires will include only those directly involved with the presentation of the courses, rather than all those who might be included in an ethnographic study (Adelman 1985). However, I am not a stranger to the situation under research, which Stenhouse maintains is also a requirement of ethnography (cited in Burgess 1984).

However, it is important to note that the research crosses the boundaries between "emic" and "etic" research, boundaries which are often blurred (Freeman 1998). Those interviewed and questioned, as well as the researcher, are "within" the system being investigated; as our views are the views being elicited and examined, the nature of the information is emic. However, one part of this project is the comparison of the experiences of those in the field against the literature. This literature goes far beyond the boundaries of the field work area, and indeed well beyond the Christian religious education of adults; in that sense, this is etic research as it is concerned with the meaning made not by those who are a part of the particular group under study, but of the conjunction between the meanings they make of their experience and that presented by the literature (Freeman 1998).

1.3. ***Theoretical Framework***

The theoretical framework here is that of the interpretive tradition of the social sciences. It builds on the liberal concept of education as show below, and on the values associated with that form of education.

Further, this is a philosophical approach to the central research question, which concerns the possibility of the Christian religious *education* of adults; is it possible to undertake this process under the heading of education, or is the process always an indoctrinatory one?

Such a framework requires an investigation into a number of areas: the nature of education, then of the education of adults and of Christian education, as well as the connections between these concepts. This investigation is rooted in the literature of the field, but requires a wide ranging view of that literature.

Because the conceptual analysis which is apart of the substantive contribution of this work is underpinned by the literature of the field, it is not useful to present a separate "literature review" in the traditional and separate chapter. Rather, it became clear that the review of selected literature (from a vast field) was best woven into the thesis as a part of the whole. In other words, the review of the literature is an essential component of the conceptual analysis of the area and of the creation of the contribution made by this research. Thus, the critical review of the literature most relevant to the research is incorporated into the presentation of the conceptual framework, particularly in the chapter entitled, "Literature, Concepts and Continuum".

The theoretical framework, however, also includes an emphasis on the practicality of the work of the Christian religious education of adults. Within this, it is assumed that the Christian religious education of adults is a teleological

activity; that is, it is undertaken for a specific purpose. It is posited that there is a purpose to the activity (Holley 1978; Nipkow 1996), and that this purpose is a worthwhile object, which will be best served through a coherent and rational framework. Fieldwork was undertaken to illuminate the results of the conceptual work undertaken with the literature. The same emphasis on practicality has resulted in specific recommendations not only for further research but to the diocese concerned in the field work study.

The field work took place within only one Christian group, that is, within one Roman Catholic Diocese. This represents a narrowing of focus from the conceptual analysis, which crosses denominational lines (indeed, such lines are rarely drawn in the literature; without reference to personal biographies, one would not know the personal religious adherence – if any – of most of the authors in the academic literature).

As is explained in greater detail elsewhere, the field work is not meant to be representative, but rather illustrative. To this end, one ecclesial group was chosen to be the focus of this illustration, that group being the one most known to the researcher in question, and to which the researcher had the greatest access[9]. The context of the researcher within the group of the researched provides one leg of the validation as discussed below. Also, the grounded nature of the field work required that the researcher be not only familiar with but at home in, the context of the research.

The Roman Catholic Church is undeniably a Christian grouping, and therefore falls under the general heading of "Christian" as in the title of the research. Had the field work sought to be representative of all Christian instances of adult education, investigation in other faith groups would have been

required. However, the field work is illustrative rather than representative (and suggestions for further research, across ecclesial communities, are made in the final section). Therefore, this group was chosen as illustrative.

The purpose of the Christian religious education of adults may be expressed in a number of ways: to allow adults to live the Christian life more fully, to integrate adults more fully into the Christian community, to allow adults to more fully experience a relationship with God through and in the Christian community, and so on; these aims will be discussed more fully below. However this aim is expressed, it represents a more or less permanent change in the behaviour of the adult involved; from the point of view of those involved in this practice, such a change may be seen as "worthwhile". This tentatively places the activity within the sphere of education and learning. It is important to note that here I refer to the *intention* behind the Christian religious education of adults, rather than to its effects.

The placement is tentative because the intention of those involved in the process of Christian religious education of adults must be tested; it cannot be accepted on their words alone, as being worthwhile. (It is assumed that as adults themselves, they are freely engaging in this activity, and therefore deem it to be worthwhile at least in some sense – this is particularly the case in relation to tutors, who are volunteers, and participants, who often pay at least a nominal sum for the privilege of being involved in such undertakings). The theoretical framework extends to the assumption of worthwhileness in the minds of those involved; it does not assume a de facto worth to the Christian religious education of adults. The worth will be determined in relation to the autonomy of the learner.

From the point of view of the published literature on the subject, the end of

the Christian religious education of adults is not (or not merely) the transfer of information about specific doctrines or teachings, or even the transfer of biblical knowledge. Rather, Christian religious education, particularly where adults are concerned, aims to affect the lifestyle of the learner in such a way that life becomes more fully Christian, (Astley et al. 1992a; Lee 1973). A clear understanding of the end of the process, of the reason for undertaking it is essential to the process as a whole, because while the end may not justify the means, it should certainly dictate them (Lee 1971). The end of Christian education is an ultimately personal one for the learner (Astley et al. 1992a). These concepts will be developed more fully below.

The Christian religious education of adults then, becomes a process of facilitation of worthwhile change in the faith life of the learner. Again, "worthwhile" is predicated of the intentions of those involved.

"Faith" is a remarkably difficult word to define, partially because it is such a personal thing (Astley 2002; Raman 2004; Sims-King 1997). For the purposes of this study, "faith" will be defined according to the concept underlined by Fowler, that is, not according to what the faith is in, but rather, the commitment this faith evokes in the faithful person, the entire orientation of the faithful person (Fowler, 1981, as cited in Astley 2002; Sims-King 1997). This definition has been chosen because it is adequate in relation to faith related education[10]. Faith is a process of meaning making (Astley 1992).

This definition of the Christian religious education of adults raises a further question. The methods used to deliver religious education as a whole have been under scrutiny for quite some time, (Aubrey 1948; Carr 1994; Nichols 1992; Stubblefield 1993; White 1972). There is relatively little work, however, which

relates specifically to the Christian religious education of adults, (Foltz 1986). The present research will investigate the literature in this area, as well as the conceptual issues involved, particularly in relation to method - what is "education", what is "indoctrination", and do they overlap in practice? What is the relationship, in theory, between "education", "nurture", "preaching" and "indoctrination"? Is it possible to educate religiously, to aim to affect changes in faith-life behaviour, and still be free from a justifiable charge of indoctrination?

1.4. *Contribution*

This research will make a contribution to four different areas: first, the literature on the Christian religious education of adults; the second, to the work of those engaged in the in this work (practitioners), thirdly, it provides a link between theory and practice, and finally, it provides a conceptual basis for the Christian religious education of adults.

There are gaps in the literature on the Christian religious education of adults, as acknowledged by the scholars within it (see below). This research goes some way providing a synthesis of the literature, which has mainly been directed toward school based education. This work relates and synthesises the literature surrounding religious education with theoretical aspects of the Christian religious education of adults to qualitative obtained from practitioners, administrators and participants. The research provides a conceptual map, providing an analytical means of discussing the various types of the Christian religious education of adults, from one end of the spectrum (indoctrination) to the other (education, "pure").

As with any exercise of this kind, filling some gaps allows others, previously unnoticed, to come to prominence; these are highlighted at the end of the work under the heading of "Further Research".

Secondly, this research makes a contribution to the work of those engaged in the Christian religious education of adults. To this extent, the research is "praxis- oriented" (Humphries 1997), as it aims to be of use to those in the field, by providing a link between theory and practice.

It does this by creating a partial map of the view of provision which currently exists in the diocese, or at least, which existed at a particular moment in time, including a taxonomy of the type of courses provided. This overview is lacking at the moment, and this lack obviously has consequences for the allocation of resources, the provision of courses, the training of catechists and tutors, etc.[11] This map is provided in chart form in the appendices.

Thirdly, by providing a link between the theory and the actual practice of the Christian religious education of adults in the locality, this research will provide a basis for reflection on that provision, and suggestions for the future.

The research will also suggest ways forward in the training of catechists[12], by delineating and highlighting issues of good practice in relation to the Christian religious education of adults. The research draws out from the field work the concepts of "good practice" in the Christian religious education of adults, from those involved in the three sectors of administration, teaching and learning, and maps these against those proposed by the literature[13].

Finally, and most importantly, this research provides a clear conceptual basis and justification for the Christian religious education of adults, one which elevates it from the charge of indoctrination, and firmly places it within the

practice of education per se.

1.5. *Overview*

The following research seeks to answer the philosophical question: is it logically possible to undertake this particular type of education (the Christian religious education of adults) without also being involved in processes which are, of themselves, indoctrinatory? The literature provides opinions that any teaching of religion which is faith-based must, of itself, be an instance of indoctrination; this work will investigate this claim in relation to the informal Christian religious education of adults.

The thesis itself begins with the methodological information and reflection. This is placed at the beginning of the work, rather than after the conceptual analysis (where it might be expected to be) for a number of reasons.

The first is the pragmatic one of readership. Throughout this research, the grounded nature of the contribution to practitioners in the field was kept at the forefront of the work. Practitioners are more likely to focus on the conceptual analysis and particularly the field work; therefore placing the reflections on methodology at the beginning of the work allows practitioners to concentrate on the results of the work directly.

Secondly, the conceptual analysis contains both the literature review and the conceptual contribution based on that review, which is then illustrated by the field work. Therefore, placing the second directly after the first makes sense in terms of the narrative flow of the work, allowing the reader to go smoothly from one to the other.

Finally, the methodological reflections should inform the reader of the lens

through which the work of the conceptual analysis as well as the field work was viewed, therefore the reflections must to proceed the other findings.

The first part of the research is literature based. This includes a wide ranging examination of the literature, as applicable to the question in hand. Such literature needs to include not only that relating to indoctrination, but also to adult education, and the Christian education of adults more generally. Further, it is necessary to examine the concept of informal education.

The location of this type of education in the informal sector is an important factor in this research. The informal sector is vastly under researched, and in many ways difficult to define, much less investigate.

This investigation of the literature was informed throughout by the researcher's experience in both the informal and formal sectors, as one means of triangulation.

The different sources, often unrelated to one another, were drawn together following the thread outlined above, of the possibility of non-indoctrinatory practice (or not) within the informal sector of the Christian religious education of adults.

However, whether something is possible in the abstract is no guarantee that it takes place in the field. Field work was undertaken to ascertain the relevance of the literature to the work of those actually in the field, in one particular locality at one particular time. The field work included both questionnaires and interviews.

Respondents were drawn from one particular Roman Catholic diocese, under the three headings of participant, tutor and administrator. Each of these three groups was asked broadly the same questions, whether on the

questionnaires (designed to elicit background data) or interviews (semi structured, and designed to elicit "thick, rich" data).

In Section Three, the field work data are analysed in view of the results of the investigation of the literature, and the framework which resulted from that investigation. Section Four presents the conclusions from both the literature investigation and field work, along with recommendations for further research.

---

[1] (See: Committee for Catechesis and Adult Christian Education 2000; Congregation for the Clergy 1997). The other acronym commonly used of this process in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, CCD; this is almost always aimed at school age children who do not attend parochial (faith-based) schools.

[2] It is my experience that work with adults is much less structured in the Roman Catholic Church than work with children. There are any number of work schemes for teaching young children, and many to choose from when preparing people for Confirmation (usually between the ages of 11 and 16 in this country). However, schemes of work to be used with adults are few and far between in the UK.

[3] A further spur to the direction of my research came while teaching a formal sector module; during the module it became clear that factual information to be presented in the next session (on the archaeology of the Celts) would undermine the religious beliefs of a student in the class. The ethical considerations raised by this situation led to a conference paper and directly to my interest in philosophical issues touching on religious beliefs.

[4] During the writing of this thesis, I was visited while teaching for the ecumenical, "Christians Studying Together in Derby", by the Director of Adult Education for the Anglican Diocese of Derby. This took the shape of a visit to a part of the class: there was no feedback from the observation, and as far as I am aware, no documentation pertaining to it. As a mentor in the School of Continuing Education's PGCCE programme, I have observed the teaching of a member of the clergy of the diocese, who is a student on that course. This observation fed into the PGCCE course, and into the course structure and design of the particular learning programme; however, it was not fed back to the diocese overall.

[5] During the course of this research, "Christians together in Derby", administered mainly through the Anglican diocese of Derby, did request very brief cvs from its tutors. Also during this time, the Bishops' Certificate in Lay Ministry (Diocese of Southwell) underwent the process of certification by the University of Lampeter; it is to be expected that this institution will require CVs from tutors. However, this change effectively takes the Certificate (now "The Certificate in Lay Ministry") out of the informal sector and into the formal, at least for that part of it which is accredited by Lampeter.

Also in the course of teaching on this Certificate in 2003-4, a system of student evaluation of teaching was brought in for the days which were mandatory for all students (as opposed to those in the specialisms which are attended by only a small group of students). None of these instances, however were under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Diocese involved in the research; they are merely illustrative of the movement in other denominational providers.

[6] Tutor/catechist training courses are available, and are sometimes recommended to tutors. However, as there is no system of observation or feedback, it is difficult to know how these are tailored to suit the needs of participants. As there have been no central records, it is difficult to know which, or how many, of the tutors active in the diocese at any given time have availed themselves of the training on offer.

[7] The Education and Formation Committee of the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales has produced a schema of accredited courses which would be offered across the country as a response to the opportunity now available to claim funding for accredited courses. To my knowledge, this is not being offered in the Diocese in question, although something analogous is being offered.

[8] "Ecclesial communities" is a term used by the Roman Catholic Church to refer to groups such as the Baptist Community, the United Reform Church, etc.(Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 2000). The term, "church" is used differently by different authors/groups: in Roman Catholic documents, it refers generally to the Catholic Church (Roman and other Rites), and at other times, to the Greek Orthodox Church (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 2000, etc.; Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II (Second Vatican Council) 1966). In contrast, much of the literature around religious education in general, and especially that concerned with Christian religious education uses "church" to mean, roughly, "the body of Christian believers, and the myriad of structures therein". This has a great confusion potential in research such as this, which begins with a wide frame of reference, then narrows to examine one, particular ecclesial community. For this reason, precision will be used in relation to the following terms: "church" will be used as it is used in the literature, to mean "the Christian communities"; "ecclesial community" will be used to refer to specific groups within that community; "Roman Catholic", "Baptist", etc. will be used to refer to specific, named ecclesial communities as appropriate.

[9] As is clear from the context set out in Appendix 6.1, the researcher also had access to at least one Church of England diocese during the time of the research. However, this access would not have afforded the same breadth of respondents with the same ease as did the Roman Catholic Diocese in question, nor is the researcher's background in that particular ecclesial community.

[10] For an interesting discussion of the nature of different types of faith, see (Raman 2004).

[11] During the writing of this thesis, it became apparent that such a map of provision is of little interest to the Diocese as a whole, (personal communication, Adult Education Officer, 2003). As mentioned elsewhere, there is no central register of tutors or courses. The diocesan officials feel that such a register would

diminish parish ownership of their own provision. A map of provision was of only cursory interest to the diocese as diocesan officials felt they had no overarching responsibility for this provision.

[12] In the same way that "catechesis" is used of informal religious education in the Roman Catholic Church, those who provide these opportunities for learning tend to be referred to as "catechists", as well as the more usual terms of "teacher", "tutor", "facilitator", etc. The use of these terms may reflect differing conceptions of the goals and models of the religious education experience, see below.

[13] This does not, however, assume that concepts laid out in the literature are "right", while concepts elicited particularly from practitioners and participants have less validity.

2. Methodology

Telles likens the work of research, particularly qualitative research, to the creation of a quilt, and uses the term "bricoleur" for the researcher. This seems an apt image for this research, as it draws together the apparently widely disparate elements of the literature and practice in this field (Telles 2000).

There are two main strands to this project: conceptual analysis of the literature, which leads to the creation of a new way of understanding the process of the Christian religious education of adults, and field work within a Roman Catholic diocese. The field work was undertaken to illuminate the conceptual analysis, rather than to specifically provide new findings; however, the results of the field work do provide new information for the field. In the event, the field work led to a refinement of some of the ideas presented in the conceptual analysis.

2.1. *Justification for the methodology*

Approach

This research does not fit neatly into any particular category of "research approach". Using the chart suggested by Holloway and Todres (Holloway et al. 2003), the field work portion of the research is seen to fall more generally under the heading of "grounded theory" than either of the other options cited, "phenomenology" or "ethnography". This article presents seven elements of research, and examines how these three approaches deal with each of them. While I am aware that these are contested terms (Delamont 1992; Ely et al. 1991; Wallace et al. 1998), the schema is a useful one, which will be adopted here to situate the present work. The authors suggest that research be regarded under a

series of headings: goal, research question, data gathering, analysis, presentation of results, knowledge claims and historical background.

The goal

One goal here is to illuminate any connections which exist between the literature on the Christian religious education of adults and the experience of those actually involved in such, in the informal sector. Along with this aim, there is another of research into the viability of this activity as a species of education, which includes the experience and views on this issue from practitioners. Finally, an important goal of the research is to provide information to practitioners about the field itself, and to the involved about practice within it.

Within the contexts held out by Holloway and Todres, this straddles the categories of phenomenology and grounded theory, in that it seeks to understand and interpret meanings of experiences at a individual level (phenomenology) and also of how particular concepts and activities fit together (grounded theory). It does not address the issue of the interconnectedness of those involved, or the social relationships they form (Adelman 1985; Cohen et al. 2000).

Research question

The central research question of this work is the simple one, "Is Christian religious education of adults a valid instance of 'education', and can it take place without indoctrination?". The literature search enabled the construction of a conceptual framework for the answer to this question, and the field work provided grounded information about how (and if) that framework applies in practice.

Under this heading, the work falls firmly within the parameters of phenomenology, in that it examines the structure of the experience, rather than

attempting to formulate theory from experience (grounded theory) or foregrounding social interaction (ethnography).

Data gathering

The data with which Holloway and Todres are concerned here arises from fieldwork, rather than conceptual analysis; this very fact means that this research will not fit neatly into any of their categories, as the conceptual analysis is fundamental to the entire project.

The qualitative element of this work falls within the general category proposed as phenomenological, in that it is "focused on the depth of a particular experience...." (Holloway et al. 2003, pg. 348). This description is far closer to the work undertaken than that for grounded theory (which includes a variety of methods and stages) or ethnography, which requires observation and intensive field work.

Neither of these last two was undertaken in this research, for a variety of reasons. Observation does not form a part of the teaching in the informal sector in the diocese. Teachers in the formal sector still often feel some discomfort at even peer observation,[14] yet it could be argued that peer observation is part and parcel of professional life in the formal sector. Implementing observational techniques in the course of this research would have been interesting and possibly have yielded important data; however, it would also have, in the researcher's opinion, have caused undue anxiety on the part of the tutors observed[15], and been overly costly in terms of time. There is a further, ethical consideration here. Most of the groups involved in the case study area are small – 6 to 15 people at most. The addition of an observer, for one or two meetings out of a series, can be very disruptive, particularly if the observer does not take

part in the sessions.

Further, observation would have yielded a type of data not required by the present research, (although it would be very useful research for the future). The present research concentrated on the perceptions of practitioners, rather than on correlating those perceptions to observed behaviour (see recommendations for future research).

This lack of direct observation clearly takes the present work outside the realm of ethnography (Burgess 1984), even if it does retain elements of ethnographic work.

Analysis

The information given for the three approaches under this heading is not highly differentiated. It is possible to discern differences between them, so that the present work is situated again within phenomenology, as it uses a thematic approach to analysis, with themes which have arisen from the literature. This cross checking between the literature and the experience of practitioners is vital for the object of the research; therefore it was imperative that the framework for analysis arose from the literature.

However, that framework was not imposed on the field work data in any way which did violence to the information contained therein; rather, the original framework was slightly adapted – mainly by having subheadings added – so that it more closely followed the information elicited from the respondents.

In this way, it would be possible to say that there were, at least, ethnographic elements in the field work. The use of coding and the discernment of patterns is certainly an element of ethnography (Burgess 1984; Holloway et al. 2003; Potter 2001). According Holloway and Todres, ethnographic research

searches for the constituent elements of local culture; to some extent, the interviews in the field work did this, by asking respondents why they felt the diocese mounted courses such as those with which they were involved.

I would argue, on the basis of both the field work data and my own knowledge of the field, that there is no "local culture" among tutors, administrators and participants of Christian religious education of adults in the diocese.[16] That is, there is no shared training, no clear sharing of nomenclature or specific language and no or few opportunities to come together as members of these different groups to grow such culture.

Here, this research does not sit quite so easily under the heading of grounded theory, as that seeks to use analysis as a means to the creation of theory. Rather, the theory arose from the literature review, and was compared to the data in the interview phase. This provided the comparison and organisation called for by grounded theory, but it was not the main impetus of the work.

Presentation of results

Under this heading, there is not such a great difference between the listed approaches, as particularly phenomenology and grounded theory lead to explanations of the essential elements derived from the data. Clearly, this research does not fall under the heading of ethnography, as it does not set out to tell the story of a particular group of people; rather, it seeks to look at their responses to particular sets of issues. Although data was collected on gender, employment status, etc., of the respondents, this data has no bearing on the responses. As a researcher, I make no attempt to speak on behalf of any of the groups involved (Pendlebury et al. 2001).

Knowledge claims

Here, the present research fits under the heading of grounded theory. As discussed above, there is no attempt to present transferable data from the field work; this is not possible considering the dearth of empirical data concerning the number of courses, background to tutors, etc., available not only in this diocese but nationally and internationally. Transferable qualities are required of data from phenomenological research.

Ethnography tends to concentrate on the way people react to situations and to others. While it is true that the interview schedule did probe respondents' reactions to specific issues (in the form of the question, "why are you involved..."), this was not the central question of the research.

Grounded theory, on the other hand, produces or seeks to produce a plausible theory that can be used again, and tested against other situations; it seeks to explain. The conceptual analysis has created a framework (a theory about what education is) against which the field work data was matched. This theory could be used again in different situations and contexts (see recommendations for further research).

Historical background

This work again straddles phenomenological work and grounded research: philosophy is given under the first, and sociology under the second. As a work of the philosophy of education, (which is a part of the social sciences), this research fits somewhere in between the two.

Phenomenologically grounded theory

Overall, this research fits somewhere between the two categories of

phenomenological research and grounded theory research. That this should happen is not overly surprising, as the research itself straddles a number of different disciplines, calling on educational theory, on philosophy and then again on theology. Indeed, the authors of the schema used above do not argue for an exclusive use of one approach or another (Holloway et al. 2003).

Sampling

Non-probability sampling techniques were used for the field work, for both the postal questionnaires and the interviews.

Probability sampling requires concrete knowledge of the entire population involved in the field work (Robson 1993; Wengraf 2001). Such knowledge was not and is not available for this population. Probability sampling may lead to results which are generalisable across a wider range of subjects than those involved in the study (Bell 1999; Robson 1993); however, the production of generalisable data was not the purpose of the qualitative research undertaken in this part of the work. This research in many ways exemplifies the non-idealized research situation which Walford mentions (1998b) as not subscribing to the 'cook- book' scenario of research situations presented in many text books; as others maintain, there is no 'blueprint' for qualitative research (Curtis et al. 2000). The outcome of social research is not numerical data, but rather an understanding of how and why people make the meanings they do from their situations (Basit 2003). For my purposes, a deliberate sampling of the population was more useful than a random one would have been.

The postal questionnaires were undertaken in essence to provide a context for the in-depth interviews which arose from them. Neither was meant to

lead to information which can be taken as representative of the entire sample, for a number of reasons.

The first is that it is not possible to speak of "the entire sample" in this case (Robson 1993), as there is no collated data about the number of courses undertaken or by whom[17]. Even the term, "adult education" is an arbitrary one, as we have seen above; is a person of 17 years of age, or 20 years of age, included in the population involved? In the field work, such deliberations were left to the respondents, rather than imposed by the researcher. Probability sampling (or true random sampling) is possible only if the entire population is known in enough detail to allow a population framework to be drawn up and used (Wengraf 2001).

Secondly, generalisable data across a field work which takes account of only one Roman Catholic diocese would be of limited value, (even if the diocese involved, as this one, is large and varied in terms of geography, urban and rural parishes, etc..). It is not clear that a good case could be made that such data, even if it could be obtained, would be representative of other denominations, or of other Roman Catholic dioceses, particularly outside of England and Wales. Probability sampling should lead to results which allow statistical inferences which can be applied to a larger sample (Robson 1993); it would not be possible to prove that this sample would lead to such applications.

Thirdly and most importantly, however, the purpose for which the field work was undertaken was not one which required a representative sample. Rather, the field work was undertaken to find links (should they exist) between the literature on the subject and the experiences of those involved in the subject in the field. As such, the field work aims to be illustrative and supportive rather than representative. The field work presents a snap shot of current practice; it allows

that practice to be seen and evaluated as it was reported at one given time, by three representative groups of people.

Thus, there is no intention of being able to generalise from the experiences of those in the field work to the world-wide, or even nation-wide experience of catechists, administrators or participants involved in the Christian religious education of adults. This makes the use of non-probability sampling acceptable (Blaxter et al. 1996; Robson 1993).

Rather than a randomized sample, then, a purposive, theoretical one was used, one which would allow the investigation of particular issues raised by the conceptual analysis (Robson 1993) and the examination of the continuum against practice in the field. The sample was based both on the literature and on my own, 'insider' knowledge of the sample groups themselves (cf. Pendlebury et al. 2001; Wengraf 2001). In making these recommendations I do not attempt to speak for the researched, (Pendlebury et al. 2001), which is rightly seen as a danger of educational research. Rather, I speak from the basis of the conceptual analysis, aligned to my own practice in the formal and informal fields, as well as the data gleaned from the process of field work.

In both the postal and the interview stages of the field work, respondents were categorised in three groups: administrators, tutors and students (participants). The second and third groupings are fairly obvious ones to use in any educational research; the first might require some explanation.

For the most part, the "administrators" queried were members of the clergy. The inclusion of this group was mandated by the power that they have over the provision of Christian religious education of adults in a Roman Catholic diocese. Although there is a move toward centralisation in catechesis, on both a

diocesan and national basis,[18] for the most part, adult education in the diocese is provided on a parochial basis. Thus, it is often the parish priest who makes the decision about what will be offered, as was pointed out by one of the respondents, as his is the responsibility for catechesis in his parish (A3) (776, John Paul II 1983). The inclusion of the clergy also allowed for interesting triangulation in relation to some of the issues raised on the questionnaires, particularly in relation to the answers provided by the tutors.

In many senses, the delineation of the groups into quota areas is artificial: many people in the sample groups will cross boundaries, in that they will be at one time participant, at another, tutor, at another, perhaps, fulfil an administrative role. In general, those involved in the interview stage were approached under one particular heading, (that of tutor, administrator or participant); however, in one case, the respondent requested to be treated as a member of a different group than had originally been envisaged (a request which was, of course, honoured and the correct interview schedule was substituted). It may also be argued, from the point of theory, that all three of the groups should have the same goal in mind, and indeed others researching in education have found this to be the case, across different but similar groupings (Wallace et al. 1998). In point of fact, there were some differences in the aims and goals of the groupings.

The decision about sampling groups was made early on in research as the constituent bodies of people were clear from the outset, based on researcher's experience (Blaxter et al. 1996). Subsequent work has confirmed the validity of the choice – cf. homogeneity of responses among groups but not across them. In one sense, this tallies with Flick's "abstract" strategy for sampling, as the categories were defined before the field work began; yet in another, this choice

arose from my own familiarity with the field – so that the choice of the categories, while not emerging directly from the field work data, has emerged from the field work area, thus coming under what Flick lists as a "gradual definition" of the sample (Flick 2002).

Combining these two views of sampling, the groups were defined before the field work began, and the individuals to be interviewed were chosen not on any idea of representativeness of their group, but rather on the basis of new insights they could bring (Flick 2002) (a judgement which could only be made on the researcher's knowledge of both the field and the respondents). Thus, a wide range of respondents were chosen particularly for the interview part of the research; respondents were chosen who had been known either to disagree with each other (publicly or privately) or to hold divergent views; interviewees were not told the names of others interviewed, however. As far as possible, such divergence was sought within groups (administrators, tutors and students) as well as across them.

Respondents were also sought who would bring divergence in characteristics (age, gender, breadth of focus) between interviewees. In view of the field work locus, divergence in gender among administrators (who are, overwhelmingly, priests and therefore men, in the Roman Catholic Church) was problematic.

Sampling criteria should be defined in relation to the theory of the research presented (Flick 2002). In the case of this research, the intentions of those involved in the Christian religious education of adults are the focal point of the delineation between indoctrination and nurture. Those chosen for interview were those who, in the opinion of the researcher based not only on personal

experience but on expertise evidenced and roles undertaken within the diocese, were best placed to reflect on their own intentions and desires in relation to the Christian religious education of adults.

As Flick maintains,."The basic principle of theoretical sampling is to select cases or case groups according to concrete criteria concerning their content instead of using abstract methodological criteria" (Flick 2002, pg. 66). This is the type of sampling used to create the categories of administrator, tutor and participant. That used for the participants themselves was a combination of open sampling, (fortuitous) (Strauss et al. 1990) and directed sampling, in that an attempt was made across a wide area to obtain interviews of different ages, genders, states of life, etc.

This is a further reason that no "representative" sampling was used for the interviews: what was required from the interviewees was not "the party line" as one interviewee called it (P2), but rather their own reflections, their own "meaning" as created by their experience of Christian religious education of adults. This was necessary not only for validity, but also in to be true to the research itself. However, such responses are of necessity individual and the ability to generalise from them is dubious at best.

The type of sampling used for this research then, was *purposive* and *theoretical.* The basic group from which respondents were drawn was the entire adult population of the diocese; however, within that overall population, certain groups were identified as being of particular interest; therefore, the sampling might also be typified as quota sampling. It presents a picture of the situation in the diocese at a given time.

Within the concept of quota sampling, one looks for representatives not of

the entire population but of groups within that population (Robson 1993). Within those groups, convenience sampling is often used, as to some extent it was here (Robson 1993). Yet again, the importance of knowledge of the group in question is highlighted in the literature; Wengraf speaks of being a 'native' of the overall group (Wengraf 2001, 98). Although I could not claim to be a 'native' of all the sample groups at the time of this research, I have been involved as administrator, tutor and participant in a diocese, and so felt able to work with some authority in relation to delineation of categories[19].

Curtis et al offer six points of evaluation for sampling techniques, based on the work of Miles and Huberman (1994) (Curtis et al. 2000). This seems a useful tool for evaluation of the sampling process used in this research.

Evaluation of sampling

First, the strategy used to create the sample for the research should connect to the conceptual framework of the overall project. In the case of this research, the conceptual framework included the concept of the Christian religious education of adults as an instance of education: this implies that it is an organised activity, involving not only the learner herself, but those who facilitate the learning. Further, there are arguments that education, properly speaking, must include some concept of an organisation. The delineation of the sample group into tutors and participants is fairly straightforward under this heading; the addition of a group who are not directly involved in the delivery of Christian religious education of adults (at least, not in terms of the interview schedule) relates to this final point of the organisation required for education to take place.

As seen above, the current work falls somewhere between phenomenological research and grounded theory work. In terms of sampling

strategy, this is again the case. A phenomenological approach would indicate a directed sample, based on the knowledge of the field possessed by the researcher; a grounded theory approach, on the other hand, would set few limits to the number or type of interview at the outset of the research (Cutcliffe 2000). Because of my knowledge of those to be interviewed, as well as the time and space restrictions involved in the production of a work of this sort, a limited sample, with numbers decided at the outset, was appropriate.

The second point is that the sample must lead to "thick" data. On this criteria, the choice of the groupings of tutors and participants is obvious, as the continuum proposed depends on the meanings made by the participants as well as the intention of the tutors. The use of a group of administrators is not validated by this particular criteria. However, in terms of their input into the process, they provided important and useful background data, relating to the thinking of the local hierarchy about the Christian religious education of adults.

Thirdly, the sample set should increase the ability of the data generated to be applied to a wider sample. This is not in terms of statistical generalisability, but rather in term of the analytic concepts involved. The three groups cover all the eventualities of those directly involved in the Christian religious education of adults in the diocese.[20]

The fourth point concerns the believability of the data from the sample; the story that the respondent tells must be not only recognisable as relating to the concepts under investigation but must be believable in itself. A tutor who responded that she had never encountered any obstacles in her teaching, had never in any way sought to influence the belief of a student, had always had the complete support of the clergy and all possible qualifications for teaching, would

be less than believable and would for that reason add little to the data elicited by the study.

Every source is likely to be biased in one way or another: indeed, it is for the strong views respondents had on the subject of Christian religious education of adults that respondents were sought for interview. However, these biases must be taken into account when analysing the data produced (Curtis et al. 2000), both in terms of what might be expected from a particular source before the interview, and how the data from one source is used in relation to other sources. This has been done in relation to the interview data, at least as far as possible, in view of the anonymity promised to respondents.

The penultimate point is an ethical one, or a series of ethical considerations; is it possible to obtain informed consent, etc., in the sample group? For the moment it will suffice to note that confidentiality was guaranteed to respondents, (although a number of them indicated that this was not necessary, and a number of postal returns were signed).[21]

The final issue raised is the practical one of feasibility, and this under five headings. The first is that of resources available to the researcher, in terms of time and money. In the case of the present work, the postal questionnaires were supported through mailings supported by the School of Continuing Education, and all printing costs during the first four years of the research were supported by the School as well. Time considerations were taken into account in terms of the choice of respondents for the interview phase of the research. The diocese is geographically large, and respondents were for the most part chosen either because they lived or work close to my own situation or because we would be in the same places at the same time. The number of interviews was also

constrained by time and monetary concerns, as transcription costs were not supported.

Overall, twelve interviews were undertaken, four in each of the three groupings. It might be argued that there should have been more student interviews than tutor interviews, and again more tutors interviewed than administrators. While this would, one assumes (in the absence of data) come closer to a proportional representation of these groups as they exist in the diocese, it is again necessary to reiterate that there was no attempt to concoct a representative sample either of the groups themselves or of the groupings as a whole. Using an equal number of respondents in each group allowed for the creation of the "snap shot" view of provision sought in the field work.

Rather, a balance of numbers across the groupings was chosen to allow for the collection of roughly the same amount of data from each group. In practice, this did not turn out to be the case, with some groupings providing far richer data than others. This imbalance was expected at the outset of the research (e.g. that students might have thought more deeply about these issues than administrators, and that tutors would have reflected on them more than the other two groupings).

Another practical issue which is raised by Curtis et al and which was considered was that of access (Curtis et al. 2000). Postal addresses for a large group of people were readily available; my own familiarity with the diocese provided inroads into other areas where access might have been otherwise problematic.

It should be noted that in terms of the postal questionnaire, issues of access may have had a skewing result on the data gleaned from the participant

questionnaire. The most readily available list of participants was the list of those who had completed the diaconate training. All of these men had been trained (the word used, rather than "educated") within the diocese, their details were published in the year book and on the website.

However, this training programme is very different from much of the other Christian religious education of adults offered in the diocese, so the data gleaned from the questionnaires must be seen in this light. It is, of course, impossible to tell how many of the participant respondents were "graduates" of the course (other than those who listed that course specifically as one they had undertaken). Questionnaires were also distributed to members of the Preparing for Ministry course, and through other outlets as well[22].

The final point raised under this heading concerns the researcher's work style and competencies for the work in hand. During the interview phase of this research, my employment changed from being focused on administration to research per se. This change of direction was a useful one, as it allowed me to concentrate on research and particularly interviewing skills to a much greater extent. Although I had conducted numerous interviews in the course of my previous employment[23] the change to a research post was a valuable one in terms of concentration on issues.

Validity

Cohen and Manion offer a useful list for discussion of validity in qualitative research. Again in the interests of structure, I will use their list as a framework for discussion here (Cohen et al. 2000, pg. 108). Their list includes: confidence in the data; the authenticity of the data (the ability of the research to report a

situation through the eyes of the participants); the cogency of the data; the soundness of the research design; the auditability of the data; the dependability of the data; the confirmability of the data. Many of these issues have been dealt with above; here it remains to pull these disparate issues together.

Confidence in the data, the authenticity of the data and the cogency of the data

Confidence in the data from the interview and questionnaire phases of this research rests on confidence in the individual participant to discuss issues truthfully. Other forms of confidence (spread of data, generalisability, etc.) are not relevant. What was important was to be sure that, for example, an administrator understood that it was as administrator that they were answering the questions, and to be as certain as possible that respondents were not, as P2 highlighted, "carrying the party line".

The soundness of the research design

The research design was conceived in view of the central research question (Wengraf 2001); it was designed to provide data from the field which related to, and supported (or otherwise) the outcome of the conceptual analysis.

Analysis of the field work data allowed a refinement of the conceptual analysis, so that it more clearly relates to the work of practitioners.

Auditability, dependability, and confirmability of the data.

The auditability of the data in the field work portion of this research is not germane, as again, there is no implication that the results can be generalised beyond the local sample used.

The dependability of the data from the interviews, in particular, rests to a

great extent on two issues, that of the design of the interview schedule (e.g. could it reasonably be expected to elicit the data needed) and that of the researcher's knowledge of the respondents.

The formation of the interview schedule is discussed elsewhere; here it need only be noted that the central research question was not directly formulated in the interview schedule, due to concern about "leading the witness".

The knowledge and experience of the researcher throughout this work has formed one leg of the research process. The method of choosing interview respondents has been detailed above; here it should also be noted that respondents were also chosen if not for their familiarity with the interview process (at least two respondents have been involved in research) then for the researcher's assessment that they, as respondents, would deal well with the concept of an interview, with being recorded, and with contributing to such research.

Context of the research

This research relates the theory of the Christian religious education of adults to practice in a particular Roman Catholic Diocese of England and Wales.

The diocese is not named specifically; enough detail about the diocese will be given to provide a context to the research, but not to identify it.

The Diocese has a Catholic population of over 100,000, with a Mass attendance (judged on one Sunday a year) of just over one third of this number. There are c.150 priests resident in the diocese, with the addition of nine foreign priests and six priests temporarily in the diocese. Of these, 20 priests are listed as officially retired. This leave just over 300 priests to minister to the population, a ratio of around one priest per 100 people who attend Mass, or one priest per

every 400+ people listed as Catholic in the diocese. Of the resident priests listed, c.20 have academic qualifications listed (although it is possible that not all those entitled to such qualifications have them listed in the yearbook). Clergy ages are not listed in the yearbook, but dates of ordination are: the earliest overall date of ordination is listed as 1939, and the earliest date for a priest still actively serving the diocese is 1949 (all statistics from relevant diocesan yearbook). As ordination is not normally conferred unless a man has reached the age of 25 (1032, John Paul II 1983), this would mean that the oldest priest still serving in the diocese was at least 79 years of age in 2000, if ordained at the youngest possible age.

The diocese is geographically large, comprising in whole or in part the five counties. It encompasses both urban and rural areas. In 2000, there were 20 diocesan societies (or national/international societies with a presence in the diocese) which listed either "learning", "study", "dissemination of knowledge" or "learning" among their aims, out of those listed in the yearbook (this is just under one half of the societies listed).

Adult education programmes which cover a very wide range of topics, methods and issues. At the moment, there is no comprehensive catalogue of provision in the diocese (personal communication, Diocesan Adult Education Officer, June, 2001).

Provision in the diocese is fragmented across various groups and boundaries, (such as diaconatetraining, under the direct supervision of a particular member of the clergy[24]; Eucharistic ministerial training, under the supervision of a committee composed mainly of laity and not closely related to other diocesan bodies; RCIA provision[25], nominally under the control of the diocese but often undertaken with little or no interaction with the centre; a wide

range of courses in an ecumenical, yearly cycle, through the auspices of the Adult Education Office; training for Readers; a lay ministerial training programme validated by an Irish university and with no clear connection to the diocese; the Catholic Certificate in Religious Studies, which prepares teachers for work in Catholic Schools[26], parish programmes, often mounted with no interaction with the diocese at all; as well as direct training for catechists given by the Adult Education Officer).

2.2. ***Method***

Sources

Information for this study was gathered from a number of sources: the literature surrounding the Christian Religious Education of Adults, a postal questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, the collection of documentary evidence and finally personal reflections from myself as a long time practitioner in the field.

The main sources of data from field sources were a postal questionnaire and semi-structured interviews[27].

Through the use of these three means of gaining data, the requirements of both first and second order research will be fulfilled (Freeman 1998), with the questionnaires for the most part providing information about first order information – what people do – and the interviews providing second order information – what people think about what they do. There is some cross over among these means of getting data, as the questionnaires do have some qualitative questions, and the interviews will include some quantitative information.

This dual nature of the enquiry is important (cf., Maxwell, 1996, cited in Wengraf 2001). Although the results of the quantitative information (courses

which are taught, the proportion of tutors with qualifications, the requirements for teaching imposed by administrators) will be important both as grounding for the research and it is hoped for the diocese itself, it is the qualitative data, the second order information about what those involved in the Christian religious education of adults in the field work area think about what they are doing which is the pivotal point of the search for data. The questionnaires provide the background for the interviews (Burgess 1984), informing the framing of the descriptive questions for the interviews (cf. Spradley, 1979, as cited in Burgess 1984). Together with my own practitioner reflection and the literature in the field, this model of data acquisition should be a 'well designed' object which serves the purposes for which it is designed (Wengraf 2001).

Postal Questionnaires

The process began with a postal questionnaire sent to a wide range of those involved in the work of the Christian religious education of adults in the diocese. The purpose of the questionnaire is three fold.

First, it goes some way to providing quantitative data about those who provide, oversee and participate in such provision in the diocese. The questionnaire also provided an opportunity to amass limited qualitative data from a larger group of the population than would have been possible through direct interview.

Secondly, the questionnaires provided a framework for the semistructured interviews.

Finally, the information gleaned from these questionnaires will, it is hoped, be of use to the diocese in its own evaluation its provision for the Christian

religious education of adults.

Postal questionnaires were chosen as a means of acquiring information (mainly quantitative, but including some qualitative data) from a wide range of respondents. This form of data gathering is frequently seen as a good, or best available means of acquiring information in educational research (Cohen et al. 2000). The use of these three groups, administrator, tutor and participant covers the range of persons involved in the provision of adult religious education within the diocese.

The main research questions involved in this study (the relationship between education, the Christian religious education of adults, and indoctrination, etc.) do not lend themselves to responses gleaned by postal questionnaires. Rather, the relationship between these different types of learning provision was to be elicited during interviews. However, postal questionnaires perform a number of functions within this study.

Firstly, the questionnaires provide background information in relation to the provision of such courses in the field work area. This information will not lead to statistically perfect information about the provision in the diocese; however, it will give the beginnings of an overview of the types of courses on offer.

Secondly, the questionnaires provide a wide spread means of gaining very limited amounts of qualitative data.

Thirdly, the questionnaires served to raise the awareness of this research within the diocese, thus beginning to form, or perhaps changing, the relationship of the researcher to the researched, (cf. Burgess 1984).

This raising of awareness has both positive and possibly negative effects.

One perhaps negative, or at least problematic effect, is that is highly likely

that those who are interviewed will have been at least recipients, if not respondents, to the questionnaire (as the questionnaires are designed to be anonymous, there is in theory no way to trace which interviewees have responded (Cohen et al. 2000). This may serve to allow respondents more time to think about the issues before the interviews than might otherwise be the case. However, the real research questions are not touched on the questionnaires, and have rarely been raised by respondents even within the qualitative sections of the returns.

Background to the questionnaires

As mentioned above, there is no comprehensive list of course offerings within the diocese. Indeed, there is a) no reason that there should be such a listing and b) almost no way such a listing could be compiled, let alone maintained. These two issues are closely related.

Offerings within the parishes vary enormously: some will follow well established paths, calling on a range of printed or otherwise available material, (Catholic Alpha, RCIA, Life in the Spirit, etc.). Other offerings will be seasonal (Lent/Advent groups), others will respond to events in the life of the parish (parents' preparation for First Communion/Confirmation) or the life of the Church (offerings relating to newly published documents, for instance). Some courses may have 20 or more people attending for a period of months (a large RCIA group), some may have five or less people attend for a few sessions only (an Advent housegroup).

Although in theory all such offerings come under the purview of the parish priest some may be instigated by schools, by justice and peace groups, by prayer groups, etc.

Keeping track of this multiplicity of courses would entail a great deal of work for parish staff which is already over worked .

Further, it is not at all clear what purposed would be served by a complete register.

As a researcher in this area, I would welcome such a ready reckoner; however, the Church does not exist for the convenience of educational researchers. Rather, its educational mission is clearly given in Mat. 36.6, "Go and make disciples of all nations". Resources in the church are increasingly limited; tying up these resources on record keeping which has no direct or apparent value would be difficult to defend.

This does not negate either the responsibility borne by the church as a whole for the Christian religious education of adults or the parish priest's duty in relation to it; however, even in a world of OFSTED and the Quality Assurance Authority, the availability of detailed information about provision does not equate to quality of provision.

A further issue has been raised by the Diocesan Director of Adult Education: there is no wish for such a central register in the diocese (personal communication, 2003). As highlighted above, this relates to the way the Christian religious education of adults is envisioned in the diocese: the central driving force for it should be the parish (or rather, the Eucharistic community, which may be larger than one parish), rather than the diocese. Those working for the diocese in relation to adult education see themselves at the service of parishes, rather than either imposing upon them or controlling them in any way. Keeping a central register of courses or tutors is not considered part of the function of this service[28].

Questionnaire design

The design of the postal questionnaires was dictated by the desire to acquire two specific types of data: limited quantitative data and limited qualitative data. Both of these types of data are acknowledged as limited because the function of the questionnaires was not to provide the whole of the data for any particular part of this research. The information sought is outlined above: briefly, it concerned the involvement of the respondents in the Christian religious education of adults in the diocese in terms of number and types of courses (quantitative data) and elicit their thoughts on specific questions related to that provision. The delineation of these questions formed the first phase of the design of the questionnaires, following the outline suggested by Cohen et al, (Cohen et al. 2000, 246 ff.).

The questionnaires were very structured; considering the large number of questionnaires to be sent out, this choice followed the "rule of thumb" that larger samples require more closed questionnaires (Cohen et al. 2000). However, the importance of eliciting some qualitative data, at least, from this large sample, required the inclusion of a very small number of open ended questions.

In terms of types of questions, three types were used: dichotomous (yes/no) questions, questions which requested basic, numerical information (how many?) and open ended questions.

The three questionnaires were as similar as possible, so that information gleaned from one set of respondents would correlate to that from the other two sets, where possible. I was particularly interested in doing this where perceptions between groups might differ, such as whether or not support had been offered to tutors, on which the experience of tutors and administrators might differ.

In the second phase, the delineation of topics, I chose three main areas for research, two largely quantitative and one qualitative.

The first was that of the quantitative data about courses: how many had people taught/overseen/participated in, and in what curriculum areas. This information was requested of all three groups. This section also included the question, of whether or not support had been offered to tutors, as well as a question about quality control measures, i.e., the submission of course outlines before teaching began; this information was requested only of the tutor and administrator groups.

The second type of information requested had to do with the training of the tutors; tutors were asked what training they had for this work, administrators were asked what training they required/preferred tutors to have. This information was requested only from these two groups.

The final type of information requested was qualitative. All groups were asked qualitative questions in two sections of the questionnaire. At the end of the second section, on the curriculum areas, respondents were asked what other courses they had participated in; at the end of the final section, respondents were given a chance to say both what other courses they might like to see offered, and there was also a very open ended question, eliciting further comments on church based adult education.

There is no intention to transgress the parameters of word based information by turning this qualitative data into numeric data (Cohen et al. 2000). The major reason for asking open ended questions in this survey is to elicit qualitative information, not to find a different means of acquiring numerical data.

The questionnaire was not meant to (and could not hope to) achieve an in-

depth picture of the provision of religious education for adults in the diocese. Such a picture would be impossible to draw with an instrument as crude as a postal questionnaire, particularly one of such a short length; the questions included for postal responses covered large categories (e.g. Biblical courses) and made no attempt to either give or ask for a definition of "course", for instance.

Complete coverage would also require at the very least the ability to send (if not to receive back) questionnaire to all those who might be involved in the provision of such learning opportunities (as the group most likely to have an overview of the situation) or to a representative sample of such administrators (Bell 1999). As there is no comprehensive list of such administrators (because there is no list of courses) it is impossible to ensure that all administrators will be covered[29].

The questionnaire as sent to the three constituent groups, does yield at least "snap shot" data, not only of some of the provision in the diocese (assuming we can rely on the numerical data given by respondents; see below for a discussion of some problematic areas here) but also of the immediate impressions about provision from within these groups. This information, both in terms of quantitative data (the number of types of courses) and qualitative information helped to shape the interview schedule developed for the second phase of the research.

Questionnaire distribution, return rates

Questionnaires were distributed through a number of means.

Where possible, they were delivered by post; as mentioned elsewhere, there were many clergy (including deacon's) addresses available; these addresses were utilised. Addresses were also taken from the relevant diocesan

yearbook, and any other relevant publications from the diocese, including the diocesan website. Respondents suggested three addresses; these were subsequently used.

Questionnaires were also distributed at diocesan events such as the "Preparing for ministry" course, and other courses and training events. Often the only way of distribution available at such events was to highlight the research to the main session, and then to leave questionnaires at the back of the room, in the foyer, etc. Various members of the diocese also took questionnaires for distribution.

While this may have proved fruitful in terms of widening the distribution of the questionnaires, this process makes it impossible to be specific about return rates; it is impossible to know if all those who took questionnaires on the promise of distributing them to others, actually did so.

In all, 250 questionnaires were printed, of which 99 were returned. Had all of the questionnaires been distributed, this would represent a response rate of almost 40%. However, due to the uneven nature of the returns, (14 tutor responses, 54 administrator responses, 31 participant responses), I make no claims about this return rate in relation as a function of the whole of the questionnaires printer. Rather, the response rates seem to relate to the fact that it was much easier to find administrator addresses, then participant addresses and very difficult indeed to find tutor addresses: leading to the conclusion that the majority of the responses came from those which were mailed rather than entrusted to others for distribution or left in various places.

These methods of distribution were chosen in the full knowledge of the difficulties they presented. However, in the absence of a central register, as

highlighted elsewhere, they presented the best available option for wide distribution.

2.3. *Interviews*

Semistructured interviews were carried out across a range of those involved in these programmes, from the formally structured diocesan programmes (diaconatetraining, for example) through to occasional courses offered by the diocese and then to parish provision. Interviewees included administrators/officials, tutors, "students"[30], and clergy (as religious instruction is "the most binding duty" for priests, according to Catholic teaching) (John Paul II 1983; Pius X 1905).This type of interview was chosen for a number of reasons.

Semistructured interviews across the range of people involved and across the range of provision allowed the researcher to ensure that basic points were covered by each interviewee, while also allowing interviewees sufficient scope to bring their own experience in the field into play. As so little research has been done about provision in this area, a questionnaire or completely structured interview schedule as the sole instrument might miss fruitful avenues for current or future investigation, as well as different views and highlights on the work in hand.

The sample was taken from the three groups involved: practitioners, students, administrators. It is important to include those who are in administrative positions because the decision of what courses, etc. will be taught is often left to them, as is the choice of tutor, location, etc. Their perception, therefore, of the ends of the Christian religious education of adults, of its objectives and methods, of who should provide it, has a direct effect on the learning opportunities available

to those in the field work area.

It was hypothesised (based on my own experience in this informal field) that tutors are rarely given much instruction or support, and outside of specific programmes (RCIA, Eucharistic Ministers, Readers) generally have a completely free hand in the preparation of courses and course materials, and rarely given any material or monetary support for their labours. Interviews must not give the impression that an approved syllabus or curriculum is expected or "proper".

The issue of payment for teaching was not included on the postal questionnaires or the interview schedule, partially out of the considerations above (not to raise hopes or seem to imply that payment should be given or expected). A question about payment for teaching might also be received as insulting by some tutors who feel that their work for the church is of a volunteer nature[31].

Semi-structured interviews were chosen for this research for a number of reasons.

Completely structured interviews would not give respondents enough scope to fully answer the questions involved, which were mainly qualitative (some quantitative questions were included at the beginning of the interview schedule as an introduction to the interview and to allow a rapport to be built up between the interviewer and interviewee, while putting the interviewee at ease by allowing them to recount simple data which was nonetheless of importance to them). However, a completely, or almost completely unstructured interview schedule[32], as described by Burgess (Burgess 1984) would not serve the purposes of this research (Wengraf 2001), particularly with the restricted time involved in a part time study.

Interviews are an appropriate medium for the collection of qualitative data,

(cf. Kvale, cited in Burgess 1984; 1985; Cohen et al. 2000, etc.; Freeman 1998; Wengraf 2001). The data sought through the interview process is at the heart of this research; the knowledge constructed during the interview process will provide the framework for the discussion of the place of education per se in the Christian religious education of adults in the field work area. Through the interviews, participants will be given the opportunity to express their opinions on the subject matter (Cohen et al. 2000).

The interviews are for the most part qualitative in nature, although quantitative questions are included at various places in the schedule, mainly for the purpose of building rapport with the interviewee (Burgess 1984). As has been mentioned above, it would not be possible to attain complete qualitative data at this point about the field work area; therefore, the choice of a mainly qualitative method, that is, semistructured rather than formally structured interviews, is an appropriate one.

As has been acknowledged above, as a researcher in this area I come from a position of some knowledge and experience of the practice in the field; there is no pretence that I will come to the interview situation as an empirically unbiased observer; the knowledge of the area is a basic requirement for this type of research (Burgess 1984; Freeman 1998; Wengraf 2001). Because my own views have been examined before the beginning of the interview process, the interviews will fall into the second of Kitwood's categories of interviews: that is, interviews where there is acknowledged and controlled bias (Cohen et al. 2000). The previous knowledge brought to the interviews by the researcher should aid in the process of contextualising the results of the research (Sherman and Webb, cited in Ely et al. 1991)

For this reason, as well, semistructured rather than unstructured interviews have been chosen. As Lincoln and Guba point out, semistructured interviews are useful when the researcher is aware of the gaps in knowledge that wait to be filled and thus is able to formulate questions which will, hopefully, lead to those gaps being filled (cited in Cohen et al. 2000).

It is important to be able to correlate data from not only each respondent, but also from each respondent grouping; if the responses from one grouping are generally different to that from another grouping, this will in itself be a significant finding. However, the interviews do need to be qualitative in nature, as what is sought is not only factual information (number of courses taught/attended, etc..) but reflection the experience of the respondents. Semistructured interviews fall between the purely qualitative data gathering of the formal interview and the free flowing, completely open-ended interview (Cohen et al. 2000).

Time is once again an element to be considered in the decision about the particular methods used. Semistructured interviews are less costly in time than completely open-ended interviews, as more may be predicted about responses and coding is therefore comparatively easier. However, interviews which are only semistructured, rather than completely formalised, do require a good deal more time to conduct, transcribe and code, as the data collected through this latter process is much more straightforward (Wengraf 2001).

The use of these different sources of data: the experience of the researcher, the mainly quantitative data from the questionnaires, the generally qualitative data from the interview process, and the collection of materials, will allow an overview of the situation, and will allow knowledge to be situated in the context from which it arises; as Sherman and Webb remark, this will allow the

research to "attend to the experience as a whole" (cited in Ely et al. 1991, pg. 4).

Interview design

The interviews were designed to elicit qualitative data in response to one main issue, which is the purpose of Christian religious education of adults in the field work area[33]. Answers to this question were elicited both obliquely and directly, predominately through the use of receptive interview techniques (Wengraf 2001).

The interview schedule was thus designed with what Freeman refers to as a priori codes (Freeman 1998), that is, with categories for coding which have arisen from the literature, rather than categories which are grounded in the data gathered from the research. These broad categories are "education", "nurture" and "indoctrination". Other codes did arise from the interviews and questionnaires themselves, (see Appendix Four).

This a priori categorisation is necessitated by one of the aims of the research, which is to form a connection between the literature in the field and the practice/reception of Christian religious education of adults in the field work area. Although "nurture" appears from time to time in the literature (Astley 1994; 2000b; Brookfield 1986; Draper 2000; Hull 1984; McLaughlin 2000, etc.; Slee 1998), I have rarely heard it used by practitioners or administrators. Care was needed to ensure that the use of this category is not an imposition on the data from the interviews (and questionnaires), yet that the code was applied when appropriate.

The questions to be used in the interviews were created through a process which parallels that set down in Wengraf: the research questions were defined into theory questions, which in turn gave rise to specific interview questions,

appropriate to each category of interviewee (Wengraf 2001, 64).

Using just three broad headings runs the risk of glib summarisation, and the consequent loss of data and misinterpretation of information, (Delamont 1992). To prevent this, and to allow for "thick", descriptive data (Cohen et al. 2000; Dadds et al. 2001; Freeman 1998; Shkedi 1998), the categories themselves were signalled by a group of keywords. This means that the theory-questions, as defined by Wengraf were not asked directly; rather, they informed, as he suggests, the creation of the interview question (Wengraf 2001).

One of the presumptions from which the research flows is that the terms taken from the literature will not occur frequently in either the interview or the questionnaire data; this need not mean, however, that the concepts named by these terms are absent from the data[34]. The key words will be used to highlight the presence of the conceptual categories of "education", "nurture" and "indoctrination".

Suggested key words for "education" include: education, learning/learn/learned, criticality/critical, autonomy/freedom (positive), understanding, more than skill, knowledge. For "nurture", suggested key words include: better Catholic/better Christian, deepened faith , practice (as of faith), commitment to the faith, emphasis on Catholic (qua denomination) belief. Finally, for "indoctrination", the key words include: indoctrination, rules, doctrine, "preached at", autonomy/freedom (lacking), obedience.

It is clear even from this cursory list that the presence of any given key word, however, does not necessarily signal the presence of its associated concept; it is also possible (indeed, highly probable) that some key words will be found to relate to more than one concept. Contextualisation of key words will

therefore be critical in the interpretation of results.

Part of that contextualisation will be provided through the structure of the interview itself. Following, again, Wengraf's advice, the general question, "what is the purpose of adult education" comes at the end of the interview process, rather than at the beginning thereof. Because interviewee's answers to this question will emerge after they have at least partially exposed their feelings and experiences in the area, their answer to this general question will fit within the framework of their previous answers.

As noted above, a consideration in the construction of the interviews was the element of time; I was aware of the extremely hectic nature of the lives of most of those who fell into the administrator and tutor category, and did not wish to produce and interview schedule which would take more than an hour to complete. Had I done so, I believe I would have found it more difficult to obtain interviews.

Moreover, I felt that a more discursive interview schedule would have distilled the answers given to the central research questions involved in the interviews[35]. I sought for a balance between the factual questions (see above) and the ones which related specifically to the point in hand, concentrating on the latter. None of the respondents exhibited restlessness or boredom at any point in the interviews, which I take partially as a sign that the interviews were not overly long, partially as a corroboration of my choice of respondents (they actually were interested in the subject) and partially as a validation of the interview schedule itself, as it did not lead them down paths which diverted them from the main concepts of the interview. Most of the interviews lasted between 30 minutes and an hour, which, considering the pointed nature of the central research question,

was judged sufficient.

Ethical issues involved in the field work

The ethical issues involved in this include not only those which usually arise in dealing with interview situations, such as positionality, whether or not one seeks to speak on behalf of the researched or not, the view one takes of the research situation, etc. (Bridges 2001; Cohen et al. 2000; Delamont 1992; Ely et al. 1991; Greenback 2003; Haywood et al. 1998; Kvale 2002; Pendlebury et al. 2001), but also issues related to the particular circumstances of the field work.

The touchstone of ethics in qualitative research is that, at minimum, the informant should not be changed for the worse: against certain objections, I maintain that the research interviews undertaken here are not designed to 'help' or 'empower', or 'change' the informant at all. (Wengraf 2001, pg. 4).

As discussed elsewhere, the interview schedule used in this research was particularly designed to elicit the thoughts of those involved, but not to stimulate them to think in ways which they had not done heretofore. The reason for this is simple: the aim of the research interview here was to determine to what extent, if any, the issues raised in the conceptual analysis were of import to those in the field. To this end, it was important to take a snapshot of thought at a particular time.

It must be said that the schedule was not entirely effective in this "hands off" approach, as at least two respondents, T1 and T2 indicated either during the interview or afterwards that the interview process had stimulated them to think more about their own practice. Both of these respondents, however, are highly experienced tutors who are, by nature and training, reflective practitioners.

Almost all of the people involved in the study are volunteers in the Christian religious education of adults. To some extent this applies to the clergy as well, given the number of calls on their time. Many of those involved will have little or no training for the work on which they are engaged, yet many acknowledge the importance of the work.

This then requires that interviews must be conducted in a supportive manner, without leading to undermining of self confidence on the part of tutors, (cf. the importance of the interpersonal, communicative and emotional aspects of interviews, Cohen et al. 2000). One of the recurrent themes in educational literature is the need for teachers to be reflective practitioners (Astley 1994; Griffiths 2000; Hudson 2002; Leitch et al. 2001; Welton 1993; Williams 1998), yet it is possible that many involved in the field work will have had no training or support as such. Nor must the interview process undermine the confidence of learners in their tutors or the programmes themselves. (It is for this reason that the heavily-structured, theory-driven interview, (cf., Pawson, 1996, as cited in Wengraf 2001) was rejected as a means of obtaining interview data).

A further practical, but important point, is the issue of the time involved in the interviews. Almost by the nature of the beast, those who fall into the tutor and administrator category of the field work are very busy people, and asking for a great deal of time from any of them would have been an unwarranted imposition. The interview schedule, being semi-structured, was not designed to take a particular amount of time, but it was designed to allow respondents freedom to answer succinctly or to ramble at will.

Power relationships must be considered; neglecting them may be a dangerous activity (Wengraf 2001).

Some of the interviewees were members of the diocesan clergy. In the past I have found that my background and education have opened doors and eased tensions with members of this group, as I have been accepted as "almost one of them", having (in quintessentially English fashion) been to the "Right School" (a pontifical university). As Power points out, the personal attributes of the researcher will have an effect on the results of the process of data collection (Adelman 1985; Power 1998); my training and background are therefore pertinent issues for consideration in terms of this group of respondents.

Other considerations

It is also not uncommon for members of this group to be particularly wary not only of the academy but particularly of lay women who are members of the academy[36]. Consideration must be given to these issues, as they may colour not only the possibility of obtaining interviews in the first place (e.g., how important is the researcher's Licentiate, now 20 years old, in gaining access?) but also the tenor of the interview, the information elicited, etc..

There is no history of interaction between the universities in the area and the Diocesan Adult Education Officer. The holder of this office is a new appointment and markedly more open to interaction than the previous post holder. The interviews and subsequent reporting of findings must do nothing to prejudice this (hopefully) growing and potentially fruitful relationship. In point of fact, it would seem that the research process has had little or no effect on this relationship, judging from interaction with officials in the Education Service throughout the progress of the field work phase.

Some of those who were interviewed (in all three categories) are

academics or in some way attached to institutions of higher education, and thus understand the nature of a research project such as this. Others have little or no formal research training, many are not trained teachers. Consideration was given to clear explanation of the aims, objectives and hoped outcomes of the research, which still do not prejudice what information might be elicited in interviews, so that all involved in the interviews have the same amount of information about them. Inevitably, the meaning created from the information produced will vary from person to person, yet these meanings must be founded on at least relatively similar constructions of knowledge (Wengraf 2001).

In all but one case, the interviews were individual, that is, dealing only with the data from one respondent. The exception to this was Administrators C and D, who requested a joint interview. After some discussion, it became clear that there would be no possibility of interviewing either administrator on their own: it was as a joint interview or not at all.[37]

For those who were interviewed as individuals, interviews took place in a variety of locations, some more conducive to interviews than others, but all at the instigation of the respondent. Interviews took place in family homes (2), my office (2), a church hall (1), classrooms at the University of Nottingham (3), a respondent's place of work (3) (twelve interviewees, 11 interviews, due to the dual nature of one encounter).

Appendix 6 contains a break down of respondents by education, etc..; this is not replicated here because most of it has little bearing on the results from the interviews.

However, there are characteristics of the respondents which do relate to the type of data elicited from the interviews.

Overall, 12 people were interviewed for this thesis. Of these, five either are presently or have been in the recent past, employed within the formal education sector. This employment spans the range from classroom teacher through to senior member of school staff, as well as employment within the tertiary sector. One other respondent is occasionally employed as a University Teacher.

As noted above, there was no attempt to find a random or even representative sample for the interviews; in fact, that opposite was the case, as purposive sampling was undertaken. This relates as well to the number of those involved in the formal educational sector.

My hypothesis in choosing such respondents was that those involved in the formal sector would be more aware of some of the issues raised by the central research question, particularly those relating to autonomy on the part of the learner. This did not prove to be the case; autonomy was mentioned most often by four respondents: Administrators C and D, and Tutor A (who are not employed within the formal educational sector) and Participant C (who is)[38].

Coding of responses

The responses to both the postal questionnaire and the interviews were coded manually, for a number of reasons.

One was that of time; although I use NVivo on a regular basis for my employment, it is of greater use for projects where there is a great bulk of data to be analysed[39]: for relatively small projects, it does not in my opinion repay the time necessary to use it.

Secondly, and most importantly, due to the nature of the topics under

discussion, I felt it would be better to hand code responses, thereby allowing me to become intimately aware of the information in the interviews and the questionnaires (Potter 2001). It is all too easy for the software to become the star, and the data to take second place, or a supporting role to the software used (Carney et al. 1997). Further, in using only Word, one is presented at most stages of coding with the entire piece – rather than the coded selection.

The interviews were transcribed into Microsoft Word, which has at its disposal a number of tools useful to the researcher. Interviews were turned into tables, with each intervention numbered. Interventions were then further broken down and the numbering adjusted (automatically by Word) so that individual bits (fragments) of data could be easily accessed. Word also allows for indexing (so that each instance of the word, "formation", for instance, could be found), a function which was used solely as a back up to ensure that no instances of a particular code were missed.

The questionnaire responses were entered in the first instance into Microsoft Excel, a spread sheet programme. Although more limited than Word in relation to indexing, Excel allows immediate access to information such as the number of replies to a particular question. Answers were entered in such a way that "yes" and "no" answered could be counted by the programme itself. Excel also creates an array of charts from data, allowing the creation of the charts found throughout this section and in the appendices.

A code book was created (see Appendix Four), using a version of the five digit system suggested by (Carney et al. 1997), using the elements of the typology suggested above, with additional categories for "teaching" (to allow for fuller investigation of the experience of the tutors and the types of courses

offered).

The five digit system allows for direct coding onto copies of the interview files, with four levels of subcategories for each code; this was sufficient for the nuances brought out in both the interviews and the questionnaires.

All responses which had been coded with a specific code, (cf., 11000), were then transferred to a mind mapping program. This allowed me to see at a glance all the fragments of data which had been coded with a specific code, and to move them into hierarchies, rearrange their structure, etc.. In essence, this method is a substitute for physically cutting and pasting pieces of paper containing data. Mind mapping software has a number of obvious advantages over this time honoured method, including the ability to save work and transfer it from computer to computer, to print out the results either as a mind map or as a text file, the ability to expand or contract branches of the map at the click of a mouse, and so on (Goodall 2002; Plotnick 1997).

Methods of reporting

All respondents were promised anonymity in the presentation of interview data, although as one pointed out, anyone with knowledge of the diocese would not find it overly difficult to deduce whose voice was speaking in some sections. (This presents a challenge in reporting, in that the value of verbatim, cited quotations must be balanced against the possibility of identification). Nevertheless, for reasons of confidentiality, respondents are referred to by sector (P for participants, A for administrators and T for tutors) and then by number: so that P1 is the first participant interviewed, and so on. All respondents will be referred to throughout as "they", rather than by gendered pronouns. Not all

respondents were male (making the generic male inappropriate), and there are places where distinctions of gender would again lead anyone familiar with the diocese directly to the name of the speaker[40].

One set of interviews took place as a focus group, Administrators 3 and 4. The responses from this duo will be reported as A3,4, that is, Administrators 3 and 4. They are not distinguished in the reporting (though they are so in the transcript) for two reasons. The first is that such distinction would serve little in terms of analysis: there was no disagreement and very little difference of tone between the respondents: The second relates again to the issue of anonymity: this pair of administrators chose to be interviewed together, rather than separately (in spite of my suggestions to the contrary), and therefore reporting of joint responses respects their wishes to be interviewed (and one assumes, reported) not as individuals but as a pair.

Questionnaire data is reported alongside interview data. The designations for responses from questionnaires represent the group (Administrator, Tutor or Participant) then the question number, so that (AQ20) is a response to question 20 on the questionnaire sent to Administrators.

"Interview fragment" denotes a fragment of an interview which was given (at least) one specific code. Many fragments have more than one code, as to break down a sentence such as, "Well, it's about formation and education" into two different fragments would have resulted in nonsensical statements. Fragments range from a few words, ("The nearest we come to is a boiled egg after your first communion if you're good, you know"(P1)) through to whole paragraphs, which would have made no sense if broken down into component parts, or would have yielded incomplete data.

This means that although at times numbers of fragments produced by interviews with different groups will be contrasted, "fragment" may not be used as a quantitative measure of the number of times a particular concept was raised by any given respondent or group, nor of the absolute importance given to the subject of that fragment. However, general conclusions may be drawn from clear discrepancies (e.g., one group has many fragments relating to a specific issue, and other groups have none or very few).

As always in dealing with interview and questionnaire data, some system must be devised for reporting the mass of information collected (Dadds et al. 2001). In this case, I have chosen to use somewhat the same structure for reporting as for coding: this allows the information to be presented in a coherent form which will then be related to the conclusion reached in the first part of the thesis. Accordingly, I will deal with both the questionnaire data and that arising from the interviews under four broad headings:

Education

Preaching

Nurture

Indoctrination

There were two other headings involved in the coding: Teaching and Motivation. The interview fragments under these fit easily into the coding structure for the four main areas listed above; for the sake of continuity, I have included them under those headings.

Two other themes emerged during coding; they were mentioned frequently enough to warrant the creation of independent codes: clericalism and financial implications. Here, as with the codes for Teaching and Motivation, I will deviate

from the coding structure and incorporate the information which was coded under these headings into other areas. For the respondents, clericalism in particular seemed to be a separate issue; however, as seen above in the discussion of education for the clergy and laity, this is in reality an issue which is related to the concept of education overall.

Financial implications, on the other hand, are an issue of practical import to the diocese (or other provider), but do not immediately fit into the philosophical work undertaken here. They are, to some extent, a secondary consideration: once one has decided what should be done, funding should then be found for right action, rather than action being decided on the basis of available funding[41].

As always when one imposes a structure on the messy result of human interaction, the "fit" is not perfect: here we may return to the concept of research as the construction of a crazy quilt, mentioned above: connections will have to be made between different part of the quilt, in spite of the ostensibly clear pattern of the patches.

For the most part, responses to the questionnaires are confined to the last two categories, as by the nature of questionnaires, most of the data gleaned from them deals with practical issues, such as the proportion of different sorts of courses taken, qualifications, etc.. The questionnaires also contained open ended questions; where appropriate, data from these questions will be included in the analysis under the other headings.

Triangulation

At its most basic level, triangulation is what allows something to stand, to be sturdy and unsupported by anything outside of itself (Freeman 1998). In terms

of research, the aim of triangulation is to increase the validity of the results of research (Robson 1993). To do this, at least two sources of information must be used, differentiated in time (longitudinal data collection), by person (different researchers), by method of collection or analysis, or location (Burgess 1984; Delamont 1992; Denzin et al. 2002; Ely et al. 1991; Freeman 1998).

Within this research, triangulation has been achieved through a number of means, following the suggestion made by Burgess of using "multiple strategies" (Burgess 1984).

First, there are three broad means of finding data about the central research question: investigation of literature, investigation of practice and the researcher's own experience within the field. This means of triangulation, called "between method triangulation" by Delamont (Delamont 1992, p. 159), allows not only for an increased validity to any conclusions supported by two or more broad strands. Finding the congruities or lack of them between particularly the literature and the practice, as well as between the literature and the researcher's experience of the field, is an aim of this research.

Within these broad strands, different methods have been followed. For the most part, the investigation of the literature has been undertaken in the standard manner, using the literature itself as a cross check (that is, one part of the literature with another). The researcher's experience in the field has been a guide to the areas of literature reviewed.

Within the field work element, both questionnaires and interviews were used (the methodology of both is discussed elsewhere). This is "within method" triangulation (Delamont 1992, p. 160) if we take "field work" as the over arching "method" involved; it may also be seen as "between method" triangulation if

questionnaires and interviews are seen as different methods. In this case, they must be seen as different methods as they were designed to compliment each other, rather than to elicit exactly the same information. (In the event, much of the information sought in the interview stage was at least touched on by questionnaire respondents in the open ended questions).

For both of the elements of the field work, the researcher's knowledge and experience of the field were used as means of triangulation and guidance, both in terms of the framing of the questions (the types of courses, for instance) and the choice of interview candidates.

Triangulation has thus been achieved through different methods of data collection (literature investigation, questionnaire and interview) as well as by the application of an experienced researcher's knowledge of the field throughout.

One of the stated aims of this study is to correlate the published literature on the Christian religious education of adults with practice in one particular location. However, particularly in the presentation of the findings, care must be taken so that triangulation with church documents must not be seen as "checking up on" diocesan programmes, that is, not holding diocesan provision up to a perceived standard of provision provided in the documents.

2.4. ***Widespread, Limited Qualitative Data***

"Widespread, limited" may seem an oxymoronic phrase, when applied to data; however, widespread in this sense refers to three specific criteria, (number, geography and constituent groups), while "limited" refers to the type and amount of qualitative data requested and therefore gleaned by the postal questionnaires.

The survey was widespread in that it covered a large number of people. In

the time frame allowed for this research, it would be impossible to conduct interviews with even half this number of people. Sending the questionnaires allowed the acquisition of quantitative and some qualitative data from a much larger pool of people.

Geographically, the diocese is quite large, and diverse covering both highly urban areas, and rural areas. Again, considering the constraints of time (and fuel costs) it would be impossible to ensure adequate coverage of all parts of the diocese in the time allotted for the research, if interviews were the sole means of acquiring field work data.

Finally, and most importantly, the use of a postal questionnaire allowed the gleaning of information from a large number of people in the three constituent groups involved in the Christian religious education of adults: administrators (those with responsibility for provision), tutors and participants.

These different constituencies overlap: those who administer may also teach or participate; tutors may participate or advise, etc.. This possibility of overlap raised a particular problem in relation to the postal questionnaires: should respondents be sent more than one questionnaire, if there was a good chance that they fell into more than one group?

This question arose in particular in relation to the clergy: priests and deacons.

Parish priests bear primary responsibility for the religious education within their parishes (Congregation for the Clergy 1997); this clearly means that they certainly fall into the category of administrators. Those members of the presbyterate who are not parish priests are still very likely to have responsibility for instances of learning. Thus I took the decision to send all of the priests of the

diocese the questionnaire aimed at administrators[42].

In relation to the permanent deacons of the diocese, I took the decision to send these men[43] the "participants'" questionnaire. Although deacons do have a role in exhorting and instructing the faithful (Paul VI 1967), by definition all of them have been through the process of training for the diaconate(previously three years in this diocese). It is true that also by definition, the priests in the diocese have been through seminary training, and so have been participants in education as adults in some form. However, even when not validated by an institute of higher education, such programmes conform very closely to the ideas of formal education set out elsewhere in this study, principally that they are delivered through an institution which has education as its main reason for existence (Jarvis, 1997). At least in this diocese, the deaconate formation was not delivered through such an institution (although many of the sessions did take place on the campus of a local Catholic college, they were not delivered through the systems of that college).

In view of the role and use of the men ordained to this office, it did not seem feasible to assume that all the permanent deacons in the diocese would be in a position to complete either the tutor's or the administrator's questionnaire.

A final reason for using the deacons as participants is simply the ease with which their contact details were available. Of all groups, participants will be not only the largest groups (as there are generally more students than tutors or administrators on any one course) but also those who will have least contact with any sort of central, record keeping authority; many courses in this study will keep no kind of register or any other record of attendance or members.

I am aware, however, that to use only the deacons as the participant group

would be to use an unrepresentative sample for this part of the data collection process. The diaconate programme contains within it elements of selection, which are very rare in other courses (some RCIA courses may have an element of selection, but most of the adult education in the diocese is open access). The diaconate course is also much longer (three years) than most other courses. The diaconate course is, in one sense, a means to an end, in that it is a preparatory course for ordination; the only parallel could perhaps be RCIA for adults who have not been baptised.

It is therefore imperative that the deacons are not the only sample of participants used in the questionnaires.

Problematic Definitions

Within this research and particularly with reference to the postal questionnaires, where the interaction between researcher and respondent is restricted to the questionnaire and cover letter, there are certain terms whose use/definition are or at least could be, problematic.

The first of these is, for the questionnaire, a fundamental one: "course". No definition of this word was given on the questionnaire. This lack was a deliberate choice.

"Course" may mean many things. In some institutions, a "course" is a series of orchestrated, connected, formal learning events (modules), which, in total can lead to a particular award. Thus there is a Marine Biology "course" which leads to a level one Certificate, and a Doctorate of Education "course" which leads to the award of the EdD.

In the informal sector, however, "course" is used much more freely, usually

to refer to any intentional learning opportunity. Thus there are one day courses as well as the longer courses already mentioned.

Although no definition was given on the questionnaire, it would be as well to propose one here, for clarity of purpose. For the sake of this research, then, a "course" refers to a deliberate, intentional event, set up under the general auspices of the Roman Catholic Diocese involved, in which learning can reasonably be expected to take place. A course will generally have a tutor/facilitator/leader who has some responsibility for the learning that is to take place; the course will be attended by one or more people. This definition may be remarkable more for what it does not say than for what it does.

(The words "education" and "teacher/teaching" are noticeably absent from the definition. The relationship between these courses and education will be examined later in this research; at the outset, however, no assumption is made the that the courses either are or claim to be, a species of education).

Concomitant with this, "tutor" is used rather than "teacher." Partially this reflects the common usage for those who teach adults, and partially it arises out of the possible conflicts perceived by some involved in the informal sector between a schooling model of education (perceived as a banking model, cf. Freire 1970). Responses to the postal questionnaire highlighted this point, with comments such as, "People seem to fear feeling inadequate if they attend Adult Education courses - embarrassed by how little they know. A teacher/lecturer does not help: it needs to be at a conversational level" (A 3), and "People with teaching qualifications are not always the best type of people to lead or 'teach' in catechetical situations" (ditto). One administrator insisted on calling those who were qualified to teach within the Church, "catechist helpers", saying that people

would be happier with this title than with "tutor" (A3/4)[44].

Further, the definition does not place limits on either the time or the content of the learning opportunities involved. This was again deliberate, to allow respondents to make their own judgements (consciously or not; many may not have articulated the question at all) about what constitutes a "course". The lack of definition of this term is not meant to introduce an element of undue complexity (cf. Cohen et al. 2000) but rather to avoid restricting the range of answers given.

The second issue involved in the questionnaire which is not as straight forward as it might seem is the choice of "curriculum categories" in part two of the survey.

On the questionnaire, this section is entitles, "Types of courses" rather than "curriculum categories". This was again a deliberate choice of terminology. I wished to avoid alienating those who might experience a tension between "education" and church based courses (see above). For many respondents, "curriculum areas" would be an unfamiliar term needing explanation, which would take up precious space on the questionnaire, making it more dense and less easily read (Cohen et al. 2000). "Curriculum areas" might well smack of jargon or "edubabble" to those outside the professional field, lending a perhaps off-putting air of sophistication to the questionnaire. "Types of courses", on the other hand, is a term which is easily understood by all concerned.

The list of six curriculum areas was derived from both my own experience of the Christian religious education of adults and the then latest edition of the Christians Learning Together newsletter (to which the diocese contributes).

The directions given at the beginning of this section of the questionnaire requested respondents to enter courses more than once, should courses fall into

more than one category.. This procedure of possible double entry may prove slightly problematic, because it will not be possible to assume that the final tally of courses mentioned equates to an actual number of courses delivered. However, this would not have been possible to achieve without seeking a great deal more information about each individual course, as there would have been no way of knowing how many respondents were mentioning different, or the same, courses. Therefore, this section asks only for dichotomous answers, rather than numeric ones.

Again this lack of complexity was the result of choice rather than chance; the choice was made in view of rates of response. Although it may be true that postal questionnaires do not always have their vaunted low rates of response or that questionnaires have to be short to be returned, (Cohen et al. 2000), I was aware that the groups who would receive the bulk of these questionnaires would do so during what is for them a busy period (the end of Lent and beginning of Easter week, for the clergy, and the middle of term for laity involved in education professionally) and made the decision that the questionnaires should not exceed one, two sided page of A4 paper. In using this as a simple dichotomous section, it can form a bridge between the more demanding sections one and three, and introduces the first qualitative question at the end of section two (Bell 1999).

---

[14] Personal communication, teaching staff, School of Continuing Education, 2000 – 2003.

[15] During the cases study phase, I observed the teaching of a member of the diocesan clergy, in the informal sector. However, this was for the purposes of completion of an accredited course, rather than for the purposes of the case study; to have combined them would have been unfair on the tutor observed, and would still have given only a few examples of observed sessions, from one tutor.

[16] Cf. the discussion with T1 who remarked on the concept of those who "always take a course on a Tuesday evening" and the remarks of P2 who came to

Christian religious education of adults with clear ideas of gaps in their own knowledge which needed to be filled.

[17] Personal communication, Director of Adult Education, Diocese, 17.01.04. It is not seen as either feasible or desirable by the officers of the diocese for such a list to exist.

[18] On a diocesan basis, the creation of the post of director of adult education shows the move toward the centralisation of at least information about the Christian religious education of adults in the Diocese. Nationally, there is a move toward the provision of at least lower level adult education, in conjunction with the QAC.

[19] My involvement in a now defunct Deanery Adult Education group, as well as the Liturgy Committee, provide a basis in administration in a Roman Catholic diocese; my work as a tutor is obvious; and I have attended various courses/workshops/conferences as a participant as well, (see Appendix).

[20] Indirect involvement, such as those who produce materials used by others, would present an interesting study, but it would be one outside the confines of this research.

[21] One postal return assumed that all returns would be signed, as instead of answering one of the open ended questions, the respondent requested that I see the response sent in by another person, (named).

[22] At two different times, questionnaires for both tutors and participants were given to administrators in the diocese, for promised distribution. Either this distribution did not happen (in one instance) or it was singularly unsuccessful, as only two responses were gleaned during the requisite time frame.

[23] Such interviews included: interviews for those wishing to join the panel of tutors for the School of Continuing Education; interviews for the post of Co-Coordinator for the Certificate in Intercultural Theology; student interviews for the BA in general and for two specific Certificates within it, and involvement in short listing for various posts within the School.

[24] This training was suspended for a year, for internal review: it has since commenced again.

[25] RCIA: Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults.

[26] There is, however, widespread dissatisfaction among the clergy about this Certificate, particularly as it seems that many of the participants are not qualified teachers, but rather parishioners seeking a general experience of adult Christian religious education; (clergy opinions gleaned from the National Liturgy Conference, February 2002, Leeds). From 2003/4, there will be two options within the Diocese for this award: that offered by the diocese itself, and one offered in conjunction with a university: this course will be accredited (personal communication, programme director, 2003). The fact that both of these courses will be mounted in the Diocese points to the lack of coherence of diocesan policy in this area.

[27] It was originally envisioned that these would be supported by the

collection of documentary evidence. While a certain amount of such data was available, the lack of any centralised repository of tutor information made collection of a useably wide sample impossible.

[28] It could, of course, be argued that keeping such a register should be a part of the work of the education service in the diocese. To argue this, however, would take us into realms not properly covered by the present work, interesting as they are: the need – or not – for qualified tutors, what form these qualifications might take, any attempt at creating a balanced curriculum across the diocese (for of course there is no current way of knowing whether or not the curriculum is in any way balanced), etc. . See the recommendations at the end of this work.

[29] It is arguable that all possible participants in adult religious education in the diocese would have to be included for a comprehensive survey; it is doubtful that such information (names and addresses) would be possible to obtain. Even if the information were available, this would lead to an unmanageable amount of data, as the possible pool of participants would include every person in the diocese over the age of 16 at any given time.

[30] There is some resistance to calling adult participants in these learning situations "students", as this is felt to be reminiscent of "the school room"; this in itself provides a fruitful area for investigation, as it relies on a concept of pedagogy which relates not only to children, but to a view of pedagogy which is outdated even for school use (c.f., Astley 2000b). This issue was raised by a number of respondents to questionnaires as well as in the interview data.

[31] Merely as an illustration, my own experience of payment for teaching in a diocese is one of almost entirely non-payment. One course always pays tutors a rate equivalent to that paid by the local university to its part time tutors; only at one other parish in the diocese have I ever been offered payment (in the form of book tokens).

[32] It is difficult to imagine a completely unstructured interview, if the words are taken literally; if nothing else, the researcher must know what it is they want to find out during the interview, must know what Wengraf refers to as the theory-question (Wengraf 2001). Indeed, Burgess' own list of what he wanted to cover in his interviews is described as "structured" (Burgess 1984, p. 108). What seems to differentiate his study as "unstructured" is not the lack of a structure, but rather the lack of *insistence* on following that structure through the course of the interviews.

[33] It is entirely possible that those interviewed would assume that their answers pertain to the whole of either the Roman Catholic Church or Christianity in general. However, as the focus of the interviews is on the perceptions of those involved in the case study area, no assumption is made about the wider applicability of the data *from the point of view of those interviewed.*

[34] This relates to the distinction made by Wengraf between the theory-language of the research community and the more general language of the interviewees (Wengraf 2001).

[35] Discursive *respondents* on the other hand, were welcomed.

[36] This comment arises from personal experience and also from personal communication, particularly from clergy during the course of this research. A number of members of the diocesan clergy, rightly or wrongly, feel that their views were not held in appropriate confidence or accurately presented in previous research, and are therefore at best wary of such, (Personal communication, 2002 – 4).

[37] The reasons for this were not expressed, but may be related to the issues reviewed under the heading of power, above, along with other issues (also noted above) of previous unhelpful experience with research in the diocese.

[38] Although these statements about employment give a bit of personal information about respondents, I feel that it is important to be able to situate a respondent's relationship to the formal sector in terms of their knowledge of specific issues and, more importantly, their relation of those issues (or not) to the Christian religious education of adults. It would be difficult, however, to trace either Administrators C and D or Tutor A through the fact that they are not employed in the formal sector, or Participant C through the fact that they are.

[39] The project on which I am employed is in the process of evaluating the data from something over 100 interviews, for example.

[40] Fragments reported in quotation marks are verbatim from interview scripts; the only editing has been to remove noises such as "um", "uh", etc.

[41] "I could say I can't do anything, because of the lack of funds, but that's also lack of imagination" (Head teacher of inner city school, personal communication, 2004).

[42] Names and addresses for members of the clergy, priests and deacons, were taken from the diocesan website, on 15 March, 2002.

[43] Like other ranks of the clergy, the permanent diaconate in the Roman Catholic Church is reserved to men alone (John Paul II 1983).

[44] My own experience tells me emphatically that this is *not* the case, and indeed, this phraseology implies a very hierarchical view of the Church, with "Father" doing and the laity "helping". "Tutor" is the usual terminology in printed matter as well as in speech, in the Diocese, to refer to those who teach in the sector; "catechist helper" was an entirely new phrase to me during this interview, and I have never seen or heard it since.

3. Literature, Concepts and Continuum

Theory without practice is sterile.

Practice without theory is blind.

(Nichols 1992)

This research is based on the hypothesis that religious education is a subset of education over all (Astley 2000a; Bastide 1999; Farley 1996; Holley 1978; McLaughlin 2000; Peters 1970; Tight 1996; Winch et al. 1999)[45]. This hypothesis places religious education within the social sciences, rather than within theology (Lee 1971; 1996)[46]. The conceptual analysis of the literature in the field will be interwoven with the exposition of the framework which underpins this research.

The Christian Religious Education of Adults in the informal sector will be treated as a part of the social sciences, rather than of theology. Although theology has an important part to play in the determining of the content and outcomes of such education, (the more or less permanent changes in behaviour) it is not the discipline which can determine the means of achieving those changes.

3.1. *Education*

"I believe that education, therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living". (Dewey 1897)[47]

Although a thorough investigation of the nature and parameters of education is outside the scope of the present work, it is necessary to be clear what is meant by "education" as the term is used here,[48] particularly those

aspects of education which relate to the religious education of adults.

"Education" possibly derives from one of two Latin words, either educere, to lead out or to train, or educare, to train or to nourish (Frankena 1973; Winch et al. 1999). Although simplistic, this radical (that is, returning to the root) definition of education paves the way for the discussion which follows. It should be noted immediately that both of the definitions offered are active; they imply involvement in a process, rather than a static entity.

There is widespread agreement in the literature that education is not a "thing" so much as a process (Holley 1978; Lee 1971; Nichols 1992; Peters 1970)[49]. It is suggested that it is easier to see and recognise education than to define it (Holley 1978), which is indicative of its essence as process rather than object[50].

At its simplest, education may be said to be the process by which a person learns something from another; as one author immediately points out, this definition makes it impossible to restrict the use of the term "education" to the formal processes of the school or institutional classroom (Lee 1971). Education, then, exists as the process by which learning is achieved; what are described are actions and activities, rather than an outcome or product (Holley 1978).

By definition, a process leads to change; learning is described as a change in the learner, (Astley 1994; Brookfield 1986; Jarvis 2002; Karakowsky et al. 1999; Lee 1971; McKenna 1994; Minton 1997). As a result of learning, the learner is somehow different. This learning does not take place without at least the possibility of concomitant changes in attitudes and values (Minton 1997).

Learning is an internal, human process (Houle 1984; Karakowsky et al. 1999; Lee 1996; Tight 1996, etc.). Prompted initially by the process of asking

questions (Jarvis 1993), learning is facilitated, if not instigated when the person learning encounters something which is other than herself (Stubblefield 1993).

Learning is the process the process of education facilitates; to put it another way, education exists for the sake of learning, rather than for any end of its own. It is, then, a dependent process, an activity undertaken as one, but only one, means of attaining the desired end, the change brought about by learning.

In general, the type of process which is called education[51] is deemed to be intentional (it does not just happen) (Fenwick 2000; Snook 1972a), deliberate and systematic (Astley 1994). It may or may not take place within educational institutions (see discussion of formal and informal education below).

Following the thought of Wittgenstein, it has been suggested like "justice", "education" does not insist on a concrete referent, but rather gives parameters within which the activity must take place (Nichols 1992; Peters 1970). In the case of education, these parameters are generally expressed as criteria.

For the purposes of this work, the definition of education used as a basis for discussion will be that offered by Peters. This definition has been chosen not only because if its wide currency, but also because of its applicability to the issues researched; as a definition of education, it provides a clear standard against which to measure what may, or may not, be called "education".

The classic delineation of the criteria which an activity must meet to be considered "education" as given by Peters are, first, that the process itself be about something which is not only worthwhile but is deemed to be so by the learner (Peters 1970, pp. 26ff). This immediately raises the question of what is worthwhile, and of who is to make the decision about "worthwhileness", and to what the adjective is applied. Peters makes it clear that this criterion relates to

the concept of education per se, rather than to any particular content, (Peters 1970, p. 25).

The "worthwhile" element of education is not a distant goal; rather, engaging in the process itself is worthwhile: education, or the process of education, is itself intrinsically worthwhile (Peters 1970; Winch et al. 1999). At this point the merit worthiness of education is about the value of the process, not yet the content.

Yet not any learning is deemed to be the result of "education". Peters' second criteria is that education must be more than mere technical skill; there must be a cognitive element involved, a level of understanding which effects a change in the learner (Congregation for Catholic Education; Peters 1970; Stubblefield 1993; Tight 1996; Winch et al. 1999). Again, this highlights the fact that education is a process which can be undertaken for its own merits, rather than for any extrinsic purpose (Winch et al. 1999). The learner is not only taking in new knowledge; she is being initiated into a body of thoughts and indeed into a group or society (Burkert 1985; Dewey 1897; Diotima 2005; Peters 1970; Winch et al. 1999; Zmeyov 1998)[52].

This criteria again relates to a change in the learner; the mere learning of a skill may not effect this transition, but education, which reaches beyond skills into the cognitive domain, will have this effect (Peters 1970; Winch et al. 1999). It is this criteria which, according to Stanley, makes education rare in a technicist society such as our own (Stanley, (1978) as quoted in Stubblefield 1993), or which is at times overlooked in discussions about education (Congregation for Catholic Education).

Astley sums up the view of education expressed above (and aligned with

the different set of criteria proposed by Melchert) when he says, "To be educated is to learn certain sorts of (valuable) things with understanding"(Astley 1994, p. 39). However, Peters has a final criterion.

The process which is worthy of the name education is one which must be conducted in a manner which is "worthwhile", one which is morally acceptable. This rules out both brainwashing and indoctrination as means getting across the worthwhile information required of education (Peters 1970).

This description of education, that of a process by which learners learn, in a worthwhile manner, that which is itself worthwhile and beyond mere skill, is not only a fairly surface level description of education, it is a contested one (Brandon 1992; Winch et al. 1999). However, rather than discuss this model in depth at the outset, we will begin from this model as a base, examining, extending and reworking it as necessary in the investigation of the Christian religious education of adults.

The justification for such a stance will be addressed particularly in relation to Christian religious education.

Adult Education

Adult education may or may not be discipline in its own right, (Brookfield 1986); arguably, it has been going on for centuries, but little attention has been paid to it as a field of study (Houle 1984). Even now, it may be said that there is no complete, concrete theory of adult learning (Brookfield 1986), or that even if there is, most practitioners are unaware of its existence (Peters et al. 1991).

The definition of adult education is no less contested than other such definitions; it is variously described in a very straightforward manner as that which

relates to education undertaken by adults (UNESCO, quoted in Tight 1996) to a quest for meaning[53](Rogers 1967), or unending inquiry (Clark 1993), or at a basic level, as a creation of opportunities for adults to learn (Thomas 1982), and other points in between, (see, among others, Billington 2000; Brookfield 1986; Hillage et al. 2000, etc.; International Council for Catechesis; Jarvis 1995; 1997; Jarvis et al. 1993; Kelly 1992; Little 1962; Martin 5-7 December 2001; Rogers 1996; Zepke 2005).

We will examine the concept of adult education not in its entirety, but in those aspects which relate directly to this research into the Christian religious education of adults. These are issues of adult learning and teaching, the placement of adult education in the informal sector, and particularly the aim or end of adult education.

It is necessary to define the parameters of the discussion, including that of "adult" education. The definition of 'adult' is not straightforward, as Shea points out (Shea 2003) Shea discusses an impressive range of theories relating to adulthood (Shea 2003). Although the precise description of the societal view of "adulthood" is outside the scope of this research, we will have cause to return to some of these issues in relation to the Christian religious education of adults. Does the word signify those who are over a particular age (18, 21) or those who are in employment (which could be much a much younger age)? For the most part54, those involved in this study will come under the definition of adult proffered by Rogers, "those who have had a break between their full-time initial education and their participation in organised learning activities" (Rogers 2000, 1); this is aligned with Thomas' definition of those who have finished or are no longer eligible for schooling (Thomas 1982).

However it is defined, it is clear that the term "adult" is a social construct (Rogers 2000), referring to a specific status in society, rather than (at this point) to a type of learning or particularly to a particular content to that learning. It may be that this status is accorded to people when they reach a particular level of wisdom or learning, but in general, this is more of an expectation of what happens as one ages (Tight 1996) than a reflection of a right of intellectual passage; adulthood may be said to be a process of becoming (Brookfield 1986) based in experience, rather than a recognition of arrival (Shea 2003).

This allows us to go some way toward a definition, in that we may say that adult education takes place when those whom society deems to be adult take part in the process described as education. Brookfield calls this a "transactional encounter" (Brookfield 1986, p. 294) for adults. Thomas continues this theme in seeing adult education as something which involves both a teacher/guide/facilitator and the learning adult (Thomas 1982).

If adult education is a transactional process between people, it follows that it cannot be a solo activity; while adults may learn without the intervention of others, adult education, in the sense it is used in the literature and in this research, requires the presence of at least two people[55]. This encounter may be formal or informal.

Formal/Informal

The division between formal (in educational institutions) and informal (outside of them) is well rehearsed in the literature (Brookfield 1986; Cox et al. 2000; Rogers 2000; Tuijnman et al. 2002). However, it is possible that the division between the two is not as clear cut as it might seem (Tuijnman et al. 2002).

Ahmed and Coombs suggest that formal education takes place in chronologically structured, hierarchical patterns, from primary school to university; nonformal education mirrors this process outside those institutions, and informal education as a lifelong process which requires no structures at all (cited in Tuijnman et al. 2002), (see also English 1999).

Rogers, however, makes the case that the difference between informal and formal education is not founded only, or even mainly, in the place and sphere of activity (that is, institution or not) but rather in the culture through which it takes place, either that of formal education (a transmissionist model of education[56]) or that of radical liberal education (usually in the informal sector), which takes a constructivist approach to knowledge (Rogers 2000). More recently, Rogers has made an interesting division between what he calls task-conscious learning (where the learner is focused on the task) and learning-conscious learning, (in which the learner is aware of the process of learning, in a sense, the learner's learning is foregrounded) (Cox 2002).

Ahmed and Coombs delineate not only between formal and informal education, but also between informal and nonformal education. This final category composes the process known otherwise as lifelong learning (Department for Education and Employment 1998; English 1999; Fryer 1997; Gorard et al. 1999; Houle·1984; Tom 1998; Tuijnman et al. 2002), that is, the process by which people continue to learn throughout life, from a variety of sources, other than from instances which are constructed specifically for learning (as cited in Tuijnman et al. 2002).

For the purposes of this research, informal education will be understood as education offered through structured means, outside of the formal educational

system.

It may be argued that an educational institution is necessary for a process to be called, "education" (Jarvis 1995), or that "adult education" per se requires structures for supporting learning (Thomas 1982). The first stance would eliminate informal learning (such as that sponsored, mounted or run through the churches) from the field of "education"; the second would require proof of support structures within the Church to allow its educational activities to be classed as such. I would suggest that neither of these is a useful narrowing of the term.

It is clear that education need not be limited to such institutions. The criteria for education cited above makes no mention of an institution being involved in the process, (unless one wishes to see an entire society, which arguably decides what is "worthwhile"). Indeed, Peters mentions the possibility of education being something a man does for himself (Peters 1970), which as we have seen, would not be accepted by more recent authors. In fact, it is possible that the reliance on an educational institution as provider of education is a part of the legacy of the schoolroom which adult education has not yet been able to shed (Houle 1984).

Secondly and conversely, if an institution dedicated to education is required for activities to be counted as "education", it is possible to argue that church based activities would fit the bill more than adequately. From the earliest days the members of the church have seen teaching as a part of their mission (c.f. Matt. 15.16, Mk. 28.20, etc.). By the third and fourth centuries, theologians were constructing tracts which not only sought to teach about the faith (the works of the Latin and Greek Fathers, for instance), but had also laid out plans for that teaching (cf. Cyril's Protocatechsis[57]). Augustine was even moved to pen a text

to a teacher who was suffering from what might, today, be diagnosed as "burn out" (Augustine (400)). Either way, whether education requires an institution or not (and I would argue that this is an untenably narrow definition of education), Church based learning is not excluded from the category, "education".

We have so far arrived at a definition of adult education as a structured process of adults learning something worthwhile in a worthy manner. This is, however, far too prosaic a definition to be of use when investigating the practice of the Christian religious education of adults in the Catholic Church. We must look at the aims or end of the process.

The Aims/Ends of Adult Education

Holley states the need for clarity about the aims of a process: the aims affect the procedures and content of the activity in question (Holley 1978). Asking questions about the aims of education is a means of clarifying what is worthwhile about the process (Peters 1970); good practice, which surely is the ultimate aim of all educational research, presupposes good theory (McKenzie 1986). The aim, of adult education is must be seen as the effect that practitioners wish the process to have on those who take part (Thomas 1982).

Yet there is little clarity and less agreement about the ends of adult education (Houle 1984), and the discussion of such aims may even be seen as a distraction to the field (Thomas 1982). This research, however, calls for a clear understanding of the general teleological reasons for adult education; this will underpin the delineation between education and other activities.

There are many theories about the ends of adult education; (See, among others, Astley 1994; Fenwick 2000; Foltz 1986; Freire 1970; Stubblefield 1993;

Sutherland 1998a; Thomas 1982; Tight 1996); although the theories vary widely, most of them relate in some way to the attainment of greater "adulthood" or of more autonomous living (Lindeman 1926). If we assume that adulthood is a process rather than an accomplished state, then we may say that the process is one of maturation.

This statement contains an implicit value judgement, that "maturation" is a good thing, something to be valued and worked toward, a judgement of which Peters is well aware (Peters 1970)[58]. Most proponents of adult learning in general and adult education in particular see adulthood as being about what might prosaically be called standing on one's own feet; Brookfield sums this up neatly when he states that the task of the teacher is to "..provoke students' separation from mass culture and then to assist in a critically aware re entry into that culture". (Brookfield 1986, p. 137); Zmeyov states the concept simply as the ability of adults to "realise themselves" (Zmeyov 1998). It may be said that the process of adult education is aimed at the ability to assume responsibility, or of seeing the world "objectively". (For an overview of different theories related to this idea, see Stubblefield 1993).

We may take from this that the end of adult education is to further the process of becoming that is adulthood; it is one of the means through which adults make meaning out of their situations and this desire to make meaning may be said to be a defining human condition, by which we "avoid the threat of chaos" (Mezirow 2000, p. 3). It is this meaning which allows the learner to define their "being in the world" (McKenzie 1986). This meaning-making is the final stage of the separation of self from environment which begins in childhood (Peters 1970), so that they may come to their own conclusions, their own knowledge and their

own learning, and know it to be their own.

Although education may be seen to be valuable in and of itself, the process is usually undertaken for a specific end. Thus, not only does adult education facilitate the making of meaning, it also allows adults to act as agents in relation to that made meaning (Imel; see also the views of Mezirow, as cited in McKenzie 1986; Stubblefield 1993).

Adult learning

The concern here is not learning per se, but rather what it is about adult learning which is specifically *adult*. We will concentrate not on what is different about the education that is presented to adults, but rather on the process of learning which is facilitated by that education (Thomas 1982).

Adult learning is a vast field, and it is beyond the scope of the present research to cover the entirety of the field [59]. We will concentrate on those aspects of adult learning which are of direct importance to the Christian religious education of adults: an examination of the concept of adult learning, of the characteristics of adult learners, and then finally, and flowing from these characteristics (Schauffele et al. 2000), we will examine some of the models proposed to explain the process of adult learning.

The concept of adult learning

Learning itself, whether in relation to adults or children, defies an accurate description: as with education, the term "learning" denotes a process, rather than a static entity; disparate notions are combined under the heading of "learning", as they form more or less of the process at any given time (Schauffele et al. 2000). Even the term, "learning" is not undisputed (Black et al. 1995).[60] Schauffele and

Baptiste (2000) provide a concise overview of the history of the theories of learning; what concerns us here is the concept of learning as it relates to the process of adults making meaning; a process which requires its own principles, apart from, or at least slightly different from, those related to the learning of children (Zmeyov 1998).

Discussing both the behavioural and cognitivist views of learning, Schauffele and Baptiste state that "...both could assent to the description of learning as being the process of developing repeatable strategies which are habitually acted upon in order to achieve what the subject perceives to be the best possible ends" (Schauffele et al. 2000, p. 451). This neatly connects the definition of adult education (meaning making) with that of the process of education per se, if we can substitute "the best possible ends" for "worthwhile" in Peters' definition.

It is important to note, however, that in the definition suggested by Schauffele and Baptiste the perception of worthwhileness is made by the learner herself, rather than by society as a whole or in part. Although the authors are not discussing adult education per se, this transfer of responsibility from society to the learner as agent is important in any discussion of adult learning. This transfer also reflects a change in the way adult learning is viewed: recent authors have been less inclined to differentiate absolutely between the process of learning undergone by children and adults, and concentrate on the differences in the persons involved (Rogers 2000). Adults bring different levels of experience to learning, and have different intentions about the process, than do children. Schauffele and Baptiste's view of learning is particularly applicable to that undertaken by adults.

Characteristics of adult learners

There are numerous lists of the characteristics of adult learners (such as those proposed by Smith and James, cited in Brookfield 1986). Simpson argues that the two most commonly cited characteristics of adult learners (that is, of the agents involved in the learning) are their autonomy and the experience which they bring to the learning situation (1980, cited in Brookfield 1986). These two characteristics provide a useful framework for the discussion of adult learning in relation to the Christian religious education of adults; I will align these with the framework proposed by Daines et al (Daines et al. 1993) in this discussion.

Daines' first few characteristics fall under Simpson's general heading of experience. Adults do not come to the learning experience as blank slates or as empty vessels, either in terms of knowledge or experience. This experience may be practical (in terms of the practice of learning – Daines' fourth characteristic), it may be knowledge (Daines' first characteristic), or it may be manifest in attitudes and ways of thinking (Daines' third characteristic). While it is true that children also come to the learning situation with a fund of experience, by definition adults should have more experience to draw on, simply through having experienced more in their lifetimes. This experience can become a valuable resource for learning and teaching (James, cited in Brookfield 1986). It is the amount of experience which adults bring to learning which differentiates them from children.

> "I think that's I think that distinction I think lies at the heart of what we're trying to do. Like one of the characteristics of being an adult in today's society, all the transitions that are going on, all the questioning that's going on is living with ambiguity and living with complexity and living with perplexity". (A3)

This experience is not static: humans experience change throughout their lives (Karakowsky et al. 1999). Some adults undergo specific periods of change during the period normally described as "midlife" (Billington 2000). James' taxonomy of the characteristics of adult learners provides a bridge between the concepts of experience and autonomy[61] as set out by Simpson. The view the adult has of herself, James maintains, moves from one of being dependent to one of independence, as her confidence in herself grows, and as she assumes responsibility (cited in Brookfield 1986). Not only does the adult bring more experience to the learning situation than might a child, in theory at least the adult chooses to bring that experience to the learning situation, and may well have reflected on that experience. The experience itself may become a part of the learning, as adults test what they learn against their experience (Rogers 2000); this leads us back to Brookfield's idea of a critical evaluation of culture.

Joined to this idea of experience is Daines' third characteristic of learning, which parallels Simpson's second: that adults may be expected (the phrasing is important) to take responsibility for themselves (Wickett 1991). As adults age and (presumably) mature, they move toward their own formations of meaning. Joining the two ideas, we find that adult learning is one of the means for attaining this ability to make meaning, which is part of the end of adult education per se; it is an intentional act on the part of adults, to which they bring experience and expectations.

Models of adult learning

In relation to adult learning, the creation of models is an attempt to take the dynamic process of learning and confine it into a set of more or less static boxes; although clearly doomed to failure in terms of absolute accuracy (Brookfield

1986), the attempt is still a necessary one. As we have seen, practice flows from or at least is supported by theory[62]: the model by which adult learning is conceived will have an impact on the practice of those involved in the field, whether they articulate this model or not.

So contested is the field that even providing a taxonomy of the various models is a difficult task. As we are interested in these models in their relation to the Christian religious education of adults, it is not necessary to delve deeply into every model, but rather to mine them for resources of benefit to the task in hand. For the sake of clarity, I shall use the division suggested by infed.org: behaviourist, cognitivist, social/situational and humanist. (infed.org).

The behaviourist model of learning is concerned with exactly that: the observable behaviour of the learner (Reece et al. 2000). Rooted in behavioural psychology, in the work of theorists such as Watson, Thorndyke and Skinner, behaviourists concentrate on the environmental determinants of action, and the response to stimuli from that environment. Hartley (1998, quoted in Smith 1999a) highlighted four key principles in the behaviourist view of learning: the importance of activity, the value of repetition and practice, the motivational force of reinforcement, and the necessity of clear objectives. Although elements of this model are frequently found in the formal sector, (c.f., the use of the phrase, "By the end of this module, students will..." in course documents) (Smith 1999a), this model has had the least direct effect on the Christian religious education of adults as it is presented in the literature.

Many educational theorists have left the behavioural paradigm either behind, (eschewing it completely) or below (building on it to arrive at a different level of understanding of learning, centred around the learner rather than around

the learning process (Reece et al. 2000)). Miller, for instance, emphasises the importance of cognition, but also calls for reinforcement of behaviour and the necessity to practice what is learned, leading to the supposition that his work may well fit into the cognitivist camp (Brookfield 1986). Tolman highlighted the importance of cognition for education (Schauffele et al. 2000), pointing out the importance of the action of the learner qua agent, building a cognitive map (Reece et al. 2000), as opposed to the learner as someone simply responding to stimuli (a stance with which Lee would agree, see Lee 1971). In the same vein, while recognising the importance of the environment to the process of learning, Piaget investigated the process of cognition and cognitive change involved in learning (Schauffele et al. 2000). As Fenwick points out, that which is cognitive is necessarily experiential, as we experience the process of cognition (Fenwick 2000). Gangé's model of learning encompassed behaviourist ideas, but only as a small part of human capabilities (Smith 1999b). The learner need not rely entirely on the environment, but rather can become, as Knowles pointed out, self directed (Brookfield 1986; Knowles 1962; Knowles 1984). This highlights again the intentionality involved in adult learning.

It is the cognitivists' insistence that the mind acts, or can act, independently of the environment (Schauffele et al. 2000), and that knowledge is itself a process (Reece et al. 2000), which is relevant to the discussion of the Christian religious education of adults.

The next classification of this particular taxonomy of adult learning is that of social/situated learning. Stemming from the work of Bandura, the theory of social learning holds that people are influenced by a wide range of factors, both external (the environment) and internal (Schauffele et al. 2000). Thus the learner

is able to take account of not only her own experience, but that of others, in her learning (Smith 1996b).

The learner acts as agent of her own process of learning, choosing situations according to her own evaluation of the means to the best possible ends, as in other views of learning [63]. However, in the social cognivitist view, these ends are no longer simply those of the environment or observation of their own behaviour (as for the behaviourists) or those of what might be called the mind (as for the cognivitists) but encompass a much wider range, including the "spiritual dimension of personhood" (Smith 1996b).

The learner decides her participation in the process of learning in this view according to a holistic process which includes within it an estimation of the best goals, the value attached to the process itself (which relates to Peters' declaration that education can be a valuable end of itself), the value of the outcomes to the learner, and the learner's perceived ability to make use of those outcomes (Smith 1996b).

Building from this model, Lave and Wagner have put forward a refinement known as situated learning (Rømer 2002). Using constructivist ideas, these authors insist that learners construct their knowledge through interaction with the environment (Schauffele et al. 2000) (thus also calling on previous behaviourist work, and showing yet again that human learning can not easily be put into a tidy box).

Learners participate in the process of learning as a social act; rather than attempting to build or accrue structures for understanding the world, making meaning of it, learners participate in structures already created (Smith 1996b) [64]. Harking back again to Peters' criteria for education, learners seek to attain the

best possible goals for and through their learning. However, these goals are determined on a number of levels: through the community into which learners are initiated, through the process of learning itself (on the assumption that it increases criticality), and through the situation in which the learner finds herself, with the experience it provides for her. The delineation of what ends are "the best possible ones" is made through not only the rational processes of the mind, but also through physical and emotional sensations, as well as other types of awareness, through reason and affect – a duality to which we shall return. This entire process allows learners to use the process of learning to build and integrate models of meaning to their own ends (Smith 1996b), to reinterpret their particular situations in terms of new knowledge and learning (Karakowsky et al. 1999).

The final model is that labelled "humanist", and grows out of the concern of humanist psychology for the potential humans have for growth.

Carl Rogers' work insisted on the holistic nature of learning; Rogers held that adult learning should involve the whole of the learner, it should be self initiated, be evaluated by the learner herself and that the essence of learning is meaning (Rogers 1967; 1990; Smith 1996a). This leads to learning which is significant, founded on the experience of the learner (Foley 2001).

Rather than assuming, as the behaviourists might have been seen to do, that all human action is in response to stimuli which are external, the humanist view of learning argues for a teleological orientation to learning and growth. Thus, Maslow proposed a hierarchy of needs which, through the process of maturation, leads people from fulfilling their own, particular desires through to concern for the greater good (Maslow 1971; Zmeyov 1998). This reiterates the

view of learning as process – a process toward the agent's actualisation of these higher goods.

Such a proposal, however, contains within it judgements such as we have seen above; it argues that the greater, common good (communal good) must be better, higher, than the good solely of the individual. Although it is common within this framework to speak rather of facilitation than of teaching (Brookfield 1986), and thus bringing the intention of the learner into prominence, there is still a sense in which the facilitator is enabling a process toward a specific end. In relation to the Christian religious education of adults, this argument takes on solid shape and finds a firm foundation.

Mezirow speaks of transformative learning: the learner integrates new learning with previous experiences, understandings and knowledge (Brookfield 2000; Imel; Karakowsky et al. 1999; Mezirow 2000). Astley sums this type of learning up as "a change of perspective or habit of mind" (Astley 2002, pg. 21) This process requires critical assessment on the part of the learner, again harking back to Peters' original statement that education is about more than the acquisition of more than mere skill, but rather takes in the cognitive faculties as well. The end of this process is maturity and growth (Billington 2000).

Boyd (Boyd and Meyers, 1998, cited in Imel) gives a shape to this process of change by characterising it as a three fold process of receptivity, recognition and grieving. It is in this final stage, of letting go of what the learner had previously used to make meaning and accepting new meanings, integrating them with previous knowledge, that the change of learning takes place[65]. This process that the learning becomes part of the learner's "anthrosphere" in what Verbitsky names "contextual learning" (Zmeyov 1998); Slee likens the process to a

dialectical exchange between the (previously) known and unknown (Slee 1998).

The relationship of these models to the Christian religious education of adults

The value of these models to the subject at hand must be demonstrated. Rather than settle on one model, I would suggest that parts of each of them have relevance to the present research.

Obviously, the behaviour (widely defined as including speech) of the learners is involved in the Christian religious education of adults, so from the behaviourists we must take the emphasis on observable phenomena as indicative of interior change; we will also have cause to highlight the presence, or lack, of clear objectives on the part of the learner involved in the Christian religious education of adults overall and in the field work area; indeed, the clarity of these objectives both on the part of the providers and the learners is of paramount importance to the present research.

From social and situated learning theories, the concept of the spiritual dimension of learning will obviously recur in any discussion of learning and teaching which is overtly religious; further, the creation of meaning as a part of society will be of importance in relation to the educational experiences provided by the Roman Catholic Diocese in the field work.

Above all, however, we will have occasion to investigate the process of meaning making involved in the Christian religious education of adults, both in terms of the literature and in relation to the field work area; it is here that ideas of transformative learning, and transformation through learning, will come to the fore. What meaning is being made by the learners, and what meaning is

intended by the providers? What transformation is desired by the learners, and what transformation is intended by the providers?

The Teaching of Adults

While there are many texts which deal with the practicalities of teaching[66], we are concerned not with general debates about practice but rather with the theory that underpins and surrounds them[67]. In particular, we will examine the literature on the teaching of adults which has a bearing on the Christian religious education of adults.

As always, the first problem is that of definition. We will then move on to examine issues of power and authority, and finally take a brief look at relevant issues of practice.

What is teaching?

In many ways, defining teaching presents the same problems encountered above in relation to the definitions of education and learning. This continuation of confusion is logical, as teaching is intimately connected with both processes.

It has been argued that teaching is not a discipline (or that education, overall, is not a discipline) because it lacks common ground for "creating and testing knowledge" (Schulman (1988), quoted in Freeman 1998). For the most part, practitioners operate in local settings; what is shared in the community of teachers (such as it is) is experiential (Freeman 1998). "Teaching" is a process (Carr 1999a), but only in terms of a process undertaken by individuals in concrete situations. Is it possible to discuss "teaching" in a more reified sense?

As McCaffry points out, "teacher" describes both the person engaged in the activity, and the function undertaken (McCaffry 1993). In practice, it is very

difficult (if not impossible) to separate the person from the function, at least in the execution of the process of teaching; in general, teaching is what the teacher (broadly defined)[68] intends to do: teaching is an intentional act (Astley 1994; Carr 1999a; Crittenden 1972). Therefore, as a basic definition, a "teacher" in the sense used here, is one who intends to "teach" – that is, to facilitate learning in others (Astley 1994; Clark 1993; Cook 2001).

For this reason, "teaching" must accord, in theory and practice, with the theory and practice of education and learning; the second must provide the overall framework in which the first takes place, consciously or unconsciously[69]. Teaching must endeavour to bring about or facilitate (the two words put a slightly different slant on the work of the teacher) a process which leads to (or can lead to) a meaningful change in the behaviour of the learner, in an appropriate fashion.

Teaching is not synonymous with education (Carr 1999a), as education is a process which is situated in the learner, while teaching is situated in the teacher.

Rather, teaching is a part of the overall process of education: teaching feeds and supports the process of education and learning, but does not dictate it[70]. Teaching is a process which is individual to the person undertaking it (otherwise, there would be little point in the industry which has sprung up around the continuing professional development of teachers, for instance). Because of this individual nature of the practice and process of teaching, what is said about it here will suffer from all the usual faults of generalisation. The field work phase grounds the generalisations in the practice of a diocese as a whole and in the work of individual tutors.

Teaching is one of the means by which the process of learning is enabled

for the learner. As such, the teacher's role is to be either the agent of that change (Peters 1970) or at least the catalyst for it. This in turn means that merely giving information is not teaching (Crittenden 1972): information exists all over the world, yet unless a learner (or series of learners) is engaging with that information, being changed by it in a worthwhile and appropriate manner, learning understood as a part of education is not taking place.

The role of the teacher, then, is to somehow be a link between information and the learner, so that learning is enabled (Minton 1997).[71] This does not mean, however, that the role of the teacher is merely that of a conduit, nor does it require a banking model of education (Freire 1970). The teacher must structure the learning environment to best enable the learner to learn (Lee 1971) whatever it is that the learner wishes to learn; particularly among the teachers of adults, it is a common idea that teachers should so structure this environment that they eventually do themselves out of a job (in relation to any given learner); "The good teacher is a guide who helps others dispense with his services" (Peters 1970, pg. 53). In fact, it may be said that the important aspect is not so much the content of the learning, but the process itself (Rogers 1990), as we have seen above: education is a process, rather than a thing.

We are particularly concerned with the teaching of adults. The best known theory relating to the teaching and learning of adults is that popularised by Knowles, "androgogy" (Brookfield 1986; Rachal 2002; Tight 1996; Zmeyov 1998). One of the appeals of what Knowles called the "art and science of helping adults learn" (Tight 1996) is the fact that the theory is practice based (Rachal 2002).

The history of the term "androgogy" or its alternative spellings, is rehearsed elsewhere in the literature (Rachal 2002; Tight 1996). Although not

without its critics (Brookfield 1986; Rachal 2002; Tight 1996), androgogy is undoubtedly an influential theory.

For our purposes, the element of androgogical theory which is of interest is the view of the relationship of the teacher and learner. The emphasis in androgogy shifts away from the teacher to the self-directed learner; the teacher is no longer in possession of the content-to-be-learned, but is rather the expert in learning (Tight 1996). In the androgogical process learners learn to be self directed in their learning through the process itself (Mezirow, (1981) as cited in Reece et al. 2000). The process is a conscious one for both teacher and learner, aimed at the attainment of adulthood on the part of the learner (Anderson and Linderman (1927) cited in Brookfield 1986). This will have particular relevance for the Christian religious education of adults.

This leads us to the issues of authority and power in the teaching/learning situation. An androgogue (Jarvis et al. 1993) is far more likely to think of her work as "facilitation" than "teaching" per se (Brookfield 1986; Lee 1971; Reece et al. 2000).

The teacher is deemed to be in a dual authority, one of control (of the classroom situation) and one of content (Peters 1970; see also: Raviv et al. 2003). Although this view of the authority of the teacher relates particularly to classroom practice in schools (see, for example, Beck 1994; Robertson 1994; Snook 1972c)[72], it still holds in some senses for adult education in at least the formal sector: the teacher (facilitator) is contracted to do certain things, to help students to attain certain set outcomes; she is expected to be competent not only in the processes (technology) of teaching, but also in the subject matter in question. To a certain extent the same must hold for the informal sector: learners

come to instances of learning expecting to do just that, aided by skilled tutors.

Much has been written on the issue of the relationship between teacher and learner in adult education, both formal and informal (Bingham 2002; Brookfield 1986; Houle 1984; Lee 1971; Orr 2000; Raviv et al. 2003; Reece et al. 2000; Wickett 1991). For our purposes, Lee sums up the relevant view of the work of the teacher in the situation of Christian religious education of adults, which he calls facilitation:

> Facilitation is not a transfer of knowledge from the mind of the teacher to the mind of the students. Instead, facilitation is the deliberative arrangement of the conditions of learning whereby the individual is enabled to learn what he can learn in terms of where he is developmentally here and now. (Lee 1971, pg. 49).

This has clear connections to the model proposed by Hand, of the passing on of beliefs from one person to another through what he names an "exercise of perceived intellectual authority" (Hand 2002, p. 551).

The salient point here is that the work of the facilitator of adult learning is one of creating the atmosphere in which learning can take place, and of allowing learners access to the tools needed for learning. There is no guarantee that what the facilitator does will *result* in the desired learning (or, again, teaching comes merely a craft with a set of tested procedures). Nor, significantly for the discussion of indoctrination below, is the facilitator setting out to *prove* the content of the teaching, to such an extent that the rational mind would have no choice other than acceptance (Hand 2002).

There are still issues of power and authority here, however: the teacher will have an idea of how she would like the learner to change (the behavioural

change involved in learning) and what learning she would like to take place (Lee 1971). Few human processes are entirely neutral, and the facilitation of learning is not such a one. The ideal for the teacher is not absolute neutrality, but rather openness to difference and divergence.

Much of the preceding work, however, has been theoretical rather than practical; how does the teacher, particularly in the informal sector, transfer this theory into practice?

One of the perennial tensions between theory and practice is the neatness of theory and the messiness of practice; what seems perfectly plausible and workable in the study of the academic rarely works out quite so neatly in a situation which includes a group of real people. Teachers/tutors are left to make the transition from printed word to classroom practice[73].

One of the first areas of tension any teacher of adults will encounter is simply this issue of "adultness": not everyone present in any particular group will have attained the same level of self direction, in spite of what the theory may say (Wickett 1991). Brookfield warns that text book idyll of the self directed, joyful learner is not always encountered in practice (Brookfield 1986). In fact, Brookfield calls the vision of the self directed adult learner a panacea for the facilitator, as (if it were the reality) it would remove from her the need to make difficult decisions about content, selection, etc..(Brookfield 1986).

Rather, we have seen that at times learning is a process not of joy, but of grief. This does not mean that the teacher becomes a bereavement counsellor. The learner is the one who must make the move from one state to another, encountering the grief of loss on the way: at best, the teacher is a midwife to this process, supplying instruments and support as necessary, but unable to take over

the motive power of the process[74].

(The question of whether all adult learners will, or indeed, should reach this level of self directedness is a not inconsiderable one; we will return to the assumptions made of and about adult learners in this sphere below).

Brookfield makes the salient point that one could take the ideal of self directed learning too far, so that the teacher becomes nothing but a technologist of learning for the learner (Brookfield 1986). This is particularly the case in relation to Christian religious education of adults, where the teacher (presumably, see below) has not only intellectual but spiritual reasons for hoping to foster the learning involved.

Most of those who are involved in teaching are so because they hope to effect a change in the behaviour of the learner. While this may seem an unfashionable thing to say in the light of some of the rhetoric about androgogy, I believe it still remains the case, a belief upheld by my own experience of both the formal and informal field. In the formal field of adult education, the attainment of such changes is the measure of the effectiveness of the learning experience: learning outcomes must be specified and institutions must be able to show how they assess whether or not these outcomes are met (Quality Assurance Agency 2002).

Lee sets out his stall very clearly in this regard, stating that, "Instruction is the process by and through which learning is caused in an individual in one way or another. Instruction, then, is identical with teaching" (Lee 1971, pg. 8) (italics as in original), and we have seen that teaching is an intentional activity (Astley 1994; Crittenden 1972). It is what, precisely, teachers intend in the Christian religious education of adults that is the focus of this research: what intentions do

they have, are the processes which are available to them capable of allowing them to attain these ends, and are the ends and process themselves worthy ones, cf. Peters' criteria? To this end, we must examine Christian religious education of adults itself as a subset of adult education. We will look first – briefly – at the concept of religious education, then at how these concepts relate to adult education and learning per se. From there, we will be able to map out a schema of types of interventions along the continuum of indoctrination, preaching, formation and teaching. (This continuum is somewhat hinted at in the work of Moore, (Moore 1972), but he deals only with education and indoctrination; the addition of nurture and preaching, as steps on the continuum, will make the progression from one end to the other much clearer and allow practitioners to reflect more accurately on their own practice and intentions).

Religious Education

Religious education is itself contested territory, (Astley 1994; 2000a; Astley et al. 1992b; Carr 1999b; Cush 1999; Diotima 2003; Farley 1996; Gardner 2004; Hand 2002; Holley 1978; Lee 1996; Mackenzie 1998; McKenzie 1986; Slee 1998; Wickett 1991). The aims and objectives of religious education itself must be examined, particularly in relation to Christian religious education[75].

A great deal of the extant literature on religious education concerns the presentation of RE/RS (religious studies) in (Aubrey 1948; Barnes 2000; Bastide 1999; Capaldi 1998; Carr 1994; Carr 1999b; Chapman 1998; Charnley 1999; Congregation for Catholic Education; Cush 1999; Francis 1998; Francis et al. 2001; Galloway 1996; Groome 1995; Hardy 1982; Holley 1978; Hull 1984; Karmran 1999; Mackenzie 1998; McCaffry 1993; McLaughlin 2000; Newbigin

1982). A smaller subset of that work relates to the education of adults (Hull 1985; Savage 2000; Wickett 1991; Wilde 1998; Withnall 1986), and finally, a much more restricted field deals with the Christian religious education of adults in the Roman Catholic Church (Committee for Catechesis and Adult Christian Education 2000, etc.; Congregation for the Clergy 1997; International Council for Catechesis). Working with this broad range of literature, is it possible to come to some conclusions with regard to the aims and objectives of Christian education per se? This, coupled with a concept of the expected outcomes of Christian education will inform any discussion of the methods used to attain those outcomes.

What then is the basic aim of religious education?

There is no more agreement on this issue than there has been on many of the others; this is merely a contested subset of a larger and contended issue. Attfield maintains that religious education is the open ended investigation of the major faiths of the world (Hull 1982). Yet from what we have seen of education above, religious education, if it is worthy of the name, cannot simply be the parroting of specific ideas without understanding; there must be a conceptual framework undergirding the knowledge acquired (Peters 1970). Aubrey holds that the work of the religious school (and we may, without damage to the concept, extend this to religious education as a whole) is to help the learner build a personal faith (Aubrey 1948). "It's about providing a situation where people can actually, whatever experience they have had, help them to integrate their experience into God, their understanding of God and the church and the life into what they are doing" (T3).

On the other hand, in the same volume Marvel sees the central aim as enabling the learner to understand what is central to religion, the essence of the

experience of revelation and response, "as known by the religious person". This is a more affective view of religious education, as it calls for a cognitive and affective response from the learner, (Marvell 1982, p. 72). Hand assumes that at the least, it must include the transmission of religious beliefs (Hand 2002).[76] DIM goes further, and sees the subject of religious education as the human person, whole and entire (56), and its aim as the attainment of the "Supreme Good... and the maximum of well being possible here below for human society", achieved by perfecting individuals and society (8) (Pius XI 1929a). This is echoed by at least one theologian influenced by Freirean educational theory, Gorringe, who describes the primary concern of education as the realisation of the human potential for freedom, love and goodness, (Bellett 1998; Cooper 1995), as well as by one of the tutors in the field work, "My reasoning behind it is I think education is a freedom. I believe it is something that gives us freedom and allows people the capacity to reflect on their experience" (T3). This parallels the general aims of adult education as seen above, in relation to autonomy and meaning making. It does not, however, get us much further in an attempt to understand what religious educators are actually doing.

Lee states the ends of religious education as: "Religious instruction at its highest level consists in facilitation of the modification of the learner's entire behavioural pattern along religious lines" (Lee 1971, pg. 56). He holds that there are four cardinal goals for religions instruction (a term he employs for the entire act of facilitation of learning in this area). The first is the modification of the learner's cognitive behaviour to aid the intellectual synthesis of faith in the life of the learner, both in terms of knowledge and understanding. The second concerns the modification of the learner's affective behaviour in relation to

attitudes about things religious. The third and fourth goals concern the modification of the learner's product and process behaviour, in relation to that which is known and understood by the learner and that which is thought, felt and done by the learner (Lee 1971). Aubrey sums this up more succinctly by saying that the aim is to "believe, and to grow in and through one's believing" (Aubrey 1948, pg. 461).

Astley makes the point that over-intellectualisation of not only the discussions about but the practice of, Christian education, does a disservice to the concept. He holds that Christian education – a term he uses as more or less synonymous with what we have called Christian religious education and to which we shall return – is not primarily an intellectual matter, but one of affect and therefore of the whole of life (Astley 1994). This leads us to a discussion of the role of affect in learning, particularly in religious education.

Astley argues for the centrality of affect in this type of learning. Affect, he claims, comes from and leads to religious experience (Astley 1994). We have seen the importance of experience, and experiential learning, as it relates to adult learning and education: in the case of religious education, this experience is religious experience, (Astley 1994; 2000a; b; Lee); for Astley, the purpose of religious education is the evocation and development of specifically religious experience, and "in particular, religious feeling states" (Astley 1994, p. 135). To teach otherwise, to concentrate on the doctrinal elements of religion, is to undervalue the purposes of religious education in relation to adults, particularly in the informal sector[77].

Statements such as the above can cause disquiet among educators (Wickett 1991), as this affective domain is thought to be too sensitive, too

personal, to touch in teaching. The interaction with the student is too near, the possibilities of overstepping professional boundaries are too close for comfort, both for educators themselves and for those who write about the field[78]. It is much safer to retreat to a transfer model of education (Freire 1970), in which the educator hands over "stuff" to the learner, who assimilates it, without being affectively changed or challenged in any way. It is here, in this issue of affect, in the issue of the ways in which religion goes beyond theology and becomes experience[79], that questions are raised about whether or not it can be education, in the sense used in this work: is this dealing with the affective part of others actually anything which could be considered a morally acceptable transaction?

Yet if we return to what we have seen above about the behaviouralist view of education, surely this desire to effect the affective realm is merely an extension of the rest of the educative process? It is here that we must make the distinction between learning about religion – as happens in Religious Studies/Education in state schools (Ali Ashraf 1992; Barnes 2000; Bastide 1999; Bolton 1997; Copley 1997; Cush 1997; Cush 1999; Everington 1999; Fox 1996; Galloway 1996; Groome 1995; Hardy 1982; Hull 1982; Hull 1999; Jackson 1999; Marvell 1982; Matthew 1966; Mott-Thornton 1996; Newbigin 1982; Slee 1998; Smart 1966; Thatcher 1991; Watson 1992; Wilson 1992) and religious education, that is, education which is primarily aimed not only at informing learners about religion (or rather allowing learners to become informed about religion) but at providing the space for learners to learn about the primary facet of religion, that is, experience. Astley aptly calls this process, "education for conversion" (Astley 1994, p. 250).

Christian Religious Adult Education

> In fact the key words used to describe the present situation of Christian education are confusion, loss of direction and frustration of purpose. Both Protestant and Catholic educators speak of a crisis of foundations in Christian education and call for a search for a new identity for the field. (Seymour 1996, pg. 3)

Christian religious education is a subset of religious education, and as such, still a part of the social sciences (Astley et al. 1992a; Lee 1971; 1973; 1996).

Christian religious education is specifically confessional religious education, (Astley 1994; Cush 1999; Dykstra 1996; Winch et al. 1999), aligned to a specific faith. Christian religious education seeks religious changes in the learner that are specifically Christian (Astley 1994). The significance of the confessional nature of this type of education underpins the understanding of the field.

The outcomes of Christian religious education are not seen to be simply, merely or mainly intellectual or content-related, (Astley 1994; 2000b; Holley 1978; Lee 1996; Nipkow 1996; Seymour 1996, etc.). Rather, the outcomes of Christian religious education are directly related to Christianity, to the living of the Christian life, (Astley 1994; Cush 1999; Foltz 1986; Hull 1985; Leahy et al. 1997; Lee 1973; McKenzie 1986; Pius X 1905; Willis 1993). Tutors in the field work agreed, "...and they [tutors] must be able to relate to adults because it isn't teaching to secondary school kids, it's not teaching to university students; you're teaching to men and women who want to serve god in this particular way." (T2)." At the end of it I look back and see a student gone on from something more. ... a contribution to a deeper and richer lifestyle" (T3).

In Astley's words, the aim is not only to learn the truth "but also - in Kierkegaardian terms – to "be the truth" (Astley 1994, pg. 255).

However, it is a contention here that religious education is education: there are boundaries around educational enterprises, and these boundaries must obtain in religious education, as well. "Christian education" cannot be taken to mean entry into the entire life of the church in a general sense[80]; rather, it must mean ordered learning, with a specific goal in mind (Farley 1996).

We may say, then, that the goal of Christian religious education is the Christian life, lived more fully. This means that Christian religious education is ordered learning, with both cognitive and affective outcomes, both of which are aligned to a deepening (or beginning, in terms of converts to Christianity) of a particular view of life, a particular way of making meaning.

Is this not, however, too prescriptive a concept to fall under the heading of "education"? Does this end, which is an extremely directive one (at least on the face of it) preclude the possibility of confessional education from the outset? Is this not indoctrination rather than education? What price the autonomy of the learner in this scenario?

To try to answer these questions (which are very real and lively ones), a scehma of provision will be proposed and examined, a schema which spans a continuum from indoctrination at the one pole, through preaching, nurture and formation, and arrives at a specific definition of education at the further pole.

As will be reiterated throughout, however, this schema is a continuum, rather than a set of distinct stages. The nature of this continuum is such that there may be great difficulty in assigning any particular instance of learning/teaching to a particular point on the typology. Rather than make such an attempt, therefore,

we will examine indoctrination, preaching, nurture/formation in that order, and relate them to what we have seen of education[81].

3.2. *Indoctrination*[82]

Indoctrination is another contested issue: there is no general agreement even on the definition of the term itself, (Atkinson 1972; Callan 1985; Crittenden 1972; Ducasse 1968; Flew 1972a; b; Gardner 1998; 2004; Hand 2002; Kilpatrick 1972; Leahy et al. 1997; Moore 1972; Peters 1970; Snook 1972c; Tatarkowski 1997; Theissen 1982; White a 1972; White b 1972; Wilson 1972a). It is, however, generally seen as reprehensible (Gardner 1998; Snook 1972c). While indoctrinatory practices may frequently take place under the guise of education, (particularly religious education, in the view of many), considering the definition of education given above, it is difficult to see how it could, itself, be considered such, if we accept Peters' definition as above that education is the transmission of something worth while in a "morally acceptable manner" (Peters 1970)[83]. If the goal of Christian religious education is, as with all education, behavioural change or modification (Lee 1971) in relation to something worth while (Peters 1970), and that change is towards a more Christian, or more fully Christian lifestyle (or some part thereof), can this be both accomplished and measured without recourse to indoctrination, or indoctrinatory techniques? (It is important in respect to this sequence of concepts to understand that those who partake of this kind of educative process do so through their own choice; this goes some way to addressing the issue of "worthwhile-ness", as we shall see below). Popular perceptions might well hold that such teaching is, of necessity, indoctrination (Carr 1994; Flew 1972a; mentioned in Francis et al. 2001; Gregory et al. 1972;

Willis 1993); indeed, one author holds that the very topic of the field work, the Roman Catholic Church, is mainly responsible for indoctrination in schools (Flew 1972b); another set of authors query whether indoctrination takes place primarily in politics and religion and therefore most commonly in communist countries and the Roman Catholic church (Gregory et al. 1972).

It is the hypothesis of this work that Christian religious education for adults is possible without recourse to indoctrination or indoctrinatory techniques[84]. This hypothesis is based on the view of education expressed above, coupled with an assumption of autonomy on the part of adult learners particularly in the informal sector. This hypothesis remains to be tested, first against the literature in the field, and secondly in the field work.

Knowles relates indoctrination to the transmission model of education (Little 1962). (It should be noted, however, that the idea of education as a possible instance of transmission at all has been attacked (Biesta 1996)). Rogers offers a diagram of the spectrum of learning experiences, which range from training (with narrow goals, the "right" way to do, no choice) through to indoctrination, (with narrow goals, only one way of thinking). Between them lies education (with wide goals, many ways of thinking and doing, development of choice) (Rogers 1996). Jarvis states clearly that indoctrination can never be considered education (Jarvis 1995).

(This view itself, however, is not universally accepted. Tan makes an eloquent case for the reclaiming of indoctrination as a means of education for the young (Tan 2004), and supports her argument by a range of citations. Interesting as her argument is, however, it pertains to the early teaching of the young, rather than to the teaching of adults).

We require at least a framework idea of "indoctrination". For the sake of clarity, and again examining rather than attempting to define, we shall adopt as a framework the approach advocated by Theissen, in examining four criteria of indoctrination, adding to and augmenting it as necessary in relation to the topic of this study.

Theissen's means of evaluating indoctrination is a useful one, as it clearly sets out the types of arguments which are made about indoctrination; he is concerned not so much with the specifics of any given episode which may be indoctrinatory, but rather with categorising the different ways of approaching the issue of indoctrination.

Criteria One: Content

Theissen (1998, pg. 68) uses content as the first criterion of indoctrination. As this concept underpins a number of the other criteria, it will require a greater depth of exploration. Theissen argues that indoctrination may be seen to be learning/teaching which has to do with doctrines. The argument here is more than one of semantics of the derivation of indoctrination from doctrine (both deriving from the Latin word meaning to teach or to lead out, see above, p. 16). Rather, Theissen contends that doctrines are a particular type of knowledge, which rest on belief rather than empirical evidence for acceptance. This is such a widespread understanding of the term indoctrination (Gregory et al. 1972; Hand 2002; Kilpatrick 1972; Leahy et al. 1997; Peters 1970; Snook 1972d)[85].

Theissen elsewhere makes the point that while it is it impossible to discuss the content criterion of indoctrination without an understanding of doctrine, little discussion has been given to the concept of what a doctrine actually is (Theissen

1982). He proposes a four fold definition of doctrine, or at least of the characteristics of doctrine. We will adopt this schema as a useful one, augmenting it and relating it to the subject in hand.

First of all, Theissen describes doctrines as those things which are the core of any particular belief system. It is significant that he does not limit such belief systems to religious ones; it is the centrality of the belief which concerns us here. If indoctrination is about doctrines, it must be shown that what is being discussed is not peripheral to the belief system involved. To give a practical example which relates to the field work, it would be possible to see that a learning experience dealing with Christology or Transubstantiation might include doctrines of necessity; it would be more difficult (though not impossible) to see how a session dealing with how children should dress for First Communion would do so.

The second characteristic follows from the first: doctrines are broad brush affairs, not limited to particulars and details. This flows naturally from their centrality to the belief system in question. Further, doctrines deal with wide ranging implications, and, according to Gregory and Woods, relate to action (Astley 1994; Gregory et al. 1972). To return to part of our analogy, what children wear for First Communion is hardly doctrinal – that they must be of an age to have some concept of what the Sacrament is about is doctrinal, because it relates to free will, response to grace, and ultimately to issues of salvation.

It is with the third and fourth characteristics of doctrine, however, that we are most concerned. The third criterion is that doctrines on the whole cannot be verified, that they are "not known to be true" (Hand 2002; Theissen 1982, pg. 4). This is clearly a highly problematic statement: what is truth, in this instance, and what it is to know that which is true?

This is not the place for an excursus on the nature of truth, or the knowledge of same. As Theissen points out (and cites others as doing) the relevant issue is that of the basis of evidence for statements – can they be known to be true? Doctrines, using this criteria, are propositions for which the evidence is at best ambiguous. This belief is implicit within the understanding of doctrine itself, whether that doctrine is Catholic or Communist (Gregory et al. 1972).

For some authors, this lack of evidence (or actual untruth) for doctrines is the substantive element of indoctrination (Wilson, 1964, cited in Flew 1972a). To avoid the charge of indoctrination, beliefs which are taught must have at least a good deal of evidence to back them up[86]. Flew suggests that it is the incongruity between the sense of truth of dubious doctrines and the firm conviction which is the (intended) outcome of a process of teaching, which forms the primary case of indoctrination (Flew 1972a). This opens an interesting line of investigation, when aligned to White's questions about the intentions of any religious educator, which surely must be (he maintains) to instil belief (religious belief) into the student (White a 1972). White questions why any religious educator would be involved in the business of education that is in any way religious, if firm, indeed passionate, enthusiastic belief on the part of the learner, were not the intended outcome.

We may usefully refer here to Hand's distinction between belief which results from proof and belief which results from belief in the personal authority of the teacher/facilitator (Hand 2002). The first refers to experiential proof, and is of course not the way in which we either wish anyone to learn a great many truths, (fire burns skin, falling from windows is dangerous); the second is a far more common way of learning and indeed, that on which much of both the formal and informal (as well as nonformal) sector rests; it is in this type of situation that

learners "take the teacher's word" as if not definitive then as nearly so. Indeed, this is also the basis of the industries which support newspapers, news broadcasts and documentaries. One of the tutors in the field work exemplified the extreme end of this as the teacher saying, "I stand in the name of the bishop and I will teach and what I will teach will be the final truth". (T3).

Theissen elsewhere points out that, as time has moved on, the sacrosanct nature of scientific belief – once thought unassailably objective and rational – has come under increasing attack, particularly since the publication of Kuhn's work (Czubaroff 1997; cf. Kuhn 1996; Raman 2004; Tan 2004; Thiessen 1992). Theissen suggests that it is because of false views of both science (lauded as objective when it is not) and religion (reviled as non-objective in relation to science) charges of indoctrination are frequently made against one and not the other.[87] Without a doubt, science contains within itself "doctrines", (Astley 1994; Theissen 1982) whether called such or labelled, perhaps more acceptably as axioms, if such are defined on the basis of verifiability[88], the grammar of belief (Wittgenstein 1953). As mentioned above, an in-depth investigation into the nature of truth, or the truth of different types of belief, is not germane to this work, (see, for example Astley 1994; Carr 1994; Carr 1999b; Clark 1993; Degenhardt 1998; Everington 1999; Farley 1996; Flew 1972b; Galloway 1996; Green 1972; Leahy et al. 1997; Lee 1971; Mackenzie 1998; Peters 1970; Tan 2004; Wittgenstein 1953), yet this lack of difference between the perceived objectivity of scientific "truth" and the assumed subjectivity of religious truth/belief must be highlighted, if we are to discuss the Christian religious education of adults as an instance of indoctrination or not.

The crux of the matter is whether or not the teaching of something believed

that is not verifiable is indoctrination *on the basis of the lack of empirical evidence* for that belief. While it is possible to maintain this stance, (the application of a label is, after all, merely a linguistic device to allow recognition)[89] in doing so, one must therefore label a great deal of education aimed at children as indoctrination (Green 1972); and rightly so, as there is no need to empirically demonstrate, for instance, the danger of fire[90]. Again, this need not be problematic unless "indoctrination" is seen as a pejorative term, and as a labelled process something to be avoided, and indeed Green finds a place for indoctrination – a carefully ring-fenced place to be sure - in early education[91]. However, as we have seen, "indoctrination" is generally a pejorative term. Can we really apply it with so broad a brush, in an educational milieu which, as Tan points out, accepts that "it is fallacious to use the preponderance of evidence as the measuring tape for our beliefs to be rationally grounded" (Tan 2004, pg. 259). In relation to practitioners, there are, I would suggest, few educators of adults who would be sanguine about this label being applied to their practice.

There is discussion in the literature about incorrigibility of doctrines. (Astley 1994; Carr 1994; Green 1972; Gregory et al. 1972; White b 1972) and beliefs. However, as Wittgenstein pointed out, what is important in belief systems is not their external verifiability, but rather their internal consistency, their "grammar". Coupled with Kuhn's deconstruction of the ideal of scientific objectivity, this calls into question any use of the term "indoctrination" based solely on the ability (or lack there of) to externally verify that which is taught, as the arguments question the ability of most teaching to be objectively verified. Theissen holds that this significantly undermines the content criterion as related to indoctrination, as it does not allow the teaching/learning of doctrine to be set off against the

teaching/learning of any other subject (Theissen 1982).

The final criteria offered by Theissen for doctrines is that of their importance (Theissen 1982). Doctrines concern issues which are of great merit and import to those involved. In the case of science, such doctrines might be said to be fundamental statements as of laws (thermodynamics, etc..). In terms of religion, "doctrine" as a term would be properly applied to radical (as in "root") teachings, which underpin the greater superstructure of the religion itself. To return to the field work, it could be said that the Roman Catholic view of the Trinity is doctrinal, as this conception of God underpins the view taken of the sacraments, the human person, and so on. As Gregory and Woods point out, the acceptance of a system of doctrines is not something done in isolation; rather, such acceptance requires that action follows belief (Aubrey 1948; Gregory et al. 1972).[92]

Gardner makes the distinction (extrapolating from Hand) between those who are authorities *on* religious belief and those who are authorities *about* religious belief: the first, he says, are deemed to be able to tell others what to believe, the second, to be able to expound on what is believed (Gardner 2004). This distinction is germane here, as it relates to Hand's concept of the personal intellectual authority of the teacher. I would combine Gardner's division between on and about, with Hand's concept as well as with what has been said above about the autonomy of the learner and the nature of religious belief, and suggest that authority *about* doctrines may be said to be the teaching of theology (as it is, in theory, experienced in the formal sector) and/or religious studies (ditto). If merely being about doctrine is enough to class an activity as indoctrination, then clearly all theological teaching, or at least that which deals with those religious

systems which acknowledge a body of doctrine, is indoctrination. Surely this is far too sweeping a term to be useful; it also ignores the criticality of both teacher and learner. I would suggest that even within the discussions of indoctrination as linked to doctrine, it is not the teacher *about* doctrine who is most at risk of the charge of indoctrination, but rather anyone who seeks to teach, or be an authority *on* religion.

Flew maintains that indoctrination is linked to an ideology[93]: inculcating a desire or inclination without an underpinning ideology to explain that desire might be reprehensible, but it is not indoctrination (Flew 1972a). When this is related back to the issue raised above of the necessity of responding to an ideology or belief system, it is clear that the concept of indoctrination held here is one that which aims at not only knowledge on the part of the learner, but also action, that is, assent to a particular system of belief or ideology. This extends the definition of indoctrination beyond content alone, to include outcome.

If this is accepted solely at face value, a great deal which we might like to see as good, reasonable education may have to be re-labelled as "indoctrination". Almost all of our formal education is based on societal views of what is good, worthwhile, etc. Is the inculcation of such beliefs, either as assimilated through the curriculum or overtly through such instances as "citizenship" classes, indoctrination? Or, as Degenhardt maintains, are there beliefs which we should not question (Degenhardt 1998)? This use of the term "indoctrination" for much of what we would see as a normal part of education, seems not only harsh but relatively unhelpful – if all inculcation of an ideology is indoctrination, and if we are honest about what happens in the compulsory school system (Carr 1994; Galloway 1996; Jepson 1997), then most of it would come under the heading of

indoctrination. Further, it has been argued that the inculcation of non-rational (or pre-rational) beliefs is not only a valuable part of childhood, but an essential part of it (Tan 2004); without this framework or platform (one might say, paradigm), it is impossible to begin the process of building a rational world view.

The above is, therefore, a problematic definition of indoctrination as either a subset of education or a completely different type of thing. In the discussion of education above, one definition of learning was "a more or less permanent change in behaviour" on the part of the learner. What must be made clear is how the change in behaviour hoped for in/required of the learner, in cases of indoctrination, differs from that hoped for or required in cases of learning and education. I would argue that so far, this case has not been made and cannot be made solely on the content of the learning; content does not, of itself, effect the response of the learner. This is particularly so in the case of adult learners, as the reception of learning depends to greatly on their prior experience.

Further, this definition of indoctrination relies only on the immediate reception of information/learning, rather than on the long term effects. However, "indoctrination" as a concept is concerned not only with the reception of information but with the effect that reception has on the learner and particularly on that learner's critical abilities in relation to it. An indoctrinated belief is one which allows no critical examination either at the time of reception or in the future (McLaughlin 1984; Tan 2004). This closure of critical examination, if based on the content of the teaching, would surely lead to a situation in which no one would dispute it; manifestly, this is not the case in relation to religious doctrines.

Of course, indoctrinated beliefs can be eschewed by the indoctrinated at some point in the future, as has been pointed out, (Callan 1985; Tan 2004);

however, if content were the only or indeed the main criterion for indoctrination, this critical questioning of indoctrinated beliefs could only come about if the nature of the beliefs themselves had changed. If one takes the stance that specific content always leads to indoctrination, it is difficult to see how such indoctrination could be abated. Rather, it seems, other criteria must be included in any workable definition of indoctrination.

It would seem that the content criterion for indoctrination does not stand, in that it is unclear that every case in which doctrine is taught/learned is, in some fundamental way, different from any other case of learning or education.

Criterion Two: Method

The second criteria often mentioned in relation to indoctrination, or the delineation of practices as being indoctrinatory, is the method in which the teaching takes place.

Indoctrinatory methods are held to be those which are nonrational (Callan 1985; Gardner 1988; Thiessen 1992). This relates to much of what has been said above about the autonomy of the learner (although it must be reiterated that most of the work concerning indoctrination and indoctrinatory methods relates to the teaching of children rather than adults). For some, this particular methodology of teaching defines indoctrination completely, as "a one-sided or biased presentation of a debatable issue" (Moore 1972, 93) (although this clearly includes the idea of the ambiguous nature of the issues taught, as presented above). This definition of indoctrination seems more prevalent in north American philosophical thinking about education than in British, which Moore relates to issues arising from both the second world war and the cold war. Vilifying

indoctrinatory techniques as like unto those used by Hitler or in Communist countries may be a useful ploy for those who wish to argue for a method criterion for indoctrination, but it does raise serious difficulties.

Green raises an interesting point in relation to the method criterion when he points out that it is possible to indoctrinate people into the truth (Green 1972). By this he means that although two people might hold the same belief, one has come to that belief by "rational" means, the other through means which did not respect the autonomy of the learner. This is a more complex statement than might first appear, because the validity of it rests on the result of the process: whether or not the learner holds the inculcated belief (whether this is religious, scientific or geographic) on the basis of evidence or "correct belief" is at issue, rather than the belief itself. He further makes the point that instruction (which he sees as inevitably tied to teaching and learning) has to do not (or not only) with what is believed but rather how that belief comes to be held. This has clear links to what has been said about adult teaching and learning. Beliefs must be held, for Green, on the basis of evidence and rationality. (Green does not discourse at any great length on the types of evidence which might be acceptable).

Moore sums up the view of the method as being one which does not admit of, or does not wish to admit of, alternative view points or alternative conclusions. However, this is not merely an issue of method; surely anyone who sets up such a situation must have particular intentions in mind?

Flew touches on much the same point when he points out that most definitions of education deal with the result of the process, rather than solely with the process itself: that is, if a child is able to understand and use the multiplication tables, does the fact that she has learned them by rote, by a transfer model of

education, mean that she has been indoctrinated (Flew 1972a)[94]? If we accept Green's criteria, the answer is yes. Similarly, Green holds that the style of belief need not be conceptually dependent on the means by which it is acquired (Green 1972). Coupled with what we have seen above about the nature of education, the means by which beliefs are acquired are not a sufficient determinant of the definition of an educative process.

There is the further point that methods sometimes fail: while a method of "teaching" may be indoctrinatory, unless it can guarantee the outcome of the instillation of belief without reference to the autonomy of the learner, it is difficult to see how method alone could define indoctrination: there is a lack of a causal link between method and consequence (Hand 2002). If there were such a causal link between teaching method and consequence, the field of education would be a very different one, and there would be little cause for the constant calls for reflection on the part of practitioners: teaching would be reduced to a skill, using a tool kit of tried and tested methods which could guarantee learning in every instance.

Criterion Three: Intention

The final criterion used for indoctrination is intention. (Theissen divides this final category into two: intention and consequences. He does acknowledge that they are closely related (Thiessen 1992), and indeed the relationship is so close that the two are best treated as one: the desired consequences, after all, arise from the intention of the teacher).

Snook states this criterion in the form of a proposition which repays exact reproduction: "A person indoctrinates P (a proposition or set of propositions) if he

teaches with the intention that the pupil or pupils believe P regardless of the evidence", (Snook 1972c). We have seen above that teaching itself is an intentional activity: Snook here suggests a particular intention for that activity, e.g., that what is imparted will be taken on board by the learner on some basis other than that of evidence, and held in the same way. (Here the connection between the intention and the consequences is clear and it is impossible to detach one from the other). White takes a similar, but more straightforward line when he posits that in general actions are defined by their intentions, and so it should be in this case (White a 1972).

Snook make an important point (though not quite in this way) that the indoctrinator need not name her activity as such; she may find another term for what she does. "Indoctrination", Snook holds, is the moral criticism applied to the activity, whether the agent uses that term or not. The test, he holds, may be found in the teacher's reaction to a student who clearly understands what is taught and still rejects it: if such rejection is seen as failure, the process leading to this impasse has been one of indoctrination rather than education (cf. White a 1972). This may also be the case when a teacher judges her success not by congruence of belief, but by her popularity among students (Brookfield 1986).

It would seem that, particularly in relation to the education of adults, the intention criterion is the most salient one for reflection on action, for a number of reasons.

The first is that of the autonomy of the adult learner. Particularly in relation to the types of courses and learning events in the field work, adults have freely chosen to undertake the learning: therefore to some extent, at least, they have chosen the content of the learning for themselves. As Hand points out, even

practices which are not strictly indoctrinatory but which do not allow for the full autonomy of the learner, such as those used by parents, must become increasingly less justifiable as the child ages (Hand 2002).

This very fact negates a good deal of the previously published discussion concerning the relationship between indoctrination and education, as so much of it centres around schooling (which is rarely a choice on the part of the schooled) or parental imposition of belief (or attempts at same) on children within their care.

If adults are being indoctrinated on the basis of the content of that learning, it must be that some indoctrination has taken place prior to this choice, forcing, or at least inclining them, to choose this content (perhaps here, if anywhere, we might consider the implications mentioned immediately above of parental imposition of belief). That is, these adults have freely chosen to come to learning about content such as is described as "non-rational", "non-empirical", etc. At least in the particular instances, it would seem that if they are being indoctrinated, this is through their own choice.

Is this logically possible? Is it possible to choose to be indoctrinated?

Yes – and no. The answer depends on the definition of indoctrination chosen.

If a component of that definition is a lack of freedom on the part of the learner, either freedom to learn[95] or freedom to choose the content of that learning, then the answer is clearly no, one can not choose to be "indoctrinated"[96] even if one has chosen to partake of learning about specific content, even through specific methods and even from someone who has the intention of imparting that content in such a way that no divergence from it is possible. Although perhaps logical in terms of semantics, this argument is ludicrous in

terms of common-sense[97].

Rather, surely the answer to the question is, yes, one may choose to be indoctrinated, on most of the criteria cited above. The content criteria leaves no room for doubt – one could easily choose to learn about things for which there is no empirical evidence, etc. and it could well be argued that every person listening sympathetically to any religious preaching of any kind is making this choice. The reasons for which they make this choice may be, for the individuals involved, more important than the spectre of indoctrination: as mentioned above, there is a need to balance different needs – for those who make the choice envisioned here, the need for the reinforcement of their beliefs takes priority over other concerns. As we have seen above, the aim of adult education may be described as the realisation of the human potential for freedom, love and goodness. This puts freedom (autonomy) as one good among three; adults will make more or less informed decisions about how they wish to balance these.

(It might be argued that any attempt by outsiders to a particular adult's situation who attempt to insist upon a specific balance are themselves damaging the autonomy of the learner).

It can finally be argued that one might choose an experience which could be labelled indoctrination by the intention criterion. This, however, becomes a more murky enterprise because this relies not only on the intention of the learner but of the provider of the experience, or, rather, the learner's assessment of the intention of the provider. One could argue, for instance, that the choice to attend a "Christian College" in the United States is just such a choice; as one web site puts it: "Christian is more than a label...it's a lifestyle choice. Christian colleges help you to focus on Christ at the center of your education" (Hobsons). At least on the

face of such an advertisement, these colleges take Christianity and Christian faith as a given, rather than as something which may be disputed. (It will be argued, however, that this may be a case of nurture, rather than, of necessity, a case of indoctrination).

By both the method and the content criteria, then, it is plausible that adults could choose to be indoctrinated. But surely this goes against the very notion of indoctrination? Is there not, embedded in the idea itself, an assumption of imposition on the learner (Astley 1994; Atkinson 1972; Gatchel 1972; Holley 1978; Theissen 1982; Thiessen 1992; Wilson 1972b)? Only the intention criterion sensibly allows the concept of indoctrination to be applied to adults without having to make allowance for their freedom, as agents, in participating in the process[98]. The intention criterion is the only one which removes agency for indoctrination from the learner.

Secondly, we have seen serious flaws in the other criteria, particularly that of content. The view of indoctrination as based on the content of the learning requires that a good deal of our learning, both formal (in school) and informal/nonformal (classes, personal study, etc..) must come under the heading of "indoctrination", if we accept the views posited by those who reject the objectivity of many areas seen as entirely objective. As long as "indoctrination" carries pejorative overtones (and it would be remarkable to argue that it did not)(Snook 1972b) we should be wary of any definition which would first, be applicable to much which we would see as laudable, and second, be able to be so broadly applied as to be all but useless. While a definition which is clear in a text book but vague in application might be suitable matter for philosophic discussion, it is of little use to practitioners, and a practitioner-friendly definition is

our aim.

The most important argument, however, is that of priority. As has been pointed out above, actions are usually defined by their intention; there is little reason for special pleading that indoctrination should be an exception to this.

Prior to the selection of material for any teaching comes the intention of the teacher. Preparation of content is essential for any planned teaching (Daines et al. 1993; Hillier 2002; Jarvis 1995; 1997; Lee; Minton 1997; Peters et al. 1991; Reece et al. 2000). Before the teacher selects a method to deliver the chosen material, she has in mind the reason she wishes to deliver it, based on her assessment of the learners' needs, the requirements of the programme, her own competencies, etc..

The same is true for the method of delivery of material: perhaps even more so. Added to the needs analysis required for selection of material will be that of the learning styles of the learners and their previous experience of learning (Billington 2000; Dart 1998; Joyce et al. 1997; Mezirow 1998; Paechter et al. 2001; Peters 1970; Reecé and Stephen Walker 2000; Sutherland 1998a; Sutherland 1998b; Teare 1997). The teacher must have some intent in her mind to even begin the preparation for teaching, and at least in an ideal world, all of the preparation will be made with that intent in view[99].

Definition of indoctrination

At this point, we may offer a definition of indoctrination, particularly in relation to the teaching of adults. Based primarily on that of Snook (see above) and Theissen (who offers: the curtailment of a person's growth towards normal rational autonomy (Thiessen 1992, pg. 74 - italics in the original)), we may define

indoctrination, as relates to adults, as "teaching which has the intention of imparting beliefs, values and/or behaviours to adults without due regard for their personal autonomy".

This definition is broader than that offered by either Snook or Theissen, though it is related to both. Snook highlights the intention element of the teaching, but with Theissen, concentrates on rational and evidential belief and autonomy.

We have seen above that the process of adult education places great emphasis on the meaning-making functions of learning, and of learners. Indoctrination, under the definition given above, seeks to circumvent this process: the meaning is not made by the learner, but rather is accepted by her, as a given. The meaning dictated by the indoctrinator is superimposed on the learner.

This might argue that in some senses at least, indoctrination of adults is always going to be doomed to at least partial failure, and indeed, Snook makes the point that it is probably difficult to indoctrinate adults (Snook 1972c). Meaning which is made by another will never completely "fit"; meaning, as we have seen, needs to arise from the totality of the learner's experience. Meaning imposed from without will never quite accomplish this (Astley 2002). Indoctrination which is to be successful must find strategies for explaining away the areas where the imposed meaning, and the experience of the learner, do not coincide.

I would suggest that, particularly in relation to the Christian religious education of adults, it is vital that this definition be extended to cover not only "rational" autonomy, but spiritual and emotional autonomy as well, this for the simple reason that much of the content of such teaching does not admit of rational proof, or rather, does not admit of external rational, empirical proof.

Further, lack of autonomy in any area of belief must be as reprehensible as lack of autonomy in any other, unless a case can be made that religious beliefs are a specific kind of belief which requires less autonomous, free assent than other beliefs. The weight of the evidence (both from within education and from within theology) is that this is not the case (Hand 2002).

Snook claims that he is not interested in "making the charge of indoctrination stick" but rather with the more rarefied and indeed prior argument of definition of what is meant by the charge. This is not, however, a luxury afforded to teachers in the field, particularly in a field which is as open to charges of indoctrination as religious education, (and particularly not to teachers who may well have had no, or little, formal training in relation to teaching). It is one of the aims of the present work to provide clear and useful information for such practitioners.

The question which must be asked in relation to the Christian religious education of adults is, what is this the intention on the part of those involved in teaching and facilitating such learning? There would seem to be three possible answers to this question.

The first is simply: the intention of the teacher is to ensure that learners take on board all that is taught. This may or may not include a critical assessment of the material – what matters is that the learner agrees with the tutor. White explicitly warns us of this possibility (White 1972). If this is the case then such instances of Christian religious education of adults are indeed instances of indoctrination.

The second answer is that the teacher/facilitator intends to nurture the faith and belief of the learner. The second answer is more complex, in that it would

assume that this belief is already present in the learner before the particular instance of Christian religious education of adults takes place or that the learner is at least open to this possibility. In this case, perhaps "nurture" is a more apt term than "indoctrination", as the belief is nurtured, rather than implanted. Here, we might return to the issue of authority raised earlier, and Beck's comment that what teachers must seek to do is not to eliminate all authority from their teaching (which is impossible) but to ensure that the authority is not entirely one sided: that is, that the teacher recognises the legitimate authority of the learner, rather than to deny her own authority (Beck 1994).

The third answer is: no, those involved in the Christian religious education of adults do not wish to implant belief, passionate or not, in learners. Rather, they rely on the autonomy of the learner and her freedom in the face of learning to assimilate what beliefs she chooses, if any.

One facet of this debate which is remarkable for its absence in the published discussions surrounding indoctrination, particularly indoctrination relating to religious education, is that of the learners themselves (Thiessen 1992). Astley goes some way to filling this lacuna when he states that one more properly speaks of a person being indoctrinated rather than content being indoctrinated (Astley 1994), and when he insists on the primacy of the learner in the teaching situation (Astley 2002) : yet this is still looking at the learner from the outside, rather than involving her in the investigation (cf. Adelman 1985; Delamont 1992; Power 1998). This may be because many published accounts concentrate on the education of children (although considering the ever growing amount of research which does include the views of children, this is perhaps not a valid argument). However, particularly in relation to the education of adults, the views of the

learners, both as to why they engage in such learning and what they take from it, are vital to any understanding of the learning encounter, and to its placement along the continuum of indoctrination through to education.

Reference to the literature in the field will not answer these questions as directly as the field work data, however, so we will leave them for the moment.

Having concluded that the intention criterion is the most helpful one in relation to the Christian religious education of adults, we must now examine the proposed intentions with which such teaching is undertaken. As proposed above, this will be plotted across a continuum with education at one end and indoctrination at the other. We will also examine whether or not education, as intention, is always the "best" choice for those involved in informal teaching in the Church.

Hull has gone some way to constructing this continuum, in that he posits a different theology for education, nurture, preaching and indoctrination, (although how a valid theology of indoctrination could be made is a difficult question) (Hull 1999).

Hull offers a middle ground between education and indoctrination, which allows the churches to pursue their aims in relation to the learning needs of their members (and potential members) without succumbing to the charge of indoctrination. This he calls "nurture", which is defined as an intent to deepen and foster commitment of the individual to the faith (Hull 1984). This activity is also sometimes called, "Christian education"[100].

As we have seen above, however, there are theorists in the field who would reject, out of hand, such a concept: any teaching of religion, particularly Christianity, is for some enough to ensure that whatever process is happening is

not education. This highlights yet another ambiguity with the word, "education", and requires a tighter definition than previously given.

It seems that the word is used in (at least) two senses: a broad and a narrow, pure[101] one. Broadly speaking, "education" is an umbrella term which covers a multitude of activities, and under which "Christian education", (or "Muslim education", "Jewish Education" "Heathen Education")[102] sits easily. In this sense, "education" merely describes the process by which one person learns something through the agency of another person (Astley et al. 1992a). The term is broad enough to include "self education" – the autodidact – particularly as it is unlikely that such learning will have taken place without at least the intervention of others at one remove (authors of books, for instance).

The second use of the word, however, is a much more narrow one, and relates to the fulfilment of all the criteria listed above: that something worthwhile is learned, in a morally acceptable manner, and that the learning is not mere acquisition of skill. This presents what might be called a "best case scenario" of education; it is "education" in the pure sense of the term. I would argue that the pure sense of the term should be applied only in cases where these three elements are present beyond dispute.

The one area which this definition does not take in is that of the intention of the teacher. However, we may deduce from this definition and from other points raised above, that the intention of the teacher in cases of education (pure) would be that the learner creates her own meaning out of material presented, regardless of the meaning which the teacher herself has either attached to the material, or takes from it.

The use of these two terms leads to confusion about what is, or is not,

education or educative practice: a process which fits well under the umbrella heading may fall short of all the criteria of the pure sense of the word. This is of course particularly the case in relation to indoctrination, or cases in which indoctrination is alleged. While indoctrinatory practice may well fit under the broad heading of "education" it almost surely would not fit under the purer, more concise meaning of education. It is to this dual use of the term, I believe, that we can attribute many of the discussions about whether or not indoctrination (and indeed nurture) is education. Again, the answer is "Yes and no" – yes, under the broad heading; no, under the pure. The continuum suggested above, from indoctrination on the one hand to education on the other, uses "education" in both senses. Visually, the construct may be considered this way:

Although it is tempting to invent a new term for one or the other use of the word "education", this is a temptation which in the interests of communication must be avoided: there is little justification in adding another term to a field which is already remarkably cluttered with jargon. Rather, what is required is clarity of use of the terms which are already in common educational parlance. To this end, we must now examine the other components on the continuum, that is, preaching and nurture.

3.3. ***Preaching***

We will not spend a great deal of time on this particular part of the continuum, as this process is rarely considered under the heading of "education" either within the field of education studies or outside it. However, as we shall see,

the process, content and intention of preaching as understood by the Roman Catholic Church at least, require that it be seen as coming under the mantle of education (broad).

The first task as always is that of definition, and for once, the issue is relatively straightforward. Preaching is the public, oral proclamation of the word of God (Benedict XV 1917; Paul VI 1975; Rock 1953), a definition from within the confines of the Church; dictionary sources also add the possibility of preaching as a process of rebuke (die.net; Hyperdictionary). Biblical sources [103] support both meanings: preachers (including Christ) proclaim the Good News, but also admonish, call for repentance, etc.

Rock maintains that the intention of the preacher, the motivation for preaching, is the salvation of souls (Rock 1953); to this end, the preacher engages in the process of preaching. This is a view well supported by Biblical evidence, particularly Romans 10:14 -15, which lists a series of connections:

"But how can they call upon the name of the Lord without having believed in him? And how can they believe in him without having first heard about him? And how will they hear about him if no one preaches about him?(15) And now will they hear about him if no on e preaches about him?"

This sequence is enlightening, as it illustrates the importance of human intervention for the transmission of the faith from person to person[104]. The passage insists on the need for a human agent in the process of conversion, and shows the preacher what her object should be in the exercise of preaching.

I have included the fifteenth verse of this chapter because of the importance of the concept contained within it, for the Catholic Church. Preaching is considered to be a ministry of the Church, and as such, under the direct control

and regulation of the Church. It is the Church who sends preachers, rather than preachers who work through their own agency. There are numerous Canon Laws concerning the office and ministry of the preacher (John Paul II 1983, cf: 368, 747, 764,768-771); following again a Biblical mandate (to preach to all nations – Matt. 28:19) the Church sees preaching as her fundamental task (John Paul II 1990).

This preaching may be usefully divided into two kinds: the first, that of the liturgical sermon or homily, delivered as a part of the Mass; the second, any other official oral teaching, delivered in a formal (that is structured) event. The first, in the Roman Catholic Church, is open only to ordained members of the clergy (deacons, priests and bishops)[105], while the second is open to members of the laity (John Paul II 1983, Canon 767; McBrien 1995).

It is clear that both of these moments of instruction would fit under the broad umbrella of "education", both in terms of the intention of the preacher (the distant aim may be the salvation of souls, but the proximal aim is the proclamation of the word) and in terms of the content, as something is given from the preacher (the agent) to the learner, and certainly the hope is that the learner will be changed by the experience. The question remains, however, whether preaching, understood as defined above, may be said to come under the more pure definition of education.

There are, I believe, two main issues which must be addressed here. The first is the issue of method. Preaching may be said to be a prime example of a transfer model of education (broad sense) as communication between the preacher and the preached-to is generally only one way: the preacher speaks, others listen. The emphasis in preaching is often just those issues highlighted by

Freire (Freire 1970) as characterising a banking model of education: sonority of words, the packaging of information. This type of education is an exercise of domination, according to Freire, and therefore one of indoctrination (Freire 1970). Freire here is not speaking of preaching, but rather of a teacher-student interaction; however, the application of his words is valid because the situation fits the parameters he sets for the banking model of education. (And again here, there is the use of the term "education" in a very broad sense, even for a process which the author vehemently rejects).

I would argue on that on the basis of method, it is impossible to contain preaching within the pure definition of education. The method used, although perhaps a valid one for the task in hand (an argument which is out of the remit of this work), does not promote anything but the assimilation of knowledge on the part of the learner: there is no sense of an opportunity for the learner to question or discuss the content presented, nor of any interaction between the preacher and the learner other than oratory/listening. It does not, of itself, support or nurture the deepening and broadening of knowledge called for under this heading.

In terms of content, the issue becomes more clouded. According to those who would hold that any religious teaching is not worthwhile, there is no question that this process of Christian preaching is not one which deals with content which might be deemed worthwhile. However, particularly in terms of adults attending such instances in which preaching takes place, I would argue that this stance disregards a basic principle of adult education: that is, the autonomy of the learner.

The question becomes: "worthwhile to whom?" Does the classification of a

learning experience as education (pure sense) depend on external judgement of worth, (yours, mine, Flew's, Carr's), or does it rather depend upon the judgement of the learner, herself? If we are to be consistent in our concern for the autonomy of the learner, surely this autonomy must extent to the basic point of choice of what she will learn? Is it not perhaps an exercise of intellectual hubris on the part of others to determine that which is to be learned, and that which is worthwhile for learning, for other adults?

In terms of the education of adults, then, I would argue that the standard of "worthwhileness" in relation to content must be that of the learner herself, rather than any outside, imposed standard. Any other standard of "worthwhileness" undermines the autonomy of the learner from the outset, by deciding for her what it is that she "should" learn. This is, in itself, an authoritarian stance.

As we have mentioned above, there are times in which this decision must be taken for the learner – accredited courses or those validated by particular bodies being a case in point. However, these particular instances need not provide, or even underpin, a general rule. Rather, they must themselves argue the case to justify their imposition of a standard of worthwhileness on the learner; we must not be quick to accept the equation that authority in terms of accreditation, status, etc.., confers the ability to impose a curriculum on the learner.

To return to the case of preaching, the content criterion for the pure sense of education may be satisfied (for adults, at the least) with the assertion that adults have chosen to attend (and indeed, listen to) the preaching taking place. Lacking any indication of forced attendance on the part of the learner, the assumption must be one of acceptance of the learning situation.

(It is worth pointing out here that this need not be accompanied by an acceptance of the content of the preaching, by the learner. The learner remains free to reject the content of the preaching, even if there is no opportunity for dialogue with the preacher).

What of the intention on the part of the preacher? In general terms, it must be deemed to be that which was given above: the salvation of souls[106]. This makes it possible to align preaching along our continuum; we have seen already that it does not belong in the narrowly defined space occupied by education (pure) on the grounds of the method involved. And, in view of that method, I would argue that preaching occupies a place only slightly further toward education (pure) than indoctrination: the means of delivery of content is a transfer, banking one, which is highly removed from the ideal posited for adult education. The lack of dialogue between preacher and learner sets preaching at some distance from this ideal. It is, however, impossible to determine the views of preacher in on the autonomy of the learner, without conducting specific research for this purpose.

3.4. ***Nurture***

> "I'd say the reason I'm involved is because there is a crying need for adult formation. In that people are asking questions, people are looking for things, people are challenging and searching things in a way that maybe didn't happen until the last maybe 20 years or so. And sometimes, you know, not knowing where or how to find some kind of ongoing formation. It just seems to be a crying need". (A 2)

We may now move on to the next point on the continuum, of formation[107], nurture or indeed, as it is sometimes called, Christian education.

Christian formation has an honourable pedigree in the church. A specific type of Christian methodology of teaching - Christian Paideia - was developed to synthesise secular knowledge with the content of the Gospels (Holmes 2001; Latourette 1975; McBrien 1995) and to pass that knowledge on to new generations, (Cooper 1995)[108]. Throughout the development of the church in the Middle Ages, the religious education (or education in faith) of the people was highlighted[109]; the Council of Trent gave it high priority(John Paul II 1979) . Theorising about religious education may be in its infancy (Hull 1990), but practice in the Christian churches is entering its second millennium (Willis 1993)[110] even if there are still important issues to be addressed particularly concerning the education of adults, who has written on the subject of what stops Christian adults from learning (Hull 1985). The connection, however, between theoria and praxis in this area does not seem to have been a high priority; the field work of this thesis will attempt to provide some link between the two.

Throughout most of this work, "formation" and "nurture" are used interchangeably, as indeed they are in the literature and were by respondents in the fieldwork. I have chosen to use "nurture" in the continuum, however, rather than formation. Within the field work area, there is a sense that "formation" is a more formal process; "priestly formation" is a common phrase in the Roman Catholic Church. While some of the respondents spoke of formation for the laity and indeed the documents of the Roman Catholic Church use this terminology, for the people in the field, "nurture" has fewer clerical overtones.

Christian education is, for Bushnell as quoted in Astley, the process which

would ensure that "That the child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise" (Astley 2000b, pg. 51). This is, perhaps, an much stronger statement of what Christian education is, than most would make. We will see if it applies in relation to the Christian religious education of adults of adults.

Hull proposes three different uses of the phrase, "Christian education", and points to the confusion caused by this lack of clarity.

First, there is the way in which Christian adults bring up their children in their faith[111]; secondly, there is a Christian approach to education in general, and finally, a curriculum that has Christianity as its content (Hull 1984). Astley and Day propose a slightly different typology, with five distinct parts: Christian formation; Christian self-criticism; Curriculum Christianity; the Christian mind; and the Christian curriculum (Astley et al. 1992a). This typology raises interesting questions for the subject in hand.

Of these, Christian formation clearly fits under the heading of formation; Astley and Day point out that this process may be understood as that of making disciples. Christian self-criticism, however, does not fit under our heading of formation/nurture: the term describes more an attitude within education, as the authors acknowledge when they give "critical openness" as an alternative term. Here one might find Degenhardt's "ethic of belief" which calls for such openness (Degenhardt 1998); one might also place here Aubrey's concept of "ex-doctrination" in which beliefs are drawn out of experience, rather than imposed on the mind (Aubrey 1948). In a similar way, Curriculum Christianity is not a species of education, but rather a type of educative content. The Christian Mind is again more of an attitudinal stance than a method of education; the authors include

here a Christian critique of education. While valuable in and of themselves, these modes of Christian education do not have specific places on the proposed continuum.

The final category listed by the authors is the Christian curriculum. The authors describe it as "educational activity that is not directly focused on Christianity, but which is influenced by a Christian understanding of education" (Astley et al. 1992a, p. 17). The Christian curriculum is not overly concerned with issues which relate to Christianity (although it might be); one way of describing this category might be: education as delivered by Christians who are conscious of teaching as Christians. One of the things which may set this form of education apart from any other sort is the demeanour and intention of the teacher.

However, there is no one, set "Christian intention" in education, as the authors themselves acknowledge. Again, I would argue that this category is more one of intention on the part of the reflective teacher than a species of education, per se. It is, then, with the category, "Christian education" that we are most concerned.

The authors offer a definition:

Christian education covers any and every (structured) learning experience that gives rise to the adoption or deepening of a person's Christian beliefs, attitudes, values, or dispositions to act and experience 'in a Christian way'. (Astley et al. 1992a, pg. 17)[112].

Although this definition is a useful one, in that it delineates the outcome of the process, it does not exactly meet the requirements of the continuum we have constructed, particularly as the authors continue:

On this definition evangelism and formation are indeed species of

education (Astley et al. 1992a, pg. 17).

Using the categories we have constructed with a view to the Christian religious education of adults, this final statement is problematic. While formation fits along the continuum in one place, evangelism (understood as a type of preaching) requires an earlier place (Congregation for the Clergy 1997).

The difference is in what is being examined. Astley and Day are looking at the outcome of the process, as is evident in their phrase, "which gives rise to". The proposed continuum, however, is based not on outcomes but on intention.

It is, of course, impossible to know the outcome of any learning experience in advance. One may, and indeed must, consider what those outcomes might be, and tutors work to achieve the ones they intend. However, categorisation which rests on the outcomes of any process must, of necessity, be retrospective. This research aims to be of use to practitioners at all stages of their work, which means that categories offered must be amenable to use before the teaching intervention as well as afterwards.

For the purposes of this study, therefore, Christian formation/nurture will be defined as "structured[113], interactive learning activities which have the intention of fostering[114], nurturing or deepening Christian faith". (There will obviously be a great many instances of other kinds which will have this same effect, and even this same intent: liturgy being a prime example (NCCB/USCC 1999); indeed, liturgy must be connected to adult formation in the Roman Catholic Church (Congregation for the Clergy 1997). However, our concern here is for those instances of learning which require the intervention of a tutor).

Within this definition we must acknowledge at least two layers of

development. First, there is the cognitive, rational development of the learner, albeit under the aegis of development along a specific line. (We shall look at the possibility of divergence below). Secondly, there is a need to acknowledge development which is emotional and affective (Thiessen 1992) as we have seen. This element of learning is particularly important in relation to the Christian religious education of adults, as the Christian view of the human person (exemplified here by that proposed by the Catholic Church) is a holistic one: the human person is conceived of as a composite of body and soul (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* 1994, 327, 355, 362 - 65, 1703, 1711). In terms of this balance, Astley states that "Salvation and ethics, not theological reflection, are the driving forces of Christianity" (Astley 1994, pg. 104).

Faith develops as people grow, (Astley 1992); learners change not only the meanings they have made, but their ways of making meaning, as they mature, as we have seen, allowing them to continue to make meaning out of chaos (Wickett 1991). The development of personality and the development of faith may well be closely interconnected, for the believer (Wickett 1991), as we have seen in relation to adult education above. In the Christian religious education of adults, this process of meaning making is fostered within a particular framework, a particular ideology.

Although the process of making meaning is, as we have seen, a personal one (each must do it for herself), the meaning can be made within a particular ideology. The faithful person need not re-make the meaning from scratch; rather, she can take the meanings, or the parameters of meaning, which already exist in the ideology (in this case, Christianity) as her own framework within which to create meaning (Astley 1994).

Those who engage in Christian formation must balance their work between what Theissen characterises as "anti-intellectual" elements which are often present in the Christian church and the guilt which many are made to feel for engaging in the work of religious formation (Thiessen 1992). (Theissen is concerned here with Christian parents, but his point has a much wider application)[115]. Astley points out that formative education is holistic, while critical education (see below) may well deal with less than the whole human person, as it focuses solely on the cognitive (Astley 1994).

It is worth noting at the outset that Christian formation, unlike many views of indoctrination in the education literature (which seem to relate mainly to children's learning), is acknowledged to be a life long process (Astley 2002; Astley et al. 1992a; NCCB/USCC 1999). This immediately suggests a different kind of aim, as well as perhaps suggesting a different intention on the part of the agent. The aim of formation (if it is a life long process) is clearly not the attainment of a static goal, such as the ability to pass an examination, no matter how cognitively challenging such an examination might be, nor can it be merely an agreement with the views/ideology presented to the learner; as we have seen, such ideologies require action. Christian formation seeks not a set goal to be achieved but rather a continual change in the learner (Astley 2002).

Nurture is seen as an activity that is properly the sphere of the church, rather than the state (which of course is the main provider of religious education for children)[116]. Nurture is confessionalist; that is, it is carried out within particular denominations for the people of that denomination, or at least within a specific faith[117]. This is so because, in most of the Christian churches at least, religion and faith are seen as interconnected: religion is the means of the expression of

faith (Sims-King 1997). As we have seen, belief and ideology can and do demand action: religion (which we may take here to be lived religion, that is, the living of the Christian life in this instance) is the action required by Christian faith.

Hull goes on to list seven distinctions between nurture and education[118]. The distinctions taken together focus on the intention of Christian nurture, as opposed to education, per se: as stated in the first distinction, the aim of Christian nurture is the strengthening of Christian faith (Nichols 1992). However, is this aim compatible with education?

This is not to suggest that all education should have this as its aim, (although some would have it so (Pius XI 1929b)). Certainly this has no place in a state school system in a pluralistic society where the religious freedom of all must be respected[119]. But even it if is not the aim of all education, may it be the aim of some of it, at least in the broader sense of education?

McKenzie has written of formative education as opposed to critical education. In the first, "enculturation" (Congregation for the Clergy 1997) or "acculturation" takes place, that is, the learner becomes aware of and fits in with the social norms of the society in which she lives; in the second, the learner applies critical thought to what has been learned in the first instance (as quoted in Astley 1994). Yet such initiation as into a society envisioned by formative education may be seen as a common understanding of education. Astley makes the further point that within such acculturation may be the very tools which are needed for the second, critical stage of education (Astley 1994). Religion is, in some ways at least, learned from others around us, in what Astley calls a process of fides ex auditu (Astley 2002, pg. 17).

Theissen makes the point that some of this language, such as the aim of

the exercise being the strengthening of faith, formation of beliefs and values, may be uncomfortable especially for those who are educators of adults. He answers that these must be concomitant parts of any education which wishes to call itself Christian (Thiessen 1992). I would add to this that such language seems to be common place in relation to education generally speaking, as we have seen above. In general we are happy for education to form the values of students in terms of the merits of democracy, of the value of tolerance and understanding in a multicultural society, and so on. Yet these are, surely, values on the same level as religious values and beliefs: both actions fall within the umbrella meaning of education (broad), if not within the purer meaning. The crucial point is that these values and beliefs are held out for acceptance on the part of adults, rather than imposed upon them – they must be presented not only as "that which must be held" but also with their supporting arguments: as we have seen above, this process must engage both the cognitive and the affective (International Council for Catechesis). This is necessary if formation is to be about living the Christian life, rather than, as mentioned above, the ability to pass a set exam or show a specific amount of learning.

Rather, Christian formation seeks to prepare adults for the situations in which they will find themselves, not with pat answers, but with tools for discernment (International Council for Catechesis). The elements of Christianity are held out to the learner, but the learner must, if the teaching is to be successful, interiorise those elements and make them her own (Astley 2002).

Hull points out that there is no contradiction between commitment to an idea and critical openness about it; this is the basis of much scientific work, (Hull cites Popper on dogmatism in science, Hull 1982). If we return to earlier

definitions of education, the commitment of the learner to what is learned is inherent in them (Peters' definition concerning the transmission of what is worthwhile to those who become committed to it).

The question, I believe, is not whether or not learning which leads to commitment to an idea (whether that be a religious faith or a scientific theorem) is education. Rather, the defining issue is the difference between education and indoctrination. The addition of "nurture" as a middle term between the two, as a step on a continuum, points to the vital difference between them: the intention of the teacher. In education (pure) the intention of the teacher may be characterised as that which Astley sees as "critical education" while in nurture/formation, the intention of the teacher is specifically oriented not (or not just) to criticality on the part of the learner, but to the fostering/deepening of a particular set of beliefs and values. Again, it is clear that this lies under the umbrella of education (broad), as learning is taking place, but not under the heading of education (pure)[120].

For Hull, in education there is no convergence between the commitment of the teacher, the content of the teaching, and the commitment of the learner (Hull 1984); this would accord with our (pure) understanding of education. This convergence does, of course, occur (or it is hoped that it will occur) in nurture (Nichols 1992). (Here we may reiterate Peters' phrase that on presents material to the learner who becomes committed to it – such a concept of education opens itself immediately to the presentation of formative material). It might be better to say, however, that education (pure) leaves the a greater possibility of divergence open. The teacher of science or history wishes those who learn with her to come to believe the truths of that subject (Newbigin 1982). Recent discussions of pedagogy highlight the connection between pedagogical methods and the

commitments of the individual teacher, (Lambert 2000). Reflection on beliefs and commitments is a necessary part of the preparation for teaching, but having commitment and beliefs does not bar the teacher from providing educational experiences for others.[121]

Mezirow points out what we have already seen, that all learning is, in some sense, individual, local, confined to the particular learner. Therefore it can't be completely objective, as the persons concerned can not be (Mezirow 1998). This comes after an exposition of the cognitive revolution, which has allowed us to see that much which might otherwise be taken as "objective" is actually formative, and even normative, as we have seen above. This must be the case with education as with other activities. If we are to accept the suggestion that education has a social function as well as an aim of increased adulthood, or that education involves the transmission of ideas and concepts that are "worthwhile", then we must accept value judgements to be a part of education. As we have posited above, in the case of adult education, those value judgements are best seen as those of the learner, rather than imposed on the process from without, wherever this is possible.

This returns us to the importance of the freedom of the learner, within the intention of the teacher/provider. If the intention of the provider of the learning experience is such that no divergence will be allowed, then the experience clearly does not come under the definition of education (pure). However, if the learner is allowed the freedom to disagree, to not converge with the beliefs of the provider, then it is wholly possible that the experience of learning could also be an experience of education (broad).

This must be even more the case in relation to the Christian religious

education of adults, as we have seen in relation to the teaching and learning of adults. One source suggests the aim of this activity, when it involves adults, is "mature intimacy and communion"(NCCB/USCC 2000) with the Divine. This highlights the need not only for an adult faith but also for autonomy on the part of the learner: surely that which is imposed from without cannot be said to be held in a mature manner. This path to maturity is an essential component of formation/catechesis (Nichols 1992)[122].

3.5. *The Continuum*

I have suggested above that education is not so much a thing as a way of delineating a process. In the sense used here, education (pure) and relates to the instances of education where not only is something which is deemed to be worthwhile (by our considerations here, deemed to be so by the learner), in a worthwhile manner (ditto), and that learning has an element of deeper cognitive engagement than a mere skill.

Further, I have argued that the intention of the teacher in cases of education (pure) is such that the learner is not only free to make her own meaning (as is the case in all points along the continuum once past indoctrination) but that the teacher intends an autonomy on the part of the learner in relation to the meaning created.

This is not an absolute autonomy, as the teacher clearly has some idea of what meaning the learner might make: teaching a class in philosophy, one hopes that the meaning made by the learners will relate, for instance, to philosophy and not car mechanics. This is perhaps a facetious example, but it does highlight the issue that even in cases of education narrowly defined, the teacher has some

ideas and desires about the meaning made by the learners: at the very least, the teacher hopes that there will be some meaning made.

However, in cases of education (pure) the teacher does not intend convergence with her own meaning, but rather the creation of whatever meaning the learners make for themselves. It is this lack of directive intent which marks education (pure) as a separate point along the continuum.

It is entirely possible that this sort of instance of education is more of an ideal than a reality – perhaps something akin to a Platonic form of (liberal) education than something encountered in the darkened cave of educational reality.

Indeed, if we were to take this concept of education literally, as envisioning complete autonomy on the part of the learner, we would be immediately presented with a possibly insurmountable difficulty for the teacher. Is it possible for teaching, or even for the facilitation of learning, to be so non-teleological that we have no preconception of the outcome for the student? (It must be remembered that it is the intention of the teacher which is our focus in relation to this continuum).

Surely in preparing for any educational encounter, we begin from the point of the outcome: stripped of its often attendant jargon, the essential question is, "How do I wish my students to be different after the session? What change do I hope will have taken effect?" (Daines et al. 1993; Minton 1997).

Yet a commitment to total autonomy on the part of the learner would negate this process – and indeed, possibly the entire area of educational planning and structure, which, arguably, exist for the purpose of effecting directed change.

However, as a final point on the continuum, this sense of education (pure)

serves us well as a counterbalance to indoctrination at the other end of the spectrum.

Certainly one element of this type of education is that described by Mezirow as transformative:

> Transformative learning refers to the process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning perspectives, habits of mind, mind-sets) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action. Transformative learning involves participation in constructive discourse to use the experience of others to assess reasons justifying these assumptions, and making an action decision based on the resulting insight. (Mezirow 2000, pgs. 7 - 8)

It is the openness to change within this definition which must attract our attention, but this definition, on its own, is not enough to separate education (pure) from education (broad). We must couple this openness to change with the interaction with a teacher who also supports this change without attempting to direct its outcome.

This type of education has clear implications in terms of method of delivery.

It would not be in any way impossible to study doctrine (defined as above) at this point in the continuum: what would be impossible would be to study doctrine (of any kind) from the point of view of truth claims about that doctrine (cf. the Curriculum Christianity above). The difference here is not so much *what* is studied but rather *how* it is studied. Teaching which is education (pure) will not

be from a standpoint of truth claims, but rather of investigation. It is impossible to see transmissionist education as falling under this heading, because of the constraints this method places on the meaning making of the learner.

The Continuum

Earlier, I proposed a visual representation of the continuum from indoctrination to a pure understating of education as:

We are now able to clearly place each concept (if not each individual instance of practice) along this continuum.

Indoctrination we have defined according to the intention criterion above all others, as this is most relevant to work with adults. Indoctrination takes place when the intention of the tutor is such that the autonomy of the learner is neither taken into account nor in any way aided by the process of learning – rather, the intention of the teacher is to negate the autonomy of the learner as much as necessary to ensure acceptance of the content of the teaching. The meaning which the learner takes from the encounter with the teacher should be, in the intention of the teacher, not the learner's own, but that presented by the teacher.

This orientation to convergence with the meaning of the teacher will have clear effects on the nature of the encounter between the learner and the teacher, in terms not only of content but also of method. However, it is the intention which drives these, as the intention of the teacher is prior to the choice of either content or method.

The content of indoctrinatory episodes may well be that of religion, but it need not be: the content is not the determining factor. However, the content will logically be such that the learner cannot disprove easily (it would be relatively useless to try to indoctrinate most British adults to believe that the game of football did not exist, for instance).

The method of indoctrinatory episodes is most likely to be a transmissionist one, as we have seen: this is most suited to the transfer of meaning, and least suited to the creation of personal meaning on the part of the learner.

Next on the continuum comes preaching, which is a one sided, transmissionist model of presentation. The preacher again intends that the learner converges with the content of the preaching. One of the main differences between indoctrination and preaching, as understood here, is the context in which the transaction takes place: as seen, preaching (particularly in the Roman Catholic Church) takes place in formally structured activities, and by those designated with the task. The intention of the preacher (lacking research to the contrary) must be assumed to be that given by the church, that is, the salvation of souls. This again provides a difference to indoctrination, per se, as this intention is not one of transference of meaning from teacher (preacher) to learner, or not precisely such. Rather, the intention of the preacher here is one which is prior to the creation of a specific meaning: the intention has to do with the outcome of the learning, rather than the learning itself.

With the next movement on the continuum, we come to nurture, also known as formation or Christian education (in some senses of that term). One of the hypothesis stated at the outset of this work is that Christian religious education of adults is undertaken for a reason. Although the hypothesis is tested

in relation to practitioners in the field work, in relation to the literature, it is clear from the foregoing that Christian religious education of adults is a teleological enterprise: those involved in the process have specific intentions in mind. That reason is summed up by the Biblical phrase, "that they may have life, life in all its fullness" (John 10:10). That is, the Churches engage in the Christian religious education of adults so that the Christian life, per se, may be fostered within learners.

Using a content criterion, this might be seen as a return to indoctrination (or rather, we would never have left that part of the continuum in the first place), if we take the assumption that any teaching of doctrine must be indoctrination. However, as we have seen, the content criterion has serious flaws in relation to adult education. Using the intention criterion, the Christian religious education of adults does not fall under indoctrination.

It aims for convergence, yes, but for willed and autonomous convergence of belief on the part of the learner. This is so because the aim of the Christian religious education of adults is faith, which, as we have seen, cannot be transferred from one person to another but must be made by the faithful person herself[123]. The teacher involved in Christian formation has specific ends in mind, but she aims to help students achieve those ends for themselves, rather than to impose those ends on the learners.

The intention of the teacher of Christian religious education of adults is closer to that of the preacher, than to that of the indoctrinator. However, the method of delivery is very different, and the choice of this method (interactive) reflects on the teacher's intention: as we have seen above, the choice of method flows logically from the intention of the teacher.

The autonomy of the learner also comes to the fore in the relation to the content of the Christian religious education of adults, in that adults freely choose to be involved in this process. Therefore, it may be assumed that they are making a judgement as to the worth of the process itself and (one assumes) as to the content as well. We have seen above that one of the hallmarks of education is that worthwhile material is presented to those who become committed to it. In the judgement of the learners, the content of the Christian religious education of adults seems to be worthwhile.

This emphasis on the autonomy of the learner removes the Christian religious education of adults from the umbrella of indoctrination, but the desire for (even if not insistence upon) convergence keeps the process from sheltering under the aegis of education narrowly understood. Thus, the hypothesis stated at the outset may be agreed: it is possible to be engaged in the Christian religious education of adults without being involved in indoctrination.

At the far end of the continuum, we find education (pure). Here, the teacher does not intend any particular meaning to be made from the learning episode, but rather intends the autonomy of the learner.

If we use the autonomy of the learner as a graphic criteria, the continuum might then be better presented as such:

Through this continuum, I have demonstrated that education is indeed, a process, as stated at the outset. It is a process not only in the interaction between the learner and the teacher, or between the learner and the learning, but also in the movement from one kind of education to another: the points between indoctrination, preaching, formation and education (pure) are not stark, easily

identifiable staging points, but rather points of interpretation, relating mainly to the intention of the teacher. As such, they are primarily subjective points, rather than objective ones which may be directly observed (although method and content may, of course, be observed). It is for this reason that observation does not play a part in the field work, but interviews will be used to determine the subjective judgements of those involved in the Christian religious education of adults[124].

The continuum allows us to place different modes of presentation along its range, but not - or not necessarily – individual instances. Such instances will be very difficult to place, particularly for anyone other than the teacher involved, as the major criterion for placement is the intention of the teacher (although method and content do have some bearing). In keeping with the concept of teachers as reflective practitioners (Astley 2000c; Griffiths 2000; Hillier 2002; Hudson 2002; Leitch et al. 2001; Schön 1995; Williams 1998) and in according to them the same autonomy and respect for autonomy we have insisted upon for learners, we must acknowledge that at least in the first instance, the determination of the placement of any given teaching intervention must rest with the teacher herself.

This need not mean of course that there is no other input possible nor that the teacher must have the final say: as we have seen above, it would be entirely possible for the teacher herself to be unaware of, say, indoctrination in her practice, particularly if she herself had been indoctrinated.

---

[45] It should be noted that not everyone agrees with this allocation of religious education – or catechesis – to either the fields of the social sciences or to education per se, (Nichols 1992).

[46] However, Christian education is in many ways dependent on theology (Astley 2000a).

[47] See also Lindeman's critique of the concept of education as a *preparation* for life (Lindeman 1926).

[48] For such discussions, see, among others: (Allman et al. 1997; Brookfield 1986; Brown et al. 1997; Fenwick 2000; Hillage et al. 2000; Jarvis 1995; 1997; Nichols 1992; Parker 2000; Peters et al. 1991; Peters 1970; Reece et al. 2000; Rogers 1996; Sutherland 1998a; Tight 1996; Trilling et al. 2001; UNESCO 2000; Winch et al. 1999, etc.).

[49] While it is true that Carr, for instance, argues that education is not a process, but rather more akin to a *state*, this argument arises from his concern to delineate between education and its identification with schooling, (Carr 1999a).

[50] As such, it is notoriously difficult to measure, (see: McKenna 1994). Assessment in most areas of education is a difficult and contested task (Farley 1996; Walton 2000); if the outcome of Christian religious education is seen, not as the ability to recite doctrine or simply to have gained cognitive concepts, but rather as the putting into practice Christian values, etc., indeed, as living the Christian life more fully (see below), assessment in this area provides particular difficulties.

[51] Or "educative"; however, if education is itself a process, to call it an educative process is to define the word by itself; it is a tautology.

[52] Indeed, Thatcher has warned against a trend which seems to downplay the importance of the social element in education (Thatcher 1991).

[53] This quest for meaning makes the accumulation of data through the case study approach, particularly through interviews, a particularly apt one (Cohen et al. 2000).

[54] It is, of course, impossible to tell if any of the recipients of the questionnaires are still in the initial phase of their education.

[55] It is possible to argue that the second party may be "present" in the form of products of their work: books, articles, etc. While it is undoubtedly possible for adults to learn through such interaction, it is not the subject here.

[56] See (Biesta 1996) for a critique of this view of education as simplistic, however.

[57] In the time honoured phrase, some things never change; Cyril includes in his prologue an exhortation to students to pay attention, no matter how long the lecture (Cyril).

[58] Peters sees developmental theory as important to this discussion (See Peters 1970, 231 ff).

[59] Indeed, Brookfield points out that, "There can be few intellectual quests that, for educators and trainers of adults, assume so much significance and yet contain so little promise of successful completion as the search for a general theory of adult learning" (Brookfield 1986, p. 25).

[60] Black and McClintock suggest that "studying" would be a more appropriate word than "learning" in relation to the construction of knowledge generally termed "learning" (Black et al. 1995).

[61] In general, "autonomy" is seen to be a positive value; however, as we

will see below, this value must be balanced against other goods, (Astley 1994).

[62] It is also true that practice informs theory, or should; this is the aim of the connection between the case study data and the literature data.

[63] Contrast this with Dewey's perception that initiation into a society is an almost unconscious process that begins at birth (Dewey 1897), see also the discussion of initiation into a framework of belief in Tan (Tan 2004).

[64] This is akin to the idea of learning as action science, see (Raelin 1998).

[65] There are obvious parallels to this concept of grieving in both the work on death and dying done by Kubler-Ross (Kubler-Ross 1970) and in the adaptations of that work in relation to continuing life changes (Bridges 1991; 1996).

[66] For example, (Brookfield 1986; Daines et al. 1993; Hansman et al. 1998; Hillier 2002; Jarvis 1995; Joyce et al. 1997; Knowles 1962; Knowles 1984; Lambert 2000; Leitch et al. 2001; Minton 1997; Reece et al. 2000; Rogers 1996; Teare 1997; Thomas 1982; Tight 1996).

[67] Whether or not practitioners are aware of the theory is another question entirely (Cevero 1991), as is whether or not professional training for teaching bears any resemblance to the reality encountered in the field (Brookfield 1986).

[68] Although it may be, and has been, argued that "teacher" refers to someone who is paid to teach a specific group of people specific "things" (Freeman 1998), for the purposes of this research, a much broader definition must be used.

[69] Part of the function of the interview phase of this research was precisely this, to see if the practice "in the field" matches the theory of the Christian religious education of adults, both in terms of what is provided, and in terms of how it is provided and supported.

[70] Of course learning can go on without specific "teaching", cf. the estimates that adults may spend hundreds of hours per year engaged in self directed learning (Brookfield 1986).

[71] "Information" here is, of course, taken very broadly, to include not only "facts" (such as historical information about dates and places and persons) but also concepts, ideas, theories, etc.

[72] Indeed, Snook holds that the holding of authority on the part of the teacher is a vital element in that process which may properly be called, "teaching" (Snook 1972c).

[73] For practical issues involved in teaching adults, see, among many others (Carr 1999a; Daines et al. 1993; Degenhardt 1998; Dwer 1998; Foley 2001; Hansman et al. 1998; Hillier 2002; Hudson 2002; Imel; Joyce et al. 1997; Minton 1997; Newbigin 1982; Reece et al. 2000; Rhem 2002; Robenstine 1998; Rogers 1996; Webb et al. 2000)

[74] Or, to paraphrase Friere, the oppressed must liberate themselves (Freire 1970).

[75] A great deal of the literature on religious education seems to assume that the basic religion in question is Christianity; this is also the case in political debates about RE as a subject (Jepson 1997). However, there is a growing literature about other faiths, including (neo)Paganism (Cush 1997; Dwer 1998; Fox 1996, as well as the current work of PEBBLE with the DfES to prepare teaching materials on Paganism for classroom use).

[76] Whether or not, or indeed, how, beliefs can be transferred is a question which will recur in the section on indoctrination, below.

[77] The purposes of Religious Education and Religious Studies in the school sector may well stop short of the affective domain, or at least not engage with it to the extent suggested here (Ali Ashraf 1992; Astley et al. 1996; Aubrey 1948; Barnes 2000; Bastide 1999; Bellett 1998; Bolton 1997; Carr 1994; Charnley 1999; Copley 1997; Cush 1999; Everington 1999; Groome 1995; Hauerwas 1996; Hull 1982; Hull 1999; Jackson 1999; Jepson 1997; Leahy et al. 1997; Newbigin 1982; Newbigin 1998; Nipkow 1996; Seymour 1996; Sharples et al. 1991; Sims-King 1997; The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority 1994a; b; Tinsley 1996; Watson 1992; Watson 1906; Webb et al. 2000).

[78] Yet as a practitioner, I know that some of the most intense learning happens at just these points, with students confronting the reality of, say, racism or what slavery. A student on a recent course who had been badly upset by a discussion of torture, for example, later held the experience to have been harrowing but "wroth it" for the sake of learning.

[79] "But unless belief leads to a corresponding practice, it is not a religion but merely a theology" (Frazer 1993, p. 50).

[80] There is a connection between education and conversion, whether seen as a one-time event or as an ongoing process. However, the end of conversion is a much wider one than that of Christian education per se; the latter may serve the former, but they are not synonymous (Astley 2000b).

[81] This method is analogous to that adopted by Smart in dealing with religions, in that he deals with *religions* rather than attempting to define religion per se (Smart 1998).

[82] Although cults may be prima facia cases of indoctrination, they will not be discussed in the course of this work. Firstly, because they form a particular field of their own (see, for example: Aldridge 2000; Bonewits 2001; Heelas 1996; Wilson et al. 1999). Secondly, this research is grounded in the general practice of a specific group, which has few areas of overlap with the generally accepted sociological views of cults. For a "ready reckoner" of cult status, see (Bonewits 2001).

[83] This of course leaves open the question of whether indoctrinatory practices reside in the content of the experience or in the means conveying that content: see below.

[84] Of course, the debate in the literature is far more likely to be about processes which involve children (for example, the recent discussions: Gardner 2004; Hand 2002; Mackenzie 2004).

[85] "Although there is still disagreement among philosophers as to what indoctrination means, there is widespread agreement that indoctrination is in some way related to doctrines. This relation between indoctrination and doctrines is primarily understood in two different ways, which are not always clearly distinguished. Many assume an etymological connection between indoctrination and doctrines. R.S. Peters, for example, argues that "whatever else indoctrination may mean it obviously has something to do with doctrines". Antony Flew bluntly states, "No doctrines, no indoctrination". This is the way in which the content criterion of indoctrination is generally described. Doctrines are a logically necessary condition of indoctrination". (Theissen 1982, pg. 3).

[86] The unstated implication here is that the evidence must be shared and demonstrable. Religious experience, for the most part, tends to be intensely person and therefore not of this kind.

[87] The discussion of the view(s) about science is admirably taken up by Midgley, among others, (Midgley 1992). Tan gives a brief overview of recent thinking on the issue (Tan 2004). For an alternative consideration of the issue, which critiques (as magical) the assumption of causal links where none exist, particularly in the field of science and science reporting, see Dukes' work (Dukes 2002).

[88] This leads, of course, into the realms of positivism and foundationalism ((Astley 1994; Theissen 1982).

[89] This is, of course, a nominalist stance; for an excellent discussion of nominalism and realism, see (Duberman et al. 1990).

[90] Again, this is not the place for a discourse on the nature of belief; what is at issue here is how beliefs may be (if they may be) inculcated in others. Tan provides a summary of the arguments about the evidential nature of belief (or not) (Tan 2004).

[91] Snook, on the other hand, does seen indoctrination as a purely pejorative term, and seeks to relieve teaching which is necessary (such as teaching young children "correct behaviour") or which happens without conscious intent, such as teaching which children absorb by observation of their surroundings, from the charge of being indoctrinatory (Snook 1972c).

[92] After asking her teacher about the religious symbol he was wearing (an awen), a secondary student's immediate response was, "And what is its required action?". Although it is most unlikely that the student was aware of the debate surrounding the requirement of religious beliefs to be enacted, that she was able to immediately articulate this connection argues that it is embedded both in our assumptions of religious symbolism and religion itself (personal communication from Newell Fisher, the teacher involved).

[93] An ideology may be defined as a system of ideas and norms that underpin a particular culture or system of practice (Astley 1994)

[94] This highlights a point made by Hand: it is not those who use such methods unsuccessfully who exercise the theorists, but rather those who are successful (Hand 2002).

[95] Or, indeed, to be in the physical situation in the first place: which may open all of compulsory schooling to, at the very least, a need for a defence against the charge of indoctrination.

[96] Note that we are here discussing what has actually happened, rather than perceptions of what has happened on the part of the learner: a truly successful case of indoctrination would leave the learner convinced that she has voluntarily taken on the beliefs (doctrines) which she has learned (Snook 1972a).

[97] Hand speaks of a somewhat parallel assumption in dealing with the perceived intellectual authority of the parent to impart religious beliefs to a child – the assumption of authority on religious beliefs (which I would distinguish from theology) is one which can not come from demonstrable proof, and is therefore at best rationally dubious. While the esteem with which young children generally hold their parents may provide an exemption from the charge of circularity in the parents' case, no such exemption may be said to exist for the adult educator of adults (Hand 2002).

[98] Of course not all instances of indoctrination of adults will be voluntary, as particularly pointed out by authors who concentrate on political indoctrination. However, in view of the amount of literature surrounding the indoctrination perpetrated by religious groups, one must find a way of dealing with what would be, at the very least, voluntary attendance at events at which indoctrination could take place.

[99] There are, of course, times when outside influences must be taken into consideration: previously decided syllabuses, even the constraints of physical place (as many tutors in the case study will be well aware). However, these restraints are issues to be overcome, rather than contributory factors to the intention of teaching.

[100] Such education of course need not be Christian, per se: it is entirely possible for other faiths, creeds and paths to offer a concomitant sort of experience to their adherents.

[101] "Pure" here is used in the sense of the word associated with "pure mathematics", that is, meaning narrowly focused.

[102] "Heathen" here is used in relation to those who follow the reconstructionist path of the Norse traditions.

[103] Isaiah 61:1; Matthew 4:17; Matthew 10:7; Luke 3:3; Acts 10:42; Romans 10:14; etc.

[104] This is not the place to discourse on the theology of conversion at any great length: we are not concerned here with the interrelationship between, for instance, the action of the Spirit and that of the preacher.

[105] Although this is the stricture, it is not uncommon for lay people to speak at Masses, either during the time allotted for the homily or at other times. In theory this is "talking" rather than "preaching" due to the rules about who may preach; in reality, the subtle difference is neither highlighted nor, I suspect, known by most who hear the "talk".

[106] Asltey makes the salient point that this aim is aligned to healing, wholeness and release, as opposed to the concepts sometimes presented of domination of one group by another (Astley 1994).

[107] Formation here is taken primarily as the formation of the laity, regardless of who offers that formation (clergy or lay). Farley discusses the difference between the reality of formation of clergy/ministers and laity (Farley 1996).

[108] Cooper sees this, however, as predominately following the "banking" model of education (Cooper 1995, pg. 66).

[109] See: (Latourette 1975), as well as (Southern 1970).

[110] On the tensions involved in teaching, for the churches, see for example, (Working party of the Board of Social Responsibility, p. 27). On the subject of the theological foundations of Christian teaching, see (Willis 1993, pgs. 67 ff).

[111] This being one leg of the Church of England's historic reason for being involved in schooling, (Francis et al. 2001).

[112] The US Catholic Bishops' Conference puts it slightly differently, when they hold out a three fold aim of formation: conversion to Jesus, active membership of the community, and preparation for discipleship (NCCB/USCC 1999). The content of such formation, to a great extent, is not germane to this research, as it is focused on the practice of Christian religious education of adults rather than the content. The seminal discussion of faith development of course is that found in (Fowler 1981).

[113] This definition of course leaves out a great deal of informal formation, which is quite possibly the most important form of formation, just as professional discussion is often the most important form of professional development for teachers (*put in citation to EPPI study, Chris' work, Alma's, etc...).* However, the definition offered is appropriate within the context of the present work.

[114] Fostering Christian faith would be an instance of conversion. While it is possible that conversion experiences could be described as instances of transformative learning (Brookfield 2000; Mezirow 2000), the theology of conversion per se is not germane to our study.

[115] In terms of the inculcation of Catholicism, parents are bound by canon law to "o form their children, by word and example, in faith and in Christian living" (John Paul II 1983, 774, 3).

[116] This points out a very real difficulty in the study of religious education for adults: a great deal has been written about the religious education of *children*, but there is not nearly so much material available for those who have attained the age/status of majority.

[117] Astley speaks of formation to religious commitment, rather than denominational commitment, in terms of school based RE, but of specifically Christian formation in terms of formation, catechesis, Christian education (Astley 1994).

[118] "The first distinction has to do with the differing hopes or intentions of the Christian nurturer and the educator teaching Christian studies.... The second distinction has to do with the relation between Christian theology and education and nurture respectively. The third reason for maintaining the education/Christian nurture distinction has to do with the spheres in which the two activities take place, or their social agencies... The fourth distinction has to do with the pedagogical character of the two processes, but it also connected with the nature of the agencies or spheres... The fifth distinction follows from the fourth. Christian nurture proceeds from an assumption that teacher and learner are inside the Christian faith, whereas education only invites the pupil to *imagine* what it would be like to be inside a faith... The sixth distinction is that education in religion is appropriate for all, but Christian nurture is appropriate only for Christians... Finally, Christian nurture takes place in the context of worship (and not merely the study or exploration of worship), in a specialised faith community...."(pp.221-3).

[119] See the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 10 December 1948, art. 18, as well as Dignitatis Humanae (Second Vatican Council 1965).

[120] Nichols rejects the idea of placing catechesis under the aegis of "education", maintaining that the processes are related but independent; that each has its own inner logic (Nichols 1992). However, "education" here is used in what we have called the "narrow" sense, rather than the broader, umbrella sense.

[121] For interesting discussions of these points, see: (Lambert 2000) and (Webb et al. 2000).

[122] Wickett sounds a cautionary note here, that we must beware of any system which would treat adults as other than individuals: not all adults will reach the same level of criticality and it is folly to expect them to do so (Wickett 1991).

[123] In this sense, faith may be analogous to music, in that what is handed on is not the faith of the believer, but information about that faith, cf, "As an ethnomusicologist, therefore, I state ...that music exists only when it is in the form of sound. A printed score is just a piece of paper with marks on it. It is not 'music' in the real sense of the term". (Cameron, 2003, personal communication arising from discussion of (Cameron 1992)).

[124] There are other reasons why observation might be problematic, foremost among them the nature of the classes involved: they tend to take place with very small numbers (between six and ten on average) and often engage members in discussions of highly emotive and deeply personal issues.

4. Field work Data and Analysis

In this section, I will relate the responses from both the questionnaires and the interviews to the preceding work rising out of the literature. It will be remembered that the field work was designed to be illustrative (or rather, to provide the possibility of illustration or negation) of the continuum created from the literature.

4.1. *Education*

The definition of "education" was not given either to interview respondents nor on the questionnaire, for reasons rehearsed above: respondents were left to make their own decisions about the parameters of this term.

The most striking point about the responses which have been coded under this heading is that they are rarely clear cut. Few responses made a distinction between education (when seen in a positive sense) and formation. One respondent who made the distinction is involved in education in the formal sector; Administrators C and D made the distinction but, as shown below, the dividing lines between the two were not always clear.

It was not unusual for respondents to see education in a negative sense, as this response from one of the questionnaires shows: "People seem to fear feeling inadequate if they attend Adult Education courses - embarrassed by how little they know. A teacher/lecturer does not help: it needs to be at a conversational level." (AQ20). One respondent rejected the idea of a post with "Adult education" in the title as part of the diocesan structure, on the grounds that "education" was, this respondent felt, too often perceived as "schooling" (A3,4).

The most polarised comments about the Christian religious education of adults came from the opened ended question on the administrator's questionnaire, "Do you have any further comments you would like to make about Church based adult education?".

One respondent said, "Catholics on the whole in this parish are not all that interested in Adult Education in the Faith" [capitalisation as on questionnaire]. The second, "There is a genuine need within the church for ongoing adult formation (this should not end at the age of 18 on the assumption that individuals are fully informed when formal education comes to an end)". In between these two was the cry from the heart, "A great need for it. But how do you get the people to come?".

In some ways, this cry is answered by a number of responses from both tutors and participants, who point to the "failure" of the church toward adults in general or towards older adults.

Participants in particular were clear that there was perceived lack of knowledge - both on their own part ("I didn't know any of this.. it was all new to me") (P1) and on the part of others,

> "I'm sitting there and I'm thinking well maybe they've just never been asked why they are there, so they just plod along every week and then realising that there's not really very many outlets for them to be told about their faith. Because unless - I mean - unless I was proactive about joining CCRS when I actually asked if I could join, the first question was, was I a teacher in Religious Education in a Catholic school? I said I wasn't and they said; 'Oh right. And you still want to do this?' " P2

This respondent pointed out that if the CCRS was the only place one could go for solid learning, there was a "huge void" in provision, (P2), a situation which led to considerable frustration for this respondent. A questionnaire respondent

linked declining attendance at Mass to ignorance of the basic tenets of the faith (PQ12); another respondent to this question stated baldly that the Church was failing adults by not providing means of on going development, post Confirmation.

In relation to the thesis presented above about the nature of education, and how it differs from nurture, preaching and indoctrination, the most important statements from interviewees were those relating to criticality, autonomy, and the freedom to think for oneself. It immediately becomes apparent that this was much more of an issue for participants and tutors than for those who were interviewed as administrators. Of the 43 interview fragments which came under the two headings of, "autonomy" and "criticality", only seven were from administrators, and while the other respondents were speaking of criticality and autonomy of thought as furthering their own growth, one administrator was speaking of the depth of study required by a particular course, "You know, we've got to ensure that there is depth and sometimes this is very hard because people just don't have the sort of education which has enabled them to slip into it easily" (A1).

One of the participants put it this way,

> "...Or I don't understand [a concept], or I meet somebody like you and I think how do they know all that? And you know, isn't it fascinating and I suppose I am fascinated by it and I think well I want to know a little bit more" (P1)[125].

Farley has highlighted just this issue, in a section called, "Educated clergy, uneducated believers", in which he discusses the difference in importance laid on the education of the clergy as opposed to that of the laity. But as one administrator pointed out, the number of priests in the diocese is set to decrease rapidly, which (in the respondent's view) heralded the importance of training for the diaconate at the least (A1).

A3 and 4 mentioned the fact that they are sometimes seen by other administrators and/or clerics in the diocese as being "way out" or liberal, when in fact what they are attempting to do in fostering autonomy in people is in accord with the teaching of the church (A3,4). The conceptual analysis above leads to the conclusion that Administrator 3 and 4 have a valid interpretation of the documents. Resistance to this movement may have many causes. One important one is fear, which is highlighted below.

Participants, on the other hand, lauded assignments which allowed them to include their own thoughts (P1), and spoke of the need to accept or reject religious beliefs which they had received from parents, "And so I decided really I had the option of: either I ignore what everyone says and just hope for the best or actually have to think about it and question it myself and make a logical decision." (P2). Another participant remarked that it was "nice to see" people pushing against the boundaries of accepted thought, particularly when those doing the pushing were members of the clergy (P3).

A tutor echoed this in saying, "And in some ways, that means trying to open things up and encourage people to explore as much as possible because you're not trying to deliver a single message; you're trying to deliver possibilities" (T1). Another tutor went further, in response to the question of why they were involved in teaching such courses, "My reasoning behind it is I think education is a freedom. I believe it is something that gives us freedom and allows people the capacity to reflect on their experience" (T3)[126]. This of course aligns very closely to what has been said above about Education (pure), that it intends a broadening and deepening of thought.but does not seek to control the direction of that change[127].

One participant respondent did use the term, "critical" in relation to adult education (P3). In context, the term seems to have been used to mean, "important, vital", rather than "in relation to criticality"; however, the respondent did follow this comment with the observation that "it has to be approached in a mature and understanding way" (P3). The same respondent mentioned personal thought a number of times, and the need for personal ownership of belief, which they felt lead to, indeed, required, commitment. Some of these responses belong more properly under the heading of indoctrination (against which the respondent was reacting) and will be dealt with there.

Another participant reported that they had attended a specific course "because I really didn't know what to think anymore" (P2). While this clearly relates to knowledge gathering, it also points to the desire to form their own thinking, rather than have thoughts given to them – to being active participant in faith-based thinking.

Three administrators discussed models of church, in ways which relate to issues of education. All were urging a move away from a clerical (A2) or hierarchical (A3,4) model of church to one which is more collaborative: the now time honoured idea of moving from a triangular vision of church to a circular one[128]. According to A 3 and 4, this change in vision of church releases tutors from the anxiety raised by awkward questions (the sense in the interview is that "awkward" here refers not to difficult to answer questions, but rather questions that directly address church teaching). These administrators were clear that this change was one they were actively seeking to observe in those attending courses[129]. This of course relates back to what has been said above about the intention of the tutor, and takes us further in our thinking about intention.

If this is the case, that a re-engineered model of church (or perhaps a reactionary model, as this conception of church fits more neatly into the original church described in Acts, than it does into models from the middle ages on) frees the tutor from concern about strict adherence to "the party line" (P3), then there are clear implications here for the training of tutors and for self reflection on the part of practitioners.

The category coded as "knowledge" yielded a good number of responses; 41 fragments were coded under this heading. These ranged from ideas about identity through to frustration: a rich vein and obviously one which throbs with thought.

One of the more interesting issues raised was that of what might be called "denominationality", that is, what it is that sets Catholics off from other Christians.

> "...and I sat on a conference about a week ago.... And they were all talking about how the young people they deal with now don't have the sense of Catholicism that they had when they were growing up and they quite happily go to different churches and seeing how other people do it. And norms aren't as enforced as though they're still there and I can relate to what they were saying because, you know, though I am glad I'm in the Catholic church I'm happy there, ultimately that isn't a big deal to me, the feeling that I'm Christian and they are talking how we just don't have that identity". (P2).

This respondent's point is an important one, as it represents the view of younger Catholics, rather than older ones, particularly older "cradle Catholics"; (one respondent who came to the church as an adult also pointed out that they lacked the background of cradle Catholics, and that this made them more sceptical about the blanket acceptance of "party views") (P3). It also provides a link between education (which is the context in which this respondent was speaking) and formation, conceived here as Christian formation, rather than

denominational formation.

A second respondent, P1, in discussing a specific course (the CCRS), suggested that although it is aimed at primarily Catholic teachers, it could be broader in approach, containing information about "other religions":

Both of these respondents are making an interesting point, that what they are seeking from Catholic sources is not solely Catholicism, but rather a broader range of information and knowledge. This is reiterated by those who call for courses which will impart greater knowledge and understanding of the scriptures (T3, A2, PQ11)[130].

A distinction was also made between information and what might perhaps best be called knowledge (although this is an imposition on the data, I think it is a valid one). One respondent characterised this as the difference between who wrote the Gospels[131] and why they were written (P2). (We will return to this under the heading of "formation").

It is not perhaps surprising that the tutors brought the issue of knowledge to the fore in exploring the reason for their involvement in teaching, "Oh to learn more and do more and discover more. And the confidence to do it..." (T1), "our efforts will give knowledge..." (T2). One tutor in particular was adamant that those teaching should be clear in their own minds about what they were passing on to others (T3).

The same tutor made a distinction between "touchy feely Jesus kind of experience" (T3) and education. Although this may sound strange on first hearing, "touchy feely" has become something of a byword (byphrase?) for a specific type of course or seminar, since the Second Vatican Council. What this respondent was emphasising was that there was intellectual, demanding content

to the course in question (RCIA) as well as person-based experiential reflection. To this respondent, the combination of the two – knowledge and reflection – was what was sought. This was echoed by a participant who juxtaposed gaining knowledge (about the scriptures in this case) and achieving understanding, as two concomitant processes (P3). Another respondent made a clear distinction between adult education (which was not defined) and "something more about harmony or integration" (T3).

This is not to say, however, that there was no mention of specifically Catholic teachings by any of the respondents. From clear suggestions, such as a course on the new catechism (PQ11)[132] through to more nebulous (and numerous) mentions of "church teaching" (PQ11, T1, T2, etc..). Interestingly, it was two tutors who raised the fact that such teachings pose difficulties. T2, more predictably, was concerned that "church teaching" is made clear to young people, especially in disputed areas. T1, however, took a different tack and was more concerned about the ability of "the modern mind" to deal with concepts such as the resurrection.

The last heading which received much attention across the groups of respondents under the broad area of education was that which looked at education as a support for formation.

In the conceptual analysis above, the interplay between education and formation was seen as one which tended toward education (pure). However, from the point of view of those actively engaged in the informal sector, this dynamic may be a recursive one: education is put at the service of formation. "I think that one of the important things is to see adult education as part of the total adult formation process. It's not something different, it's part of [it]" (T1). "So going

back to the adult education side, it's a formation thing". (P3)

This is, indeed, what raises formation from indoctrination: the end product may be the same (belief) but it is a different kind of belief: as seen above, the indoctrinated person may know that she holds right belief, but she will be unable to articulate why her beliefs are true[133]. What was important to the respondents in the field work, and to myself as a practitioner in the field, is that beliefs are held which are understood and held intelligently, for reasons which are "owned" by the believer. There were comments about the need for education and formation to be "transformative" (A3,4; T3).

One administrator highlighted the fact that learners hold some responsibility for their own formation in the faith (AC), while a tutor pointed out that vehicles for formation are not found only in the Church (T1). This reiterates yet again a point made elsewhere that the Christian religious education of adults is a holistic process, not divorced from the rest of life.

The final issue under this heading was, interestingly, raised only by tutors. Three of the four tutors interviewed highlighted the lack of structure for Christian religious education of adults in the diocese and in the country as a whole. The fact that three of the four tutors raised it (and that it is clearly an issue of importance to myself as a practitioner) is telling, particularly as the issue was not raised by any of the administrators[134]. As one tutor put it, "the Christian religious education of adults is life long and no one parish has the scope to deliver it" (T1).

From such a small sample, it is of course impossible to make any overall, generalisable statements (see above). Yet this discrepancy is surely at least indicative of a tension between those who are primarily involved in the delivery of the Christian religious education of adults and those who are primarily

responsible for its oversight: the first group would seem to feel a need for structure, if not guidance; the second does not seem to see this as an issue.

This may well relate to the attitude on the part of the diocese, highlighted above, that adult education should be devolved to the lowest possible level, a theological principle known as subsidiarity, leading to the lack of a central register, etc. However, this subsidiarity does not seem to be providing tutors with the support they feel they need.

One tutor made a connection between this lack of support and a clerical, hierarchical model of church, as a top down approach. This is intriguing, for surely such a model would insist on centralised control, and such control is exactly what the diocese hopes to avoid. I raise this as an interesting tension.

4.2. ***Indoctrination***

> "... there will be groups of people who will want to go back to the certainty of a church prior to pre-Vatican and a kind of more fundamental certainty. ... it takes the form of an evangelical certainty, which doesn't permit any questions, anything. We have the truth, this is it, *there's no personal, no deviation*. It has a kind of a certainty that will come out of I suppose our tradition which is equally fundamental but tends to be based - will be more based on parity and on certain religious practices and devotional relationship ..." (A3,4) *(emphasis mine)*

This fragment provides an apt bridge between those coded as relating to "preaching" and those fragments coded under the heading of "indoctrination". What is different in this section, from the fragments cited below, is the portion of the text which I have placed in italics: "*there's no personal*" (meaning, "there's no personal involvement" or "there is nothing personal (about it)"). Whereas in the fragments cited particularly in relation to the CCRS, there was no discussion of personal belief or personal acceptance, this fragment introduces these concepts.

The respondents concerned with the CCRS were considering teaching, per se, as in "the teaching of the Church", whereas the respondents here are concerned with personal belief, personal certitude. The first can be held, as it were, at arm's length; the second must be taken up, taken in, and incorporated into one's personal belief framework.

Because this research centred on issues which were important to those who were actually participating in the Christian religious education of adults, I did not at any time introduce the word "indoctrination" into the conversations. At the time of the creation of the schedules, I felt that this would be too much a case of "leading the witness", a stance I still believe to be the correct one for this research. One purpose of the interviews was to ascertain if there was a correlation between what had come to be an important issue for me (the possibility of indoctrination, or to put it more positively, the autonomy of the learner) and the factors which were important to others in the field[135].

There were 38 fragments coded under this heading and even taking into account the caveat dealing with numbers of fragments, it would seem that this is not a burning issue for those interviewed, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say it is not an issue which occurred to this sample of people to speak about when asked about the subject in general or about the value of the Christian religious education of adults in particular. It is interesting, however, that of those 38 fragments, 27 came from participants; only 5 came from administrators. Well over two thirds of the concern about issues which were coded under this heading, therefore, came from participants, with very little concern indeed coming from administrators.

(The point should be reiterated that a number of those interviewed in all

three groups crossed the lines between the groups at various times, so such assignment of interest to one group or another must be done with great care, and indeed, no generalisation is made or intended. As noted above, respondents were interviewed under the headings which most closely related to their primary work in the diocese at the time of the interview).

One participant gave an almost text book example of indoctrination (at least in terms of passing a course) when they said, "And so there were in a sense, there were right and wrong answers. And so if you wanted to pass the course you provided the right answers" (P1). The respondent in question was discussing the CCRS.

I have added a parenthetical phrase above, "at least in terms of passing a course", because what we have seen above is that indoctrination is a much deeper enterprise than merely assuring a student of a passing grade. Indoctrination, as understood in this work, implies an imposition on the beliefs of the learner, so that the learner is unable to make their own meaning. This deeper level of indoctrination is not mentioned by this participant; however, even the surface level instance is interesting. It is distinguished from the fragments on preaching by the introduction of the concept of "right and wrong"; these words introduce the concept of judgement.

The CCRS is a course specifically aimed at those who are teaching Religious Education in Catholic schools. Thus, it is quite reasonable for the course to insist that students show an understanding of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, in order to show that they have fulfilled the aims and requirements of the course.

This brings us to a thorny point, which was hinted at in the conceptual

analysis above but which is more clearly exposed here. Can something be called "indoctrinatory" if the action which gives rise to that label is intrinsic to it? Is it not legitimate for a course on the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church to insist that students show an understanding of that teaching, in order to pass?

Clearly, the answer to the second question is that yes, it is reasonable. Certainly this obtains in other sectors of education: one would, after all, expect a student of physics to be able to expand on the general theories of physics. This leads to a further set of questions.

The first is, is it reasonable that such a course exist at all? A complete answer to this question would require a great deal of exploration of issues outside the remit of this research, beginning (ideally) with the concept of compulsory schooling but concentrating on the licitness or otherwise of faith-based schools. However, if we may (for the purposes of discussion and in light of the status quo) take the existence of faith based schools as a licit part of the educational system, then surely it is also logical that there exist some way of preparing those who will teach in such schools, and to adequately represent the doctrines of the on which the school is based – and it is for this reason that the CCRS exists.

But is this a case of indoctrination, as understood in the conceptual analysis?

Even though I have coded this fragment, and others like it, under the heading of "indoctrination", I would argue that it is not a *clear* case of such. This is because what is aimed for – the intention of the instructor – seems to be understanding and an ability to represent the teaching of the Church accurately. In none of the fragments which relate to this particular course was there a suggestion that the intention of the instructor was to gain congruence of the

beliefs of the learners with his own, or to impose "right belief" upon them. One participant spoke of not attending further sessions of another course (Alpha) which they perceived to be "just another straightjacket" (P3), but again, this participant was clearly able to exercise their freedom to attend or not attend (see above about issues involved with the concept of voluntary indoctrination).

Further, "another straightjacket" gives the sense of being confined (which is, after all, what straightjackets do) but not necessarily of having someone else's meaning imposed on their own – straightjackets restrict movement, not belief. (It is perhaps important that the respondent did not say, "straightjacket for the mind"). What is missing, which would make these episodes indoctrinatory, is this desire on the part of the instructor to manipulate the belief of the learners. This second fragment comes closer to the concept of indoctrination, but still falls short.

Yet I have coded these fragments under the heading of "indoctrination" for a reason. As we have seen above, the definition and even more so, the delineation of indoctrination and indoctrinatory practices is by no means straightforward.

The major reason these fragments have been coded here is the sense given them by respondents. P1 was clearly indignant at the treatment accorded learners on the CCRS (an emotion which comes across somewhat in text but was very clear in the interview experience), an attitude which is expressed in passages such as these:

> "And I'm sure I spoke to you about it before, the moral theology and you know, the attitudes to women and all those sorts of issues. And I know because I still look back, I actually taped version of the lecturer who gave the course on the moral theology. And I know that he, it certainly was not designed, he did not want discussion or debate and he did not want us to, whenever we sort of mentioned our own thoughts or, you know, or views on it, he

> [would] very quickly say; 'I'm very sorry but I'm here to give you the Catholic church's point of view and this is it'". (P1)
>
> "And he fact that he was one single man facing probably 24 women and 3 men, all married, you know, either married or not but they had children and life experience and were saying that his point of view, he, you know thought was one way and it may have, was often quite obviously opposition to the views of 24 women, he thought his was the right one and there was no room to manoeuvre. You know, argument or debate". (P1)

In particular, one passage makes the respondent's view of the course clear, as well as raising other issues:

> "...but I don't think their purpose was to stimulate me to think for myself. I think their purpose was very focussed and very, if I might say, slightly narrow. But a couple of them did sort of get me to think. But I don't think they would - I wouldn't say that was the design." (P1)

This respondent's view lead me, as a researcher, into a difficult area. Clearly, P1 felt that their ability to think as an adult was at best undervalued in this course, and that they were expected to swallow what they were told without consideration, without "making the meaning their own" in the terms used above. The overall impression is that P1 was angry with the experience, and felt much more could have come out of it. P1 gave to this experience the pejorative view that has been seen to be applied to indoctrination over all.[136]

Because of the self imposed constraints mentioned at the beginning of this section, I did not ask P1 if they felt the experience to have been one of indoctrination. It would be interesting to return to this point with P1 at some time in the future. My supposition is, however, that P1 would have no difficulty in ascribing the term indoctrination to this course; at the very least, P1 would be clear that it was not education as it should be undertaken. It is for this reason that I have coded it as indoctrination: at the very least, the respondents whose

contributions are coded under this heading felt that they could describe their experiences in a pejorative manner.

However, under my own schema, the episode is not one of indoctrination per se. I am here imposing my own structure on the interview data, and must be clear that I do so. In a return to the discussion of methodology, here I work within the paradigm of phenomenology, rather than grounded theory (in which I would be guided by the interview data rather than the schema I brought to that data) or ethnography (in which I would let the data speak for itself). Is this a case of causing damage to the data, or to our understanding of it?

I would argue that it is not; rather, it is a case of using a preconceived schema (conceived by an experienced practitioner in the field and based on the literature thereof) to categorise data. The fragments are coded under the heading of indoctrination on the grounds that clearly they are were of great concern to the respondents in terms of lack of freedom of thought, etc. They are not strictly considered as indoctrinatory episodes, due to the lack of intention to ensure congruence of belief on the part of the instructor.

Having justified the use of this code for these fragments, we may return to an investigation of what was coded under this heading.

One administrator made a graphic comment about the perceived need for congruence at least outwardly, when they mentioned donning the collar (speaking of the ordained ministry) and "going into dalek-like automatic speaking" (A1). Others echoed this with comments about a party line (P3, P2), and indeed there is one fragment which walks a fine line in relation to the concept of indoctrination as shown above, "That would be the straight jacket, I would say. So it forces you to be - it forces you to sort of follow a party line which you are not yourself

convinced of. I can't really go - this is what I mean by a straight jacket really." (P3)

"It forces you to...follow a party line which *you are not yourself convinced* of" (emphasis mine); clearly, if the intention was to indoctrinate, that intention was not successful, as the learner has remained unconvinced[137]. Outwardly, the learner may seem to agree (analogous in many ways to the student on the CCRS who is able to articulate Church teaching) but remains, herself, unconvinced: she is still able to make her own meaning in the situation.

P3 was clear about why such a simplistic view of life in the Church was not viable, for them,

> " Now I'm not sure whether that's possible or whether that's the right way of handling... I can't believe it's as simple as that. The whole thing is far, far more complex to me and I can't believe the sort of simplistic sort of magic type God. That doesn't seem to fit in. I can't go along with that. If this is any - if there is a power out there then it's going to be fairly sophisticated because otherwise what's the point? So I can't see it as the simple rule following rule sort of to get you through" P3

This is an interesting and important point, which harks back to the conceptual analysis above. P3 here is stating that belief in a complex deity must itself be complex, calling for the use of the cognitive faculties, rather than mere following of rules or parroting of regulations. The respondent continued, "It's not just a matter of ... rules or trying to steer a course but it's something about personal fulfilment ..."(P3). The respondent returned to this later in the interview when they said, "..if the educational process involves you in shutting bits of yourself off, then I don't think that's going to be very helpful." (P3)

This of course relates to the issues raised above about personal involvement in faith and in the process of belief itself.

One administrator touched on this, speaking of treating adults like children,

"... because it reinforces this notion of faith as a surrender of human independence, a surrender of human dignities, a surrender of human freedom" (A1). P2 concurred, discussing courses where "...we do all these diagrams and spend lots of time drawing on big bits of paper and explaining them to the different groups. And it's all very nice but, again you don't walk out actually feeling you've had any proper training"[138]. A1 mentioned a student on one course, "...and being a very intelligent man, you know, this meant he needed theology" (A1)[139].

This provides a link, again, to the conceptual analysis. As an adult, P3 was partaking of the educative experience out of a desire for personal fulfilment, therefore seeing the experience as "worthwhile" (assuming personal fulfilment is a worthwhile goal, a reasonable assumption). It is interesting that P3 does not see a dichotomous choice between rules and self fulfilment – but rather sees it as a part of a process, "it's not just...". This highlights the sliding nature of what I have called the continuum: it is a process that moves from one indefinite point to another, rather than a series of discrete stepping stones.

A1, on the other hand, was concerned for the view of faith as it is portrayed in some of the literature surrounding belief and doctrine, as seen above: that anything which contains doctrine can not be taught without indoctrination, and that belief in anything is a matter of surrender of will.

> "And because this is perceived as being the cost of religious faith, you know: close down questions, close down talent, close down responsibility for yourself, become an obedient wretch being ridden by some mindless authority of the Roman Catholic church; it just brings religion into disrepute" (A1) .

This is not the place (as the conceptual analysis was not) to delve deeply into the nature of human belief and the relationship between belief and will.

However, as we have seen above, the concept of adult formation does leave the way open for a conceptualisation of formation of belief that is neither indoctrinatory nor rides roughshod over the will of the adult involved. What the administrator was reacting against is something which need not happen and indeed they were not saying it did happen – rather they were pointing to a perception people have about how others come to faith.

T3 highlighted the difficulty of the change from one model (what amounts to a transmission model of the faith) to another, "to move people away from being treated as children, which they are primarily at the moment, to treating them as adults is a big step" (T3). (It should be noted that this was in a discussion of life in the Church overall, so that T3's rather blanket statement that adults are generally treated as children should be taken in that light, rather than a comment particularly about adult education in the Church). This model of Church was highlighted by T4, as well, "And of course many older Catholics have been brought up into the regime by a 'Father says this, Father does that and that's Father's role' and so on". (T4). PB echoed this in saying "...and they [clergy] assume that they [laity] just aren't ready to handle these truths yet but no one ever gets prepared to actually get to that point where they[clergy] will actually tell them [laity] I think[140]". (P2). T3 spoke of the view of the priest as one who stands in the place of the bishop "and I will teach and what I teach will be the final word" (T3).

One tutor specifically rejected this sort of model in terms of their own teaching in the church,

> "Why am I involved. Um, with considerable reluctance, I have to say. I- I have never felt competent to teach in these sorts of contexts. But on the other hand, perhaps if you felt competent to do it, you shouldn't. I mean

> it, it probably doesn't matter. To be any good at this, you probably have to have a sense that you're wrestling with it just as much as the students are. If you went into it thinking you knew the answers, you'd probably end up making a complete hash of it". (T1)

This reluctance was echoed by another respondent who, while asking to be interviewed under the heading of "tutor" (as with so many of the respondents, this interviewee could have come under more than one heading), went on to say, "we facilitate or lead – we don't call ourselves tutors." This concern with nomenclature has been noted above, but it is also pertinent here, because it relates to the model of church in use. These tutors are reacting against a model which would vest in those with the title, "teacher", "priest" or "tutor" more authority than these interviewees either wish to carry or wish to be seen to carry, authority particularly in terms what others should believe and do.

These fragments link a number of conceptual areas together: that of the model of church (c.f. "... knowledge and the faith and faith development is all tied to the power of the priest as the role has in the community." (T3)), which, for the respondents, clearly influences how people are treated; that of freedom of belief within a particular paradigm, and the means of teaching and learning in the Church.

I have said, "freedom of belief within a particular paradigm" which raises an issue hinted at in the conceptual analysis. While the episodes mentioned by the respondents might not strictly come under the heading of indoctrination as defined above, they do come within what might be called a line drawing, denominational exercise. They do not intend to impose belief on the learner but they do wish to lay down guidelines as to the beliefs of a given group (and, presumably, those who would belong to it).

In some senses, this is a parallel to the process of indoctrination. It does not seek to impose belief on the learner because the belief of a particular group is deemed to be "correct" but rather says, "if you wish to belong to this group, you must share this belief". While this may provide instances in which damage is done to the autonomy of the learner, should such damage apply, it is at the hands of the learner themselves, rather than any outside body. The learner will adjust (if possible) or think she has adjusted (possibly more likely) her belief to fit in with that laid down as a requirement for membership of a group she wishes to join or remain within. T1 spoke of "ecclesial obedience" which, while not quite the same thing, has relevance here: there is no need for someone who is outside the ecclesia to be obedient to its dictates.

For one of the respondents, this process might be what the Church is trying to accomplish with the Christian religious education of adults in the first place:

> "Well, the church - if you looked upon it as a sort of business, say, if the courses resulted in people being stronger in their beliefs or they felt that they were getting something more from the church, making more adult sense for them, then ...helping them in their lives rather than just forcing them to - or feeling they were forced to follow a particular line" (P3).

This difference – between imposed belief and making belief sensible to adults – is an important one. It gets to the heart of what saves the Christian religious education of adults from the charge of indoctrination, at least when it is carried out with these ideals.

The impetus here is not to force belief (which would be indoctrinatory) but rather to make belief palatable, or indeed believable, so that the learner comes to that belief of their own accord[141].

It is not education (pure) because those mounting the courses clearly hope that the process will be an effective one: that faith will be (in the example above) strengthened as a result. It comes, therefore, under the heading of "formation". The autonomy of the learner is respected, almost by default: an attempt to make belief palatable argues a previous assumption that belief must be accepted on its own merits, rather than imposed.

The conceptual analysis touched on the fact that it may be very difficult to indoctrinate adults, as they are used to making meaning for themselves, are far less dependent on others for their thought processes and beliefs. P1's comments about the CCRS lend support to this, when they point out that although they were clear that the intention of the course was not to get students to think for themselves, at times the course ha that effect, precisely because answers were considered to be pat, simple and transferable; P1 found that when they disagreed most with the tutor, they were more likely to go off and do their own thinking and research. More straightforwardly, P3 pointed out, "So [if]... adult education is simply about making people conform to something I can't really see that there's much hope in that" (P3).

Interestingly, P1 is also clear that this lack of stimulation to think for themselves did not make the classes intolerable; the respondent is clear that they enjoyed at least some of the classes because of the new knowledge gained, (after speaking of the lack of stimulus to think for oneself),

> "But that's not, again that's not to say I didn't find it interesting because I did. Because certainly (tutor name) I found his lectures really interesting because it was new stuff to me. I hadn't heard it put in the way he put it before and you know, I quite enjoyed that". (P1)

As we have seen above, the desire for knowledge is one reason

participants become such; as P3 made clear (and others hinted at) lack of information for adult Catholics is perceived as a real problem, (speaking of other denominations of Christianity), "...you know the people at their church were telling them this information and I felt that they had kind of privileged information that I didn't get because no one was telling me in my church". (P2).

A number of respondents highlighted an interesting issue: that of fear. The fear was not their own, but was perceived to be there on the part of "the Church", either as a sort of amorphous entity, or in terms of the hierarchy in particular, and also fear on the part of potential participants.

This fear has two faces, but both of them lead (or are feared to lead) to the same end: that of change.

On the one hand, T1 was clear that there are those adults who forgo religious education on the grounds that it might harm their faith, that raising questions might destroy the foundations of their belief.

This attitude is not unfamiliar to anyone involved in either the Christian religious education of adults or teaching of theology in general. Those involved with the Certificate in Intercultural Theology at the University of Nottingham are well aware, for instance, that there is some opposition to the Certificate among various members of the clergy in the city, for precisely this reason; there is distrust of "theology" among many people of faith (personal communications, 1999 –2005)[142].

Such distrust argues a view of faith and theology which are not synonymous; indeed, it argues that they are if not antithetical, certainly that they do not make happy bed fellows. In essence, it argues that Athens really does have nothing to do with Jerusalem and that one must not bring criticality to bear

on faith. Here we may return to the view expressed by an Administrator about treating adults as children.

Again, this is not the place to examine the relationship between theology and faith in any depth. It will suffice here to point out nearly 2000 years of history which points in the opposite direction: that men and women of faith have also been able to question, to be critical, to dissent and assent with all of their cognitive faculties intact. Yet the perception remains a prevalent one; one student in the informal sector felt justified in such a belief by quoting a member of the clergy who had once told her that "canon law was designed to keep people away from God"[143].

The second fear is aligned to the first, and it is of damaging change to the Church itself.

> "... Primarily on the part of the clergy to allow the church to open and grow in faith. Fear because - and it's a natural fear, you know - it's not altogether a bad thing, it's a natural fear of what might happen, where one might go. And I think it takes great courage, great commitment to let people make mistakes and the church make its mistakes and the community make its mistakes without running in and saying... And there's that fear. To get over that fear I think we will travel great journeys together. Laity and clergy". (T3).

Another respondent touched on the same issue, from a different angle,

> "And I think it seems to be this whole cloud of - if we just kind of keep going where we are everything will be OK because the church has always been OK and - you know - we just don't want to be - if we ask questions then things might starting falling apart around us". (P2)

Again, this second fragment highlights the (perceived) problematic nature of criticality in relation to faith, and it is for this reason that these fragments have come under the general heading of indoctrination. It should be noted that the

respondents in question here are not saying that they have *experienced* indoctrination, but rather that they are aware of a fear of criticality and autonomy, which may be considered prerequisites for indoctrinatory practices, though they need not lead to such practices. But there would be no need to indoctrinate others if criticality and autonomy would lead them to the same belief as that held dear by the indoctrinator[144].

Moreover, the fragments do not seem to belong under the heading of "formation" as they do not speak of the formation of the faith of the learner or of Church members as a whole, but rather are concerned with the continuance of the institution, which is to be brought about by a stifling of autonomy and critical thought.

4.3. ***Preaching – Formation***

> "The church - the church isn't teaching, the church is ...tradition where the church is trying to lead us to go I would say the thinking of the Catholic church particularly... has an amazing challenge to people to live an integrated life." (A3,4)
>
> "It is a school for holiness, and it does this in all sorts of ways. Its function is to facilitate the process of people becoming holy." (T1)

Again under this heading, some of the coding has been an imposition on the text, for the simple reason that not all respondents made any distinction between formation and education; thus, the definitions given above have been used, with formation being seen as "structured, interactive learning activities which have the intention of fostering, nurturing or deepening Christian faith".

A number of respondents insisted that formation, and indeed the whole of the Christian religious education of adults should be transformative, that in the

best case scenario, it should leave the learner changed, should have "moved them on" (A3,4 (both respondents), T3).

As mentioned above, there was some preference for the word, "formation" as opposed to "education", because people were perceived to understand "education" as being equivalent to schooling; "Often people hear education as a course or a qualification so I think formation moves you away from that perception" (A3,4). Yet those made this point constantly moved from one term to the other, and implied that the difference was one of nomenclature rather than practice. "I think formation for me looks at the whole person, not that education doesn't but just that it's perceived not to, whereas formation I think includes the formation, the spiritual development and formation ..." (A3,4) In fact, for A3,4 and T2, the difference might be better expressed as being not between education and formation but between academia and the informal sector, (these terms were not used by any respondent, even those working within the formal sector who might be expected to be familiar with them)[145].

From the questionnaires in particular came a perception that the word "education" presupposed some sort of formally assessed learning, bringing with it the pressure of exams (PQ12, TQ18); this sort of assessment was seen as detrimental to the process which should be aimed at "bringing us up to date", and the overall aims of formation as above[146].

Helpfully, one respondent (A3,4) provided a three fold vision of formation: information, formation, and transformation. This neatly incorporates much of what has been said above about knowledge, etc. Formation, from this point of view, depends on information but is itself not the end, or indeed, the point of the process: the reason for being involved in the process, whether as administrator,

tutor or participant, is transformation.

To that end, again according to Administrators 3 and 4, the Christian religious education of adults works on both an affective and cognitive basis (terms which were not used by the respondents but which align to the conceptual analysis above). They spoke of trying to move people along in terms of both intellect and faith, reiterating again the point that formation is a holistic process, rather than a piece meal one (or rather, that it should be such – taking into account tutors' complaints above about the lack of structure and progression, it would seem that this holistic process has yet to be put in place).

As above in the section on education, it may be a cause for surprise that there was so little emphasis throughout on formation as a Catholic, per se, but such emphasis was, if not entirely lacking, certainly not overly strong. One respondent was concerned about the lack of people coming forward to learn about the faith (P2); and some respondents particularly to the questionnaire were concerned about falling Mass attendance; one respondent bemoaned the watering down of Catholic content in school teaching (T2) (which is not germane to this research but is indicative of the respondent's views) but overall, being a good Catholic (as opposed to a good Christian or a good person) does not seem to have been an important issue for those involved in the field work.

One respondent, however, had been moved to undertake a particular course because they were unable to answer questions put to them about their denominational faith (P2), and because of adverse media coverage of the Catholic Church causing the respondent to question,

> "And I've read negative papers from other people of different denominations and thinking people really think this about the church I sit in, and I find a real kind of tearing feeling going do I really want to be in this faith right now? Is

this the church I'm really in? Because this terrifies me". (P2)

Participant A provided an odd counterpoint to this attitude, when they recounted a lecturer on a course who said, "'I'm very sorry but I'm here to give you the Catholic Church's point of view and this is it'" (P1). The participant was dismayed by this tactic, as it cut off any attempt at personal meaning making. As such, we shall return to it below. It is mentioned here only as a counterpoint to the participant who actively went looking for the teaching of the Church to answer their own questions.

P1 was moved to undertake various courses for the purposes of formation – although this word was not used, the sense is clear:

> "And because it's important to me, my faith is important to me, I want to know as much as I can. But also I want to, I'm constantly wanting it to be relevant to my life and I often think it isn't. And yet I, to me, it's my faith as well as anybody else's so you don't just chuck it because it's not relevant, you find,... " (P1).

The respondent continued, in an interesting phrase, "I have as much right to my Catholic faith as anybody else does". The phrase was not particularly emphasised, merely a comment in passing, but it is indicative of an attitude which has been highlighted in other areas in this work: that there is a (perceived or real) dichotomy between the education in the faith given to those who are members of the ordained clergy and the laity[147]. P1 is stating here their "right" to such teaching. The comment came in connection to discussions of the CCRS; these two fragments are indicative of a desire by an adult practising Catholic to know more about their own faith for the purpose of supporting their faith. It is the connection with growth in faith which has led to the classification of these fragments as formation, rather than education.

T3 saw that the Church needed to offer courses such as those involved in this study because:

> "...people in the world are continually assessing where they are in relationship to God and the [Church] structures, those narrow structures that were there in the past no longer exist, no longer found helpful maybe. And so bridging that gap is the most important part. So from the point of view of the church enabling people to feel secure and to feel comfortable and to feel that they belong to the church and the church community often in an environment in which they can grow [is the reason for offering such courses]".

Again, the issue here is clearly one of formation, and perhaps not just formation in faith but personal formation overall, "an environment in which they can grow".

This same respondent was clear that such courses were not for the sake of outward conformity. It isn't about getting:

> "...Catholics back to the sacrament of penance, getting them to Matins in the morning three times a year ... those kind of structures". It is about helping them to open the Catholic experience into their lives and find that there is a God component in this and other people who journey with them is equally important and their own experience is important". (T3).

This is again clearly an instance of formation, because what is important here is the (faith) experience of those involved, rather than their knowledge (education) or their congruence to a particular set of beliefs (indoctrination).

One set of respondents made a distinction between being an adult Catholic, someone who is an adult and is also a Catholic, and being a Catholic adult, that is, someone who is a Catholic first and an adult second (A3,4). By this distinction (one which is not uncommon in catechetical training) is meant that one should strive for a faith that is fully adult, rather than a faith which is imposed on

someone of mature years or held by them but who may not be dealing with matters of faith in a mature way.

This links well with what has been said above about the need for adults to have the freedom to make meaning about and within their faith, rather than having meaning imposed upon them. This freedom to make meaning is what brands a faith, or a faith process, as adult, rather than child like (or childish), as independent rather than dependent. This is also related to what was said about the perceived need to offer catechetical experiences to adults.

One other mention of the identification of formation as Catholic came tangentially in discussion with A2, who related the fact that members of a parents' course for First Communion[148] had taken to ending the sessions by having a drink in the local pub. A2 was pleased that one of the parents had been happy to tell bar staff that they had been at a First Communion meeting: thereby "owning" their faith based practices in an unexpected location.

Some respondents were clear that formation has, as its end, a deepened relationship with God. (Other respondents might not have necessarily disagreed with this, but simply did not engage in this particular discussion). Tutors in particular were clear that this was the point of the entire exercise: to know, to see that someone had "had a Christian moment, a Christian experience" (T1) or would be able to "live their lives in terms of their faith" (T3). T1 used the phrase, "A school for holiness" and went on to say, "But there is always this sense that ultimately you walk into the centre and then beyond it" (T1) which is a profound statement of the function of the Christian religious education of adults. Both tutors spoke of a point that many teachers have made: of essentially getting out of the way and letting the learning, or in this case, the faith, take centre stage.

T1 spoke poignantly of their own prayer in relation to teaching: prayer that whatever input they might have, God would speak to students in the way that would be of greatest benefit to the student in question. T3 spoke of creating a situation in which people can "integrate their experience into God" (which is an interesting way of putting it; on paper it has definite pantheistic or panentheistic overtones which do not accord with the beliefs of this particular respondent); what was meant was again that formation is not separate from the rest of life – that the participant's entire life should be effected by the process of formation. As T3 went on to say, "That's a difficult task". But it is a worthwhile one, because as the same tutor went on to point out, the process itself leads to freedom, to a "deeper and richer lifestyle" (T3)[149].

The same respondent spoke of the fear that this process engenders in tutors and administrators. Allowing this process of formation, fostering it, means allowing people to make mistakes, allowing the parish and church communities to make mistakes; as T3 pointed out, this is a risky business, but a fruitful one.

And of course it is one that any parent knows well: the parallel to child development through adolescence and faith development is a well worn one (see, for a small example: Catherine of Siena 1980; King 1996; Teresa of Avila 1979; Waller et al. 1999, etc.). And just as parents are far from the only influence on children, the Christian religious education of adults was considered by respondents to be only one of the influences on spiritual formation: others mentioned were retreats, sacramental life, (T1), and community life (T3)[150].

Other respondents added another end to the process of adult formation: that of collaborative ministry (T4) and/or lay leadership (A3,4). For some, this related back to the issue of community and model of church (T3): collaborative

ministry will lead to a different model of church[151]. Much of this discussion took place in relation to what one respondent (A3,4) spoke of as "task related" formation, particularly that of the reader and the special minister of the Eucharist[152]. Both T4 and P3 touched on the relationships between clergy and laity, with T4 saying that the particular ministry with which they were associated was clearly to be assistance to the clergy, and P3 speaking of working well together with charity.

Yet often people who come forward to be a part of a collaborative effort of ministry are lacking in knowledge and information; the process of formation can help supply the lack, (A3,4).

> "And the days of the priest doing everything and running everything are gone, so we need people who are able to step into different positions in the church, but often they are coming to us and they are willing in that but they really don't have much idea about basic Christian teaching and that kind of thing. So that's one reason why it's really important to have kind of catechised educated people there who can effectively ensure the parish is growing". (A3,4)

This returns us yet again to the idea of models of Church; as another respondent mentioned, they felt that there was something lacking in the life of the Church that to get the opportunity to sit and discuss issues of faith with others, one had to attend a course such as Alpha (P1). This respondent felt that the chance to share ideas and issues was broadening: taking one out of one's own preoccupations with particular bits of the faith and opening doors by seeing what was important to other people. This was echoed by another respondent, who saw conversation with others as a means of being able to see oneself more clearly (P3).

These comments are linked to those to that made above by A3,4 about adult Catholicism rather than Catholic adulthood. As seen in the conceptual

analysis above, one of the features generally associated with adulthood is the ability to be critical and in particular to be self critical, to make one's own meaning.

And indeed, one respondent summed this up, "You delve and dig and you know, search until you find the bits that make it relevant to you. You know, I have as much right to my Catholic faith as anybody else does"(P1). The point P1 was making here was that knowledge of the faith should be available to all the faithful,

> "And because it's important to me, my faith is important to me, I want to know as much as I can. But also I want to, I'm constantly wanting it to be relevant to my life and I often think it isn't. And yet I, to me, it's my faith as well as anybody else's so you don't just chuck it because it's not relevant..." (P1).

The respondent here was making the connection between knowledge and faith: the knowledge that they lacked was, they felt, impeding their faith, or at least their full realisation of faith as relevant to their life.

Overall, then, respondents in both interviews and questionnaires felt that "formation" was the best way of describing the process of the Christian religious education of adults undertaken in the diocese. They linked this formation to the model of church held by those involved, and saw its outcomes in terms of personal relationship with the divine, involvement of the community and collaborative ministry for the church as a whole.

Preaching

Since the interview and questionnaires focused on the Christian religious education of adults per se, it is not surprising that there are far fewer entries relating to preaching than the previous one: there are 14 entries, in all.

Although one mention was made of preaching by living (in relation to the

life of the Church, preaching as it lives (T3), for the most part, preaching was seen as the formal proclamation of the Word, particularly during the liturgy (A1, PQ11).

There was an emphasis from one respondent on the need for preparation for preachers[153]. There were also calls for courses about evangelisation and "skills for the proclamation of the Word of God" (PQ11). (Since these were questionnaire responses, there is no way of interrogating the data any further to find out if the respondents meant formal, liturgical preaching or something more informal).

There are, however, fragments which I have coded as "preaching" which would not come under the formal heading of such: rather, I have placed them here because although they took place in what were manifestly educational situations (the CCRS, in this case), the nature of the interaction was one of preaching, rather than of education, as given above. As will be recalled, the definition given for preaching included a one-way method of delivery, with little or no interaction between participants; the content being that of the teaching of the Church, and the intention on the part of the preacher being the salvation of souls.

Certainly one respondent's experience of the CCRS fits two of the three of these criteria: the nature of the delivery and the content. (Charity would insist that the third criteria was also fulfilled, that is, one would assume that those involved in delivery had the eternal salvation of their students at heart; however, the dictates of charity are not germane to the coding framework). This respondent commented on the fact that students on the course were not generally encouraged to ask questions, that one tutor held (as cited above) that his job was to present the teaching of the church, that the lack of interaction was not what

one would have expected if those delivering the course were "professional" (one assumes the meaning here would be, professional educators), and that the view of the instructor was, "... often quite obviously opposition to the views of 24 women, he thought his was the right one and there was no room to manoeuvre. You know, argument or debate" (P1).

It might be argued that these fragments should properly have been coded under the heading of "indoctrination" rather than "preaching", as they relate to the exposition of only a one sided view.

However, taking into account what was said about indoctrination above, it seems that there is a subtle, but important difference at play here. The participant who was clearly so dissatisfied with the conduct of this particular course did not at any time mention feeling as though they were being pushed to change their own beliefs, nor even to accept those which were being held out to them; there is no sense in the interview data that the respondent felt their own autonomy was being eroded in this fragment. Their intellect was being downplayed, yes, but not their autonomy. Their critical facilities were being neither highlighted nor stimulated – or at least this was not the perceived intention – but it would seem also that the intention to impose meaning was lacking on the part of the instructors on the course. What they appear (from the interview data) to wish to do was to set out the teaching of the church, rather than to impose compliance with that teaching.

This same respondent did make the point that, perhaps in spite of this lack of interactivity on the course, they themselves did engage closely with some of the disputed territory covered by the curriculum, particularly that with which they disagreed most strongly, the disagreement with the stated teaching of the Church

being the impetus for further, personal study. This was almost certainly not the intention of the instructor, but as many teachers are aware, making statements with which students disagree is often quite a good way to stimulate the critical facilities in those students.

---

[125] This respondent had been a participant in courses I had taught; we have known each other some years.

[126] For one participant, this took place mainly through the personal study required on an award bearing course taught through the church (P1).

[127] I did not discuss the work of Paolo Friere with this respondent but of course this comment closely mirrors Friere's work, (Freire 1970).

[128] This change may be traced to many theologians; just one who exemplifies it graphically as a move away from the conception of climbing Jacob's ladder to dancing Sarah's circle is Matthew Fox (Fox 1979).

[129] "You will see in the person's face a moment of change, when it actually twigs. And suddenly stuff that I thought was really crazy or was almost heretical suddenly now made sense and I know - and I've actually undergone a change in myself. That doesn't happen all the time but it happens on a fairly regular basis and they are the kind of people that I would be inclined to encourage and try to work with and try to draw in because they have - they have got - suddenly they are validating a reflected experience, not just experience but a reflected experience". A3,4.

[130] This may reflect that fact that for the most part, informal Christian religious education of adults are free to the learner or at most have a nominal charge, as opposed to those offered by the formal sector.

[131] It must be said, however, that in my experience, just introducing participants to the possibility that the Gospel of Mark might not have been written by the apostle of that name, can be shattering enough.

[132] This respondent thought such a course would be a good idea, but appended the query, "but would anyone come?" In point of fact, the diocese did offer courses about the new catechism when it was first published in English. In a style which sums up much about the (then) diocesan view of education, two training sessions were held: one for clergy, one for laity. One of the outside speakers at the day for laity expressed amazement at the division, particularly in view of the theological qualifications of some of the laity present, (personal communication, 1999). This harks back to any number of issues raised here, but particularly that of the difference in training given to the clergy and the laity, and the model of Church such a division suggests, see above.

[133] In an interesting parallel, school improvement literature is beginning to question management styles in schools which are based on "right belief", rather than experience (West-Burnham 1997).

[134] A2 did speak about employing someone within a group of parishes to oversee adult education, but no mention was made of a *structured* programme.

[135] Research on views about indoctrination, however, would be valuable; see "Further Research".

[136] A view which is not, of course, shared by all, cf Tan's work (Tan 2004).

[137] Indoctrination need not, of course, be successful to merit the title.

[138] This sentiment is one often heard of training courses across the board; Astley complains of courses which consist of nothing so much as "shared ignorance" (Astley 2002).

[139] This argues, of course, an interesting view of theology as something which is only for those who are deemed "intelligent" or "highly intelligent". From a practitioner's point of view, I would disagree, but his point is one that is well made: because the intelligent man in question was a member of the laity and therefore had (previously) had no easy access to theology in the Church.

[140] This was echoed in my own experience as a young student: a fellow parishioner on hearing I would study in Rome asked wistfully, "Will you learn secret things?" The underlying assumption that there are truths of the faith which are hidden from the laity dies hard.

[141] It is important here that the aim is to make a set of beliefs palatable or believable – not to *prove* them.

[142] This disquiet has been reported at Council meetings of the LEP which supports the work of the Certificate, by tutors and by students on the Certificate.

[143] One can only assume that this was an offhand remark, meant to be flippant or a joke; yet the student involved had carefully preserved the comment as a shield against further faith based study and trotted it out as a definitive argument to "prove" that Roman Catholics were enjoined not to think about their faith and were merely to be obedient and not enquire of things which did not relate to the laity.

[144] This argument, of course, rests on an assumption of logical action on the part of the indoctrinator.

[145] This was again echoed by a respondent who spoke of a permanent deacon who could not engage in academic study at any great level, but was a popular preacher and "...he's sound and he wouldn't make a grave mistake in theology" (A1).

[146] As an interesting tangent, one respondent thought that formation was a much more diffuse process than education (TA).

[147] It may be that this extended training is perceived to also be open to all those in vowed or promised religious life, such as nuns and sisters (who are, as non ordained, technically members of the laity).

[148] In A2's parish, parents are expected to attend a series of meetings which parallel the preparation their children are receiving for their First Holy Communion. All such preparation is parish, rather than school based, in this

particular parish.

[149] This was echoed by others who spoke of personal development as a part of the entire process, (A3,4; T4; T3; P3).

[150] Hand maintains that the social benefits of the inculcation of religious beliefs, by parents to children, may be held as a justification for such practices (Hand 2002). It is interesting that in neither the interview nor questionnaire data was there any mention of a parallel process: the value of community was seen as something at the service of the faith and of belief, rather than the other way round.

[151] Of course it could be argued that this is the wrong way round, that the model of church must change before collaborative ministry can come about. I would argue that it is, as with so many other things, an iterative process (Dulles 1978; Koszarycz).

[152] These two ministries are open to lay people within the Roman Catholic Church, but for different reasons. The reader (who proclaims, or may do so, the readings from the Old Testament and the Epistles, during the celebration of the Mass) does so by virtue of her baptism into the faith. The extraordinary minister of the Eucharist, however, is exercising what is in essence the ministry of the ordained, as properly, the Eucharist should be distributed by a deacon, priest or bishop, hence the title, "extraordinary" or "special" minister of the Eucharist.

[153] "Of course to send a man out to preach who can't preach is not just very, very cruel to him, it's devastating to a parish. I acknowledge that this probably means that we ought to shoot half the ordained priests in the diocese as well, right now..." (A1).

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Much of the analysis of the field work data has been interwoven in the text above. This was done for two reasons: the first is the pragmatic one of the limit placed upon word length in this type of research, the second and more important one being that such an interweaving provides a much clearer flow to the narrative of the research: the conclusions and relationships are drawn immediately from the data, rather than placed in another section.

What remains to be done here is then a brief summation of the main issues which emerged from the field work, particularly those which either did not arise in the conceptual analysis or which present different conclusions, and to relate those to the main issues from the conceptual analysis. This will lead to conclusions about the central research question.

5.1. *Conclusions*

The first and most striking conclusion from the field work, both the interview and questionnaire phase, is that indoctrination and indoctrinatory practices are not of great import to those who are involved in the field work. That is, in spite of the wealth of ink which has been spilled over whether or not faith based education is possible (for the definition of education as something worthwhile, which promotes the autonomy of the learner, etc.), those in this particular area of the field did not raise the possibility of indoctrinatory practices as an issue, at least by the name. This highlights, again, the dissonance between the academy and the field, at least in the informal sector.

This finding relates to one of the original purposes of the research, that is,

to relate the literature about the field to the experience of practitioners in the field. While the academy is rightfully concerned about the autonomy of the learner, the tutors and participants in the field work made it clear that this autonomy, for them at least, could be protected by choice (e.g. the participant who did not return to the Alpha course) or by their own cognitive processes (cf. the participant who clearly disagreed with the tutor who was giving "the Church view").

As has been seen, however, there was concern expressed for the occasional lack of autonomy of the learner, and indeed lack of respect for the cognitive processes of the learner. These expressions come mainly from the participants and tutors; when they are mentioned by the administrators, they are considered under the guise of what is perceived to happen, rather than what actually does take place.

This is in stark contrast to the literature of the field, as investigated in the first part of the research.

As has been noted, most of the literature deals with the education of children, and much of it is concerned with the formal sections of that education. Yet, as has been noted, there is a growing body of work surrounding the learning and teaching of adults, which seems to indicate that issues of concern may not be directly transferred from one to the other. Important within this area is the difference between the formal and informal sectors: while children have little choice about whether to attend compulsory schooling, (or about the ways in which their parents choose to bring them up), adults attending instances of the sorts of educative processes under investigation here do so from their own choice.

This research adds to that body of work, by applying both literature and field work to the informal sector of adult education.

From the interview and questionnaire data, it is clear that most of the Christian religious education of adults in the diocese, as least in the experience of those queried, falls under the heading of "formation" rather than "education" (pure). The end, the aim of this work is support for the faith of those involved (including, according to T1, that of the tutor herself).

From this we may draw a number of conclusions, some with reasonable surety, others more tenuously.

The first, and most important in terms of this research, is that the field work supports the conclusion reached by the conceptual analysis, which is that the Christian religious education of adults is possible without resort to indoctrinatory intent or practices. This presents an answer to the hypothesis posed at the outset, and provides a firm basis for the work of practitioners in this field.

Had the intent of those involved in the field been indoctrinatory, they would have concentrated a great deal more on "right belief" than they did – this was mentioned only in passing and generally in terms of what was thought to happen rather than what did happen. Mention was made of the need to be able to give back teaching as it was given, but no mention was made of being forced or coerced to believe. A participant mentioned a course as being a straight jacket, which might have led to that course being seen as indoctrinatory, but as the participant in question was free not to attend (and indeed, did not attend) that course, the autonomy of the learner was clearly still to the fore.

At no time did any of the tutors or administrators put any emphasis on

instilling right belief in learners. Concern was expressed for the falling numbers in church (mainly in the questionnaire data), but it is significant that for those who expanded on this issue in interviews, the emphasis was on making belief palatable, so that it might be accepted, rather than on instilling it.

The issue of indoctrination was not raised, even obliquely, in the questionnaire data. Although there was no specific question dealing with indoctrination, it is significant that it was not raised in any of the open ended questions. It clearly is not a burning issue for those who responded to the questionnaire, which again supports the conclusion reached above.

Very little mention was made of practices at all. One participant discussed practices in one course; another dismissed courses which lead to little outcome because of their method. Other than that, most concentrated on the content and reasons for the offerings, rather than the method. This is in part due to the way the interview schedule was arranged: it did not ask a specific question about the methods employed. But it may also betray a lack of interest or concern on the part of those involved for issues of pedagogy or androgogy.

Or rather, it may betray not a lack of concern but a lack of knowledge that there is something to be concerned about. Issues of pedagogy, let alone androgogy, have never been raised in any of the training I have received in a Roman Catholic diocese. When I, as a tutor, have raised them in my own work, however, they have been eagerly received.

Again, this highlights one of the contributions of this research, grounded as it is in the experience of a practitioner whose experience straddles the formal sector of adult education, the research base of educational practice, and the

practice in the informal sector. The conclusions reached here add to the research about and support the practice of the Christian religious education of adults.

Whether practitioners in the informal sector have a detailed understanding of difference in practices or not, however, the point remains that there was no sense in the field work data that indoctrination or indoctrinatory practices were either widespread in the diocese or that there was concern that they were. At most, there was concern that there was a *perception* that such practices existed.

One interesting difference between the field work and the literature is that no where in the field work data was the word, "nurture" used, although this word does permeate the literature.

This leads to a conclusion which is clear throughout the interview data (less so from the questionnaire data, as it is of less depth), that those in the field do not seem overly familiar with the literature of the field, at least the academic literature. While there were occasional references to theological works and Church based documents in the interview data (few, but still present, as in T1's references to Vatican II documents), there were no references to other works cited in the conceptual analysis.

In many ways, this is not surprising. Of those interviewed as administrators or tutors, only three had formal teaching qualifications, and only one of those was in adult education[154]. While there is no causal link between teaching qualifications and familiarity with educational literature, one would expect that those who have been formally trained as teachers would have had more access to the literature in the field than those who have not. Moreover, there is often a gap between the research in any field of education and those who

practice within that field, a gap which numerous organisations seek to bridge (the LTSN network, the NFER, etc.).

Perhaps the information is filtering down, but not with the names of the authors attached? If this were the case, however, one would expect at least some of the concepts raised in the conceptual analysis to surface in the interview data. As seen above, they did so only in the most tangential way, which leads to the supposition that those involved came to their opinions through practice and thought rather than through reading.

While this is not surprising, it does raise a serious question. For whom, exactly, is all the literature being written? If it is not being disseminated to those in the field, what is the point of writing it? This relates to one of the questions raised at the outset of this work, about the gap between the academy and the field, and substantiates the original assumption that this gap existed, and again to the purpose of this research in going some way to filling that gap. (See the final section for further recommendations toward bridging that gap).

The field work provides, along with confirmation of the conceptual analysis, a refinement of the understanding of the process of adult formation. It will be recalled that formation was described above as, "structured, interactive learning activities which have the intention of fostering, nurturing or deepening Christian faith". While the field work confirmed most of this, there were two significant differences. The first is the lack of structure and the (general) lack of a feeling of need for same, and the second is a refinement of the process.

Although there were some mentions – mainly in the questionnaire data – of the need for structure, for the most part the emphasis of respondents was on the

need for provision, not *structured* provision. This has significance for the field, in that such structure will not arise of itself: it must be created.

Interactivity was highlighted rarely. One respondent was irritated by lack of interactivity, but for the most part, the issue did not arise.

However, the central point of the definition, "the intention of fostering, nurturing or deepening Christian faith" did occur often, and interestingly, often in much this format; as noted above, the emphasis was rarely on denominational belief but on Christian belief itself. This was seen by administrators, participants and tutors alike as the reason for undertaking, participating in and providing courses. Here, the research provides a clear link between the literature and the field in a positive sense, in showing that what is important in the literature is also important for practitioners, and is understood in the same way.

A schema of adult formation was suggested during one interview, (A3,4), which may be represented as:

This graphic provides a useful means of understanding the flow of formation. As above, the end result, or at least the intended result of adult

formation is strengthening of faith – which is in itself a transformative process. Information comes first (in the sense that there is something to be handed over, something to be learned), then the formative process itself leads to a transformation in the learner.

Adding this to the outcome of the conceptual analysis, I would suggest a change to the diagram, thus:

Transformation here has become a part of an iterative process which returns information to the participant/practitioner (as the result of a process of reflection) (Schön 1995), and which also feeds into the process of formation. This makes it clear that formation is never a completed process.

This new diagram highlights the need for and value of reflective practice (emphasised in both the conceptual analysis and in my own practice), leading to a clearer understanding of formation not merely as a spiritual process but as an educative one as well.

Therefore it is possible to say that the conclusion reached through the conceptual analysis - that the Christian religious education of adults is possible without resort to indoctrination and is not itself a species of indoctrination - is supported through the field work undertaken here, as well as by my own reflection on practice within the field. The Christian religious education of adults as experienced by those in the interview phase of the field work is clearly a species of formation, rather than indoctrination or indeed of education (pure).

5.2. *Recommendations for further research and practice*

As with any piece of research, this work has raised at least as many questions as it has answered. In this section, I highlight issues which would bear further research.

First and foremost, I would recommend research in this sector, that is, the Christian religious education of adults in the informal sector, which specifically investigates indoctrination.

I believe that this research should be at least multi-denominational (that is, include the established churches, the Pentecostal churches, etc.), both to provide a wider sample and also to see if there is coherence across the groups or not (possibly leading to some sort of synthesis of "Christian" views on the matter?). At best, the research should be multi-faith, taking in not only the larger faiths, but the smaller, emergent movements, such as neo-Paganism[155].

This research would unearth a host of ethical issues, not least of which would be the possible damage to the tutors or administrators themselves; in introducing the spectre of indoctrination around their work; care would be needed in phrasing, selection of samples, etc. My experience of those involved in the field both across Christian groups and across faiths is that many have not considered the fact that they might be involved indoctrinatory practices, (often because they are convinced of the truth of what they are teaching; there seems to be an assumption on the part of many, refuted above, that one can not indoctrinate the truth).

The research should, at least at the outset, concentrate on the views of the three sectors (administrators, tutors and participants) elicited specifically on the

concept of indoctrination. The reasons for not doing so during this research have been rehearsed above, but this leaves a lacuna: have those involved not mentioned indoctrination because it is not a burning issue for them (in the diocese at this time) or because they were not given a prompt to do so? Would views of indoctrinatory practice differ across denominations, between the established and Pentecostal churches, between religions of the book (Christianity, Islam and Judaism) and those which do not rely so heavily on a central text?

This research would be valuable in itself, as research on the faith based education of adults (a field sadly lacking, as above) but it would also further our understanding of how people on the ground conceive indoctrination, education, how they come to have and hold belief, etc. Such research should be aligned to that of those such as Fowler, etc., on the nature of faith, how it comes to be held, etc. (Fowler 1981).

Further research particularly on the Christian religious education of adults would also be beneficial to the sector. I would suggest that this should include in-depth research which would include "classroom" observation, to examine the range of teaching methodologies employed, which would go some way to answering some of the issues raised here. As a working hypothesis, I would suggest that many involved in the Christian religious education of adults are actually using what would be seen as good adult education practice, while being unaware that they are doing so[156].

This research could be focused particularly on practices which do, or do not, increase or support the autonomy of the learner. This research, for reasons given above, concentrated on reported practice: there is now a need to align this

reported practice to observed practice[157].

Doing this sort of research would have a secondary benefit: it would show within and without the academy that this type of teaching (informal, faith based) does fall within the purview of educational researchers.

I would suggest that one outcome of such research could be a self assessment document for tutors to use as a part of their reflective practice, modelled along the lines of the self assessment tools which will be available to schools in the coming academic year (Goodall et al. 2005).

Another issue which was not investigated in this research is the issue of payment for teaching in the informal sector. At the moment, there is no standardisation in the diocese: I know of one programme in the diocese which has in the past paid a rate equivalent to the university rate for part time tutors, but in general, my impression is that most programmes do not pay tutors, though some may offer book tokens or travel expenses (even these are few and far between, again in my experience). It would be of interest to know if tutors wish to be paid, in the first instance (I know of some who refuse outright) or if they feel they could devote more time to preparation, etc., if there was an income from the courses they taught.

There are clear subsidiary or concomitant questions here, such as that of the requirement or not of qualifications for tutors (or indeed, administrators), and what those qualifications should be. The field work showed disagreement among administrators as to what qualifications should be required, if any, as well as a wide range of qualifications among tutors.

Further, demographic research among those who act as tutors would be

useful; this might answer the question above about qualifications, but it would also possibly alert the diocese and Church in general to a need for systematic training of younger lay people, to take on this role as the number of clergy decreases.

Recommendations for practice

In the introduction to this work I remarked on the dissonance between practice in the formal and informal sector, in terms of quality assurance, central involvement and support for teaching staff.

The outcome of the conceptual analysis, that the Christian religious education of adults is indeed a species of education, although not education in the purest sense, gives an indication that at least some of the measures applied to the formal sector could apply to this sector as well. The difference should be, I believe, that in the main measures applied in the informal sector should be, and be seen to be, more supportive than otherwise. There is a difference between Athens and Jerusalem, but it is a difference of emphasis, rather than of level.

I am aware that suggestions of the introduction of even such a minimal system as that given below will be unwelcome in many quarters. It is my view, however, both as a practitioner within the field and as an experienced trainer and mentor for tutors, as well as someone who has held responsibility for the quality of teaching within subject areas, that such a system is necessary not only for the purposes of quality control but also for the purposes of tutor support and training. I am also aware of the danger highlighted by Pendlebury and Enslin, of betraying the values of "the researched", (Pendlebury et al. 2001). However, in this case I

would hope that we share the same values, but perhaps disagree on how best to serve those values.

From my own experience, and drawing from the research, I would recommend that any group involved in the Christian religious education of adults should give serious thought to the support it offers to all three groups involved, that is, to administrators, tutors and participants.

Administrators would also benefit from training themselves in areas relating to the Christian religious education of adults. Taking into consideration the comments made by respondents to this research, I would recommend that any such training be open to both clergy and lay and be targeted at both. Tutors would benefit greatly from support, if this is not already available. Such support could include, as in the formal sector, training, resources and supportive, peer based observation.

Training should include issues relating not only to theological issues but also pedagogy, androgogy, use of resources, availability of resources, etc. (The specialism, Helping Adults Learn, from the Diocese of Southwell's Certificate in Lay Ministry might provide a foundation for such work, or any of the other schemes available)[158]. Training must directly address the issues which are of concern to tutors, even when these issues are difficult or theoretical, cf. the comments from P2 about training which was busy but of little use.

Perhaps the most important means of support for tutors in the informal sector would be a system of peer- based observation. Those in the formal sector have long been used to being observed, and there are numerous forms, reports, schemes, etc. available for peer based observation(see, for example, the

suggestions in Goodall et al. 2005), including that published by the General Teaching Council, which would easily be adapted for use in the diocese (General Teaching Council 2003).

This is not the place to rehearse the value of peer observation for teachers or even for teachers of adults; the information is widely available. However, tutors in this sector are often at a great disadvantage in terms of not being able to interact with others undertaking the same work: there are no, or few, opportunities to do so. Peer observation, when seen as a supportive activity, provides such links as well as being a powerful means of training for both the tutor being observed and the tutor doing the observation.

Concomitant with this must be some means of communication among tutors, whether arising from mutual training sessions or other means; again, the value of partnership and collaboration between practitioners are well known (Day 1999; Goodall et al. 2005; Hopkins et al. 2003; Robinson et al. 2002; van Driel et al. 2001).

My own experience in this area is that there is a definite feeling that Alexandria really has nothing for Jerusalem, that the academy has little to offer the Church, and that those who teach in the informal sector are not best placed to do so in the informal sector. The twin strains of research suggested above, of classroom observation and of demography, might go some way to understanding either why it is the case that the academy and the Church do not meet in the informal sector or why they should begin to do so more often.

The recommendations for practice are made in the firm conviction that this type of process is both an educative and a nurturing one, which deserves the

support that the field can offer as well as that of the institutions involved.

---

[154] This is hardly surprising, as in the questionnaire data only 2 administrators felt that training of some kind was a requirement for those who taught for them, while 24 felt that it was not.

[155] Contact with PEBBLE (*PEBBLE* 2004), the Public Bodies Liaison Committee for British Paganism would be the first step in such research.

[156] This of course raises the possibility that much of what is considered good practice is also common sense; my own practice would substantiate this, as would Brookfield's comment cited above about a field in search of a definition (Brookfield 1986)

[157] Combining this recommendation with ones made specifically for the Diocese, one might conceive of a process of action research on the part of suitably interested and trained tutors.

[158] This particular course requires 60 hours of contact time plus a years' study previous to the specialism. This is still much less than is required by other Roman Catholic Dioceses, cf. the Diocese of Los Angeles, which requires at least a three year course (Archdiocese of Los Angeles: Office for Religious Education 2004).

6. Appendices

6.1. *Context - Informal*

The table below details my own involvement in Church based informal education.

1993 – 5	Catholicism for Catholics (Monthly)
1993-6	RCIA Programme Catechist
1994-5	Co-Director, Parish Confirmation Programme
1997-8	Director, Parish Confirmation Programme
1997 – 9	Ex-officio member, CONTRAST Council
1998	Participant Diocesan course for Youth Leaders
1998-9	Member of Deanery Adult Education Group
1997-2004	Member, Diocesan Liturgical Commission – Education, Formation and Rites Department.
1999-2001	Director, RCIA programme Catechist "Something to celebrate: The Family" (Christians Together) Catechist "One Bread, One Body".
1999 – 2004	Warden for "Helping Adults Learn". (Anglican) Certificate in Lay Ministry
2001	Chair "Women's Voices" Conference,. Teacher "Marriage" Session Diaconate Training Course,
2002	Teacher "Myth" Christians Together Teacher "Images of God" Session Preparing for Ministry course in the Diocese.
2003	Adult Education Advisor to Education and Formation Committee, Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, on "The Way of Faith" (Life and Mission in the Church) – accredited adult education programme
2003/4	Teacher Various sessions for the Preparing for Ministry course
2004	Co-Warden, Helping Adults Learn
2003-5	Tutor, Study Skills, Diocesan Certificate in Lay Ministry (Anglican Diocese)
2004/5	Work with Diocesan Certificate in Lay Ministry, toward creation of module descriptors

6.2. *Context - Formal*

1994 – Present University Teacher, School of Education, University of Nottingham

I have either taught entirely or team taught[159] on the following:

Bible One (Hermeneutics)

Bible Two (Hermeneutics)

Church History

Church in the Modern World

Cultural Constructions of Hell

Darwin's Intellectual Legacy

Doctrine

Ethics

Gender and History

Gender and Religion

Gender and Society

History of Magic

Myth and Magic

Myth

Paganism, Past and Present

Religion, Belief and Culture

Self and Society: Living in the City

Spirituality

Teaching and Training in the Voluntary Sector

Teaching in the Churches

Theories of Interpretation: Methods and Practice

Why Theology

Women and Society

Women and Spirituality

Women's History

(New for 2005/6: History of Chaos Magic; Greek Gods)

6.3. *Interview Schedules*

Introduction (Common to all)

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. I'm doing these interviews as part of a doctorate in education. What I'm particularly interested in, at the moment, is adult education in the diocese, and your views on it.

Administrators

How many courses have you overseen?

Do you think qualifications for tutors are necessary? Helpful?

Why do you work with courses like these?

What is their value for the Church?

What is their value for the participants?

Tutors

How many courses have you taught?

Do you think qualifications are necessary? Helpful?

Why do you teach courses like these?

What is their value for the Church?

What is their value for the participants?

Participants

How many courses have you taken?

Did the courses stimulate you to think for yourself?

Why do you take with courses like these?

What is their value for the Church?

What is their value for the participants?

6.4. *Coding framework*

10000 Education				
	11000	Learning - Education		
	12000	Criticality -		
	13000	Autonomy		
	14000	Understanding		
	15000	More than skill		
	16000	knowledge		
		16100	Imparting	
		16200	Desire for	
		16300	Reflection	
	18000	As support to formation		
	19000	Structure		
20000 Nurture				
	21000	Better Catholic/Christian		
	22000	Deepened Faith/Faith/ More Faithful		
		22100	Prayer (Prayer Life, More Prayer) - Spirituality	
	23000	Emphasis On Denominational Belief		
	24000	Collaborative Ministry - Leadership		
	25000	Community - Support		
	26000	Holiness		
	27000	Lifelong		
	28000	Personal Development		
30000 Preaching				
	31000	Preaching		
	32000	One Way Dialogue		
	33000	Preached At		
	34000	Witness - Evangelising		
40000 Indoctrination				
	41000	Indoctrination		
	42000	Rules		
	43000	Doctrine		
	44000	Lack Of Freedom		
	45000	Obedience		
	46000	Threat To Faith		
	47000	Power		
	48000	Convergence		
50000 Teaching				
	51000	Reflective Practice		
	52000	Qualifications		
		52100	Types	
			52110	Teaching
			52120	Adult Teaching
			52130	Church Based

			52140	Training	
			52150	Non Church Related Training	
			52150	Experience Rather Than Training	
				52161	Observation
				52162	Coaching
			52170	Clerical Training	
	53000	Preparation			
	54000	Courses			
		54100	Types		
			54110	Biblical Studies	
			54120	History	
			54130	Social Justice	
			54140	Training	
			54150	Developmental	
			54160	Sacramental Courses	
			54170	Women's	
			54180	Other	
			54190	Self Study	
	55000	Teaching/Facilitation			
60000 Motivation					
	61000	Teachers'			
		61100	Community		
		61200	Participants' Spiritual Growth		
		61300	Participants' Individual Growth		
		61400	Participants' Confidence		
		61500	Participants' Desire For Learning		
		61600	Own Satisfaction - Enrichment		
	62000	Participants'			
		62100	Social		
		62200	Interest - Knowledge		
		62300	Prayer Life		
		62400	Holiness		
		62500	Support - Confidence		
		62600	Accreditation		
		62700	For Others (Children)		
	63000	Administrators'			
		63100	Ministry In The Church		
		63200	Community		
		63300			
	64000	Church's			
		64100	Social		
		64200	Interest - Knowledge		
		64300	Prayer Life		
		64400	Holiness		
		64550	Involvement Of The Laity		
		64650	Community – Building Up Church		
		64660	Commitment - Faith		
70000 Need For Structure					

	71000	Financial Implications
80000 Clericalism		

6.5. *Interview Respondent Characteristics*

These tables represent the number of respondents who fall into specific categories.

The tables are not broken down in terms of administrator, tutor and participant. Due to the nature of the field work area, and the relatively small number of those interviewed, I felt that my promise of anonymity to respondents meant that a further breakdown would be unethical.

By Sex:

Female	Male
5	7

By age:

Under 30	2
Between 30 and 50	5
Over 50	5

By employment:

Employed by the diocese (including clergy)	6
Employed in the Church based sector	2
Employed in the education sector	2
Not employed	2

Converts to Roman Catholicism:

Adult Converts	2
Non-converts (Cradle Catholics)	10

Priests/non-priests[160]

Priests	Non-Priests
4	8

By educational level:

Number of respondents	Highest education level
1	GCSE/A Level/AS Level
6[161]	BA
3	MA
2	PhD

[159] All modules on the Certificate in Higher Education, Intercultural Theology, are team taught.

[160] This differentiation could have been broken down further: priests, deacons, religious, laity. However, again for the sake of the anonymity of the respondents, I felt this to be an inappropriate level of detail.

[161] One respondent in this category is presently working on an MA.

6.6. *Appendix Six: Map of Provision*[162]

These charts represent the information gleaned from the questionnaires about the provision in the diocese at one particular time.

These charts represent the data from the Administrator's and the Participant's questionnaires. The Tutor's data is not represented; the response rates to this portion of the questionnaire phase was so low (less than ten) that it is impossible to extrapolate from them. The data in the charts presented is given

as percentages, again because the difference in response rates would skew the data, were it to be given in raw numbers.

In text form, the groups reported experiencing courses in the following order (most courses to fewest):

Participants	**Administrators**
1. Biblical studies	1. Sacramental courses
2. History	2. Biblical studies
3. Sacramental Courses	3. Training
4. Training	4. Social Justice
5. Social Justice	5. History
6. Developmental	6. Developmental

One would expect a reasonable amount of overlap between courses overseen by administrators and courses undertaken by participants; after all, the administrators are (in theory) overseeing the same courses taken by the participants.

As the table above makes clear, however, there is not an exact cross over between the two. There are several reasons why this might be the case; I will treat these after a brief discussion of the provision itself.

Both groups agree that they have the least experience of courses which could be called developmental. Such courses would include counselling skills (which one questionnaire respondent called for, in particular), courses dealing with bereavement, family changes and family issues (parenting), etc. Aligned to this, both groups put courses dealing with training in the bottom four.

The same may be said of courses dealing with social justice issues. This

response is an interesting one, as the diocese employs a member of staff to deal specifically with issues of Justice and Peace; part of the remit of this post is the raising of awareness about these issues. (It is, of course, possible to do so without mounting courses, but one might have expected the experience of these courses to be higher than it is).

In light of what has been said above about the nature of the data here, I do not seek to generalise these results. However, it is clear that in the experience of those who responded to the questionnaire, at least, these sorts of courses do not form a significant part of the offering of the diocese. (Whether they should do or not is not an argument for the present research).

Biblical studies and sacramental courses are the highest ranking courses, the first for participants, the second for administrators. This is more understandable in terms of traditional course offerings from the Church.

As a map of provision, then, it is clear that these two types of courses make up the majority of courses experienced by these two groups.

There are a number of possible reasons for the discrepancy between the two groups of respondents. The first and most obvious is that the participants were not from the areas overseen by the administrators who responded.

The second is that, in spite of caveats at the beginning of the questionnaire about adult education, administrators in particular considered the whole of the educative work of their parishes, and thus included preparation courses for First Communion and Confirmation among the courses being considered.

Even without this confusion, however, First Communion and Confirmation courses often include sessions for parents; while participants (as parents) may only experience these a few times, in the life of a parish, they are often yearly

experiences – another reason for the discrepancy.

---

[162] Less time and space has been devoted to this map than might otherwise be the case, as during the time of this research it became clear that the diocese sees no need for such a map, see above. Therefore the contribution made by this map is one of interest only, rather than of material help to the diocese.

6.7. *Postal questionnaires*

There are three questionnaires: for "Administrators", for "Tutors", and for "Participants". These titles were chosen carefully, with the intended group in mind, see above. These questionnaires are presented here in text form, rather than in the tabular format used.

Administrator's Questionnaire

N.B. Space was left on the original questionnaire, after questions 19 and 20.

Questionnaire on Adult Church Based Courses

"Church based courses", are courses based either in the parish, (sacramental preparation courses, courses for the parents of First Communicants, RCIA, Bible Study courses, Lent Housegroups, etc.), or in the deanery or diocese (events at the Diocesan Centre, Diocesan Summer School, etc..), or other provision, such as that provided by Christians Studying Together, or advertised in The Vine. Courses do not have to have been offered wholly by the Catholic church to be included.

However, as this research is concerned with informal education, please do not include any courses which have been validated by institutions, such as the Masters Course in Religious Education, courses offered by the WEA or the University D, Theology for Life from Chester University, etc.

The survey is also concerned with the education of adults, so please only include information about courses which were aimed primarily at adults, (from age 18 on).

General Information

How many church based courses have you overseen:

Overall? If an exact number is not practical, please estimate!

In the last calendar year, (January 2001 – January 2002)?

Are you administrating any church based courses at the moment?

Yes/No

No

If yes, please enter how many:

Do tutors/leaders submit course outlines to anyone before the course begins?

Yes/No

No

If so, to whom do they submit them?

Do you provide support in the preparation of courses, such as photocopying, use of equipment, etc.?

Yes/No

Have you ever overseen for denominations other than the Roman Catholic Church?

Yes/No

Types of Courses

If a particular course covers more than one area, such as "The Spiritual in Art" which could come under the headings of both "Spirituality" and "Art", please mark both boxes, or as many that apply to courses you have overseen.

Each category is followed by examples of the kinds of courses that fall into it.

Biblical studies

(Courses on particular books of the Bible, on characters in the Bible, etc.)

Yes/No

History

(History of Spirituality, the History of the Church, etc.)

Yes/No

Social Justice

(Social issues in relation to the Church, Third World Debt, etc.)

Yes/No

Training

(Preparing people for specific roles or activities, group leading, tutoring, etc.)

Yes/No

Developmental

(Concentrating on the development of the individual, courses in Healing, etc.)

Yes/No

Sacramental courses

(Parents' classes for First Communion or Confirmation, RCIA)

Yes/No

Have you overseen any other types of courses? (Please enter any other types of courses below):

Teaching in the Church

Please fill in the following, in relation to the tutors/leaders in your programme(s).

Do you require tutors/leaders to have training as teachers?

Yes/No

Please say what type of training: (Initial Teacher's Training, PGCE, etc.)

Do you prefer tutors/leaders to have had training as teachers?

Yes/No

If yes, please say what type of training: (PGCCE, City and Guilds, etc.).

Do you require tutors/leaders to have training related to adult education?

Yes/No

If yes, please say what type of training: (PGCCE, City and Guilds, etc..)

Do you prefer tutors/leaders to have training related to adult education?

Yes/No

If yes, please say what type of training: (PGCCE, City and Guilds, etc..)

Do you require tutors/leaders to have training for Church based teaching?

Yes/No

If yes, please say what type of training: (Catechist training, etc..)

Do you prefer tutors/leaders to have training related Church based teaching?

Yes/No

If yes, please say what type of training: (Catechist training, etc..)

Are there any types of courses, or titles of courses, that you would like to be able to offer through the Church?

Do you have any further comments you would like to make about Church based adult education?

If you would prefer to receive this questionnaire by email, please contact me at: janet.goodall@nottingham.ac.uk

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

Please return it using the enclosed stamped addressed envelope, to:

Janet Goodall C 40, Education Building Wollaton Rd. Nottingham, NG8 1BB

Tutor's Questionnaire

N.B. Space was left after questions 16 and 17.

Tutor's Questionnaire on Adult Church Based Courses

"Church based courses", are courses based either in the parish, (sacramental preparation courses, courses for the parents of First Communicants, RCIA, Bible Study courses, Lent Housegroups, etc..), or in the deanery or diocese (events at the Diocesan Centre, Diocesan Summer School, etc..), or other provision, such as that provided by Christians Studying Together, or advertised in The Vine. Courses do not have to have been offered wholly by the Catholic church to be included.

However, as this research is concerned with informal education, please do not include any courses which have been validated by institutions, such as the Masters Course in Religious Education, courses offered by the WEA or the University, Theology for Life from Chester University, etc..

The survey is also concerned with the education of adults, so please only include information about courses which were aimed primarily at adults, (from age 18 on).

General Information

How many church based courses have you participated in:

Overall? If an exact number is not practical, please estimate!

In the last calendar year, (January 2001 – January 2002)?

Are you taking any church based courses at the moment?

Yes/No

If yes, please enter how many:

Have you ever taken courses presented by denominations other than the Roman Catholic Church?

Yes/No

Types of Courses

If a particular course covers more than one area, such as "The Spiritual in Art" which could come under the headings of both "Spirituality" and "Art", please mark both boxes, or as many that apply to courses you have taken.

Each category is followed by examples of the kinds of courses that fall into it.

Biblical studies

Yes/No

(Courses on particular books of the Bible, on characters in the Bible, etc..)

History

Yes/No

(History of Spirituality, the History of the Church, etc..)

Social Justice

Yes/No

(Social issues in relation to the Church, Third World Debt, etc..)

Training

Yes/No

(Preparing people for specific roles or activities, group leading, tutoring, etc..)

Developmental

Yes/No

(Concentrating on the development of the individual, courses in Healing, etc..)

Sacramental courses

Yes/No

(Parents' classes for First Communion or Confirmation, RCIA)

Have you taken any other types of courses through the Church? (Please enter any other types of courses below):

Are there any types of courses, or titles of courses, that you would like to be able to offer through the Church?

Do you have any further comments you would like to make about Church based adult education?

If you would prefer to receive this questionnaire by email, please contact me at: janet.goodall@nottingham.ac.uk

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

Please return it using the enclosed stamped addressed envelope, to:

Janet Goodall

C 40, Education Building

Wollaton Rd.

Nottingham, NG8 1BB

Participant's Questionnaire

N.B. Space was allowed after question 11 and 12.

Participants' Questionnaire on Adult Church Based Courses

"Church based courses", are courses based either in the parish, (sacramental preparation courses, courses for the parents of First Communicants, RCIA, Bible Study courses, Lent Housegroups, etc..), or in the deanery or diocese (events at the Diocesan Centre, Diocesan Summer School, etc..), or other provision, such as that provided by Christians Studying Together, or advertised in The Vine. Courses do not have to have been offered wholly by the Catholic church to be included.

However, as this research is concerned with informal education, please do not include any courses which have been validated by institutions, such as the Masters Course in Religious Education, courses offered by the WEA or the University, Theology for Life from Chester University, etc..

The survey is also concerned with the education of adults, so please only include information about courses which were aimed primarily at adults, (from age 18 on).

General Information

How many church based courses have you participated in:

Overall? If an exact number is not practical, please estimate!

In the last calendar year, (January 2001 – January 2002)?

Are you taking any church based courses at the moment?

Yes/No

If yes, please enter how many:

Have you ever taken courses presented by denominations other than the Roman Catholic Church?

Yes/No

Types of Courses

If a particular course covers more than one area, such as "The Spiritual in Art" which could come under the headings of both "Spirituality" and "Art", please mark both boxes, or as many that apply to courses you have taken.

Each category is followed by examples of the kinds of courses that fall into it.

Biblical studies

Yes/No

(Courses on particular books of the Bible, on characters in the Bible, etc..)

History

Yes/No

(History of Spirituality, the History of the Church, etc..)

Social Justice

Yes/No

(Social issues in relation to the Church, Third World Debt, etc..)

Training

Yes/No

(Preparing people for specific roles or activities, group leading, tutoring, etc..)

Developmental

Yes/No

(Concentrating on the development of the individual, courses in Healing, etc..)

Sacramental courses

Yes/No

(Parents' classes for First Communion or Confirmation, RCIA)

Have you taken any other types of courses through the Church? (Please enter any other types of courses below):

Are there any types of courses, or titles of courses, that you would like to be able to take through the Church?

Do you have any further comments you would like to make about Church based adult education?

If you would prefer to receive this questionnaire by email, please contact me at: janet.goodall@nottingham.ac.uk

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

Please return it using the enclosed stamped addressed envelope, to:

Janet Goodall

C 40, Education Building

Wollaton Rd.

Nottingham, NG8 1BB

6.8. *School of Education Module Submission Form, University of Nottingham,*

This form is reproduced, including contents, as an example, as mentioned in the Diocesan Recommendations, above.

UNDERGRADUATE MODULE SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

1. **Module Code Number**

   XXAF14

2. **Title of Module**

   The Bible, 1 (Hermeneutics)

3. **Number of Credits**

   15

4. **Level**

   A

5. **Semester in which module is taught**

   Any

6. **Pre-requisites for admission to the module (if any)**

   None

7. **Co-requisites for the module (if any)**

   None

8. **Target Group and Number of places**

   The module is available to students registered for the Certificates in Higher Education – Intercultural Theology and Combined Studies. The module is also available to students studying in the Open Studies

programme.

9. Content Description

This module will cover a basic introduction to the Bible. This will include the formation of the canon, the place of the Bible in various Christian traditions, and various methods and means of Biblical interpretation.

10. Method and Frequency of Class

10 x 3 hour meetings (or equivalent)

11. Methods of assessment including weighting of various elements

Portfolio of work, @6,000 words, to include examples of hermeneutical work, creative work related to Biblical texts/theme, reflective learning, etc. (100%)

12. Breakdown of hours

Classroom = 30 hours

Assessment = 28

Independent study = 64.5

13. Module Convenor

Janet Goodall, Subject Specialist

14. Offering Unit(s)i.e. Department(s) offering the module and percentage split

School of Continuing Education, 100%

15. Aims

This module aims to introduce students to the principles and processes of Biblical hermeneutics

16. Objectives

By the end of this module, students will:

- Begin to articulate and practice their own process of Biblical hermeneutics
- Begin to appreciate the place of the hermeneutical process in Christianity
- Have a basic knowledge of the formation of the Canon

17. Transferable skills (including study skills) acquired on completion of the module

By the end of this module, students will:

- Have become more confident as reflective learners
- Have become aware of the hermeneutical process
- Have a greater ability to use different sources

18. Confirm that adequate resources are available

19. List which departments and faculties have been consulted

7. Bibliography

Adelman, C. (1985). "Who are you? Some problems of ethnographer culture shock". *Field methods in the study of education.* Burgess, R. G. London, Falmer Press: 37 - 50.

Aldridge, A. (2000). *Religion in the contemporary world: A sociological introduction.* Cambridge, Polity Press.

Ali Ashraf, S. (1992). "The religious approach to religious education: The methodology of awakening and discipline the religious sensibility". *Priorities in religious education: A model for the 1990s and beyond.* Watson, B. London, The Falmer Press: 81-91.

Allman, P. and Wallis, J. (1997). "Commentary: Paulo Freire and the future of the radical tradition." *Studies in the Education of Adults* 29(2): 113 - 120.

Archdiocese of Los Angeles: Office for Religious Education (2004). *Advanced Formation for Catechetical Ministries: Frequently Asked Questions.* Accessed.28.7.04 http://ore.la-archdiocese.org/formation/faqadvanced.htm

Astley, J. (1992). "Faith development: An overview". *Christian perspectives on faith development: A reader.* Astley, J. and Francis, L. J. Leominster, Gracewing Fowler Wright Books: xvii - xxiv.

Astley, J. (1994). *The philosophy of Christian religious education.* Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press.

Astley, J. (2000a). "Aims and approaches in Christian education". *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection on adult Christian education.* Astley, J. Leominster, Gracewing: 1 - 32.

Astley, J. (2000b). "Dimensions of Christian education". *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection on adult Christian education.* Astley, J. Leominster, Gracewing: 33 - 71.

Astley, J., Ed. (2000c). *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection on adult Christian education.* Leomister, Gracewing.

Astley, J. (2002). *Ordinary theology: Looking, listening and learning in theology.* Francis, L. J. and Astley, J.Eds. Explorations in practical, pastoral and empirical theology. Aldershot, Ashgate.

Astley, J. and Crowder, C. (1996). "Theological perspectives on Christian education: An overview". *Theological Perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and

Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: x - xix.

Astley, J. and Day, D. (1992a). "The contours of Christian Education". *The contours of Christian education*. Astley, J. and Day, D. Great Wakering, McCrimmon Publishing Co. Ltd.: 13 - 29.

Astley, J. and Day, D., Ed. (1992b). *The contours of Christian education*. Great Wakering, McCrimmon Publishing Co. Ltd.

Atkinson, R. (1972). "Indoctrination and moral education". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 55 - 66.

Aubrey, E. E. (1948). "How should religion be taught in the religious school?" *Journal of Higher Education* 19(9): 460 - 470.

Augustine ((400)). *De Catechizandis Rudibus*. Accessed.12 January 2003 http://www.ccel.org/fathers2/NPNF1-03/npnf1-03-24.htm#TopOfPage

Barnes, L. (2000). "Ninian Smart and the phenomenological approach to religious education." *Religion* 30: 315 - 332.

Basit, T. N. (2003). "Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis." *Educational Research* 45(2): 143–154.

Bastide, D. (1999). "Religious education: Cinderella does go to the ball". *Spiritual and religious education*. Leicester, M., Modgil, C. and Modgil, S. London, Routledge Falmer. V: 101 - 109.

Beck, C. (1994). *Difference, authority and the teacher-student relationship*. Accessed.15.1.04 http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/94_docs/BECK.HTM

Bell, J. (1999). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers in education and social science*. Third edition. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Bellett, E. (1998). "Religious Education for Liberation: A Perspective from Paulo Freire." *British Journal of Religious Education* Vol. 20(3): 133- 143.

Benedict Xv (1917). *Humani generis redemptionem*. Accessed.14 August, 2000 www.listserv.aremican.edu/catholic.church/papal.html

Biesta, G. (1996). *Education, not initiation*. http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/96_docs/biesta.html

Billington, D. (2000). *The adult Learner in higher education and the workplace*. Accessed.June 20 New Horizons for Learning, www.newhorizons.org/article_billington1.html

Bingham, C. (2002). "On Paulo Freire's debt to psychoanalysis: Authority on the side of freedom." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 21: 447–464.

Black, J. B. and Mcclintock, R. O. (1995). *An Interpretation Construction Approach to Constructivist Design.* ILTweb: ILTdocs: Cognition: ICON Paper Accessed.18.01.03

Blaxter, L., Huges, C. and Tight, M. (1996). *How to research.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

Bolton, A. (1997). "Moral development: Whose ethics in the teaching of religious education?" *Journal of Moral Education* 26:02:00: 197 - 210.

Bonewits, I. (2001). *The Advanced Bonewits' Cult Danger Evaluation Frame.* Accessed.7.08.03 http://www.neopagan.net/ABCDEF.html

Brandon, E. (1992). *Steps Towards a Logical Geography of Education.* Course material for ED20H: Introduction to Argument in Education, UWIDITE and the Department of Educational Studies, UWI, Mona Accessed.5 January http://www.uwichill.edu.bb/bnccde/epb/stepsed.html

Bridges, D. (2001). "The ethics of outsider research." *Journal of the philosophy of education* 35(372 - 386).

Bridges, W. (1991). *Making Transitions: Making the most of Change.* Reading, Massachusetts, Perseus Books.

Bridges, W. (1996). *Transitions: Making sense of life's changes.* London, Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning: A comprehensive analysis of principles and effective practices.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

Brookfield, S. (2000). "Transformative learning as ideology critique". *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory-in-progress.* Mezirow, J. San Francisco, Jossey Bass Wiley: 125 - 148.

Brown, P., Halsey, A. H., Lauder, H. and Stuart Wells, A., Ed. (1997). *Education: Culture, economy and society.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Burgess, R. G. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research.* Bulmer, M. Contemporary Social Research. London, Routledge.

Burgess, R. G., Ed. (1985). *Field methods in the study of education.* London, Falmer Press.

Burkert, W. (1985). *Greek Religion.* Oxford, Blackwell.

Callan, E. (1985). "McLaughlin on parental rights." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 19(1): 111 - 118.

Cameron, F. (1992). "The Teaching of Ethnomusicology in United Kingdom Universities". *European Studies in Ethnomusicology: Historical Development and Recent Trends. Selected papers presented at the VIIth European Seminar in Ethnomusicology, Berlin, October 1-6, 1990.* Baumann, M. P., Simon, A. and Wegner, U. Wilhelmshaven, Florian Noetzel Verlag. 4: 26-41.

Capaldi, G. (1998). "Christian faith and religious education: A perspective from the theology of liberation". *Christian perspectives for education.* Francis, L. and Thatcher, A. Leominster, Hertfordshire, Gracewing: 60 -72.

Carney, J. H., Joiner, J. F. and Tragou, H. (1997). *Categorizing, Coding, and Manipulating Qualitative Data Using the WordPerfect®+ Word Processor.* The Qualitative Report Accessed.27.12.03 http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-1/carney.html

Carr, D. (1994). "Knowledge and truth in religious education." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 28(2): 221 - 238.

Carr, D. (1999a). *Is teaching a skill?* Accessed.5.5.04 www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/1999/carr_body.asp

Carr, D. (1999b). "Spiritual language and the ethics of redemption: A reply to Jim Mackenzie." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* Vol. 33(:3): 451 - 461.

Catechism of the Catholic Church.(1994). London, Geoffrey Chapman.

Catherine of Siena (1980). *The Dialogue.* Payne, R. J. The Classics of Western Spirituality. London, SPCK.

Cevero, R. (1991). "Changing relationships between theory and practice". *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study.* Peters, J. M. and Jarvis, P. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass: 19 - 41.

Chapman, S. (1998). *Assessment in Religious Education: Problems and Possibilities.* Farmington Institute http://farmington.virtualsite.co.uk/ViewInFrame.html accessed 16.11.01

Charnley, K. (1999). *Yawn, yawn, boring, boring - is this RE?* Farmington Institute http://farmington.virtualsite.co.uk/ViewInFrame.html accessed 16.11.01

Clark, C. (1993). "Truth, belief and knowledge". *Adult Education and theological interpretations.* Jarvis, P. and Walters, N. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 19 - 35.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education.* Fifth. London, Routledge Falmer.

Committee for Catechesis and Adult Christian Education (2000). *The priority of adult formation.* London, Catholic Bishop's Conference of England and Wales.

Congregation for Catholic Education *The Catholic school on the threshold of the*

third millennium. Accessed.6.8.00 www.ewtn.com Eternal Word Television network

Congregation for the Clergy (1997). *General directory for catechesis*. London, Catholic Truth Society.

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (2000). *Dominus Iesus*. Rome, Offices of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Cook, A. (2001). "Assessing the Use of Flexible Assessment." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 26(6): 539 - 549.

Cooper, G. (1995). "Freire and Theology." *Studies in the Education of Adults* Vol. 27(1): 66-78.

Copley, T. (1997). *Teaching religion: Fifty years of religious education in England and Wales*. Exeter, University of Exeter Press.

Cox, D. (2000). "Staff development and the training of part-time tutors". *The adult curriculum*. Cox, D., Dale, M., Jones, D. and Parker, S. Nottingham, Continuing Education Press, University of Nottingham: 62 - 83.

Cox, D. (2002). *Interview with Alan Rogers*. ESCalate Accessed.17.01.04 http://www.escalate.ac.uk/exchange/Interviews/AlanRogers.rtf

Cox, D., Dale, M., Jones, D., Parker, S. and Rogers, A. (2000). *The adult curriculum*. Nottingham, Gontinuing Education Press, University of Nottingham.

Crittenden, B. (1972). "Indoctrination as mis-education". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 131 - 151.

Curtis, S., Geslerb, W., Smith, G. and Washburn, S. (2000). "Approaches to sampling and case selection in qualitative research: examples in the geography of health." *Social Science & Medicine* 50(7-8): 1001-1014.

Cush, D. (1997). "Paganism in the classroom." *British Journal of Religious Education* 19(12): 83-94.

Cush, D. (1999). "The relationship between religious studies, religious education and theology: Big bother, little sister and the clerical uncle?" *British Journal of Religious Education* 3: 137 - 146.

Cutcliffe, J. R. (2000). "Methodological issues in grounded theory." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 31(6): 1476 - 1485.

Cyril *Protocatechesis*. The Electronic Bible Society Accessed.01.13.03 http://www.ewtn.com/library/PATRISTC/PII7-1.HTM

Czubaroff, J. (1997). "The Public Dimension Of Scientific Controversies." *Argumentation* 11: 51–74.

Dadds, M. and Hart, S. (2001). *Doing practitioner research differently.* London, RoultedgeFalmer.

Daines, J., Daines, C. and Graham, B. (1993). *Adult learning adult teaching.* Third. 1988 Nottingham, Continuing Education Press, University of Nottingham.

Dart, B. (1998). "Adult learners' metacognitive behaviour in higher education". *Adult learning: A reader.* Sutherland, P. Original edition: 1997 London, Kogan Page.

Day, C. (1999). "Professional development and reflective practice: purposes, processes and partnerships." *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 7(2): 221 - 233.

Degenhardt, M. (1998). "The ethics of belief and the ethics of teaching." *Journal of the Philosophy of Education* 3(3): 333 - 344.

Delamont, S. (1992). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives.* London, The Falmer Press.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S., Ed. (2002). *The qualitative inquiry reader.* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Department for Education and Employment (1998). *The Learning Age.* Accessed.19.10.00 www.lifelonglearning.co.uk/greenpaper

Dewey, J. (1897). *My Pedagogic Creed.* The informal education archives; First published in The School Journal, Volume LIV, Number 3 (January 16, 1897), pages 77-80. Accessed.18.01.03 http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~infed/e-texts/e-dew-pc.htm

Die.Net *Dictionary Definition: preaching.* die.net Accessed.06.08.03 http://dict.die.net/preaching/

Diotima (2003). "A Pagan Child: Society, education and Pagan children: A Response." *Imramma*(Saimhain): 15.

Diotima (2005). "Storms in Pint Pots." *Koton* 2(2): 22 - 23.

Draper, A. (2000). *Changing attitudes, changing beliefs*, Farmington Institute.

Duberman, M., Vicinus, M. and Chauncey, J., George (1990). *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past.* New American Library (Penguin), 1989 London, Penguin.

Ducasse, C. J. (1968). "What can philosophy contribute to educational theory?" *Selected readings in the philosophy of education.* Park, J. Third 1958, 1963 New York, The Macmillian Company: 9 - 24.

Dukes, R. (2002). *S.S.O.T.B.M.E. Revised: An essay on magic.* London, The

Mouse That Spins.

Dulles, A. (1978). *Models of the church.* New York, Doubleday & Company.

Dwer, C. (1998). *An essay for school teachers about Paganism.* Religious Tolerance.org Accessed.9.12.01 http://www.religioustolerance.org/wic_essa.htm

Dykstra, C. R. (1996). "No longer strangers: The church and its educational ministry". *Theological Perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 106 - 118.

Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D. and Mcormack Steinmetz, A. (1991). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles.* Goodson, I. F. The Falmer's Press Teachers' Library. London, The Falmer Press.

English, L. (1999). "Learning from changes in religious leadership: a study of informal and incidental learning at the parish level." *International Journal of Lifelong Learning* 18(05): 385 - 394.

Everington, J. (1999). "Mission impossible? Religious education in the 1990s". *Spiritual and religious education.* Leicester, M., Modgil, C. and Modgil, S. London, RoutledgeFalmer. V: 183 - 195.

Farley, E. (1996). "Can church education be theological education?" *Theological Perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 31 - 44.

Fenwick, T. (2000). "Expanding conceptions of experiential learning: A review of the five contemporary perspectives on cognition." *Adult Education Quarterly* 50(4): 243-272.

Flew, A. (1972a). "Indoctrination and doctrines". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. International library of the Philosophy of Education, General Editor, R. S. Peters: 67 - 93.

Flew, A. (1972b). "Indoctrination and religion". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. International library of the Philosophy of Education, General Editor, R. S. Peters: 106 - 116.

Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research.* London, Sage.

Foley, G. (2001). "Radical adult education and learning." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 20(1/2): 71–88.

Foltz, N. (1986). "Basic principles of adult religious education". *Handbook of Adult Religious Education.* Foltz, N. Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press: 25 - 58.

Fowler, J. (1981). *Stages of faith.* San Francisco, Harper & Row.

Fox, M. (1979). *A spirituality named compassion, and the healing of the global village, Humpty Dumpty and us.* San Francisco, Harper and Row, Publishers.

Fox, M. (1996). "What should we do about the New Age? Exploring the role of religious education in the examination of a cultural phenomenon." *British Journal of Religious Education* 19(1): 24 - 32.

Francis, L. (1998). "The logic of education, theology and the church school". *Christian perspectives for education.* Francis and Adrian Thatcher, e. s., L. 1990 Leominster, Hertfordshire, Gracewing: 20 - 35.

Francis, L. J. and Grindle, Z. (2001). "The changing ethos of Church schools: A survey of teacher attitudes in 1982 and 1996." *Research in Education - Manchester* 65(1): 1 - 19.

Frankena, W. K. (1973). "Education". *Dictionary of the history of ideas: Studies of selected pivotal ideas.* Wiener, P. P. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 2.

Frazer, J. (1993). *The Golden Bough: A study in magic and religion.* Ware, Hertfordshire, Wordsworth Editions Limited.

Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding.* Freeman, D. The Teachersource Series. Canada, Heinle & Heinle.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* 1996;Originally published by The Continuum Publishing Company London, Penguin Books.

Fryer, R. H. (1997). *"The treasure within" First report of the National Advisory Group for Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning.* Accessed.13.10.02 www.lifelonglearning.co.uk/nagcell

Galloway, J. (1996). *On the prostitution of religious education.* Farmington Institute http://farmington.virtualsite.co.uk/ViewInFrame.html accessed 16.11.01

Gardner, P. (1988). "Religious upbringing and the liberal idea of religious autonomy." *Journal of the philosophy of education* 22(1): 639-662.

Gardner, P. (1998). "Religious upbringing and the liberal idea of religious autonomy." *Jounmal of the philosophy of education* 22(1).

Gardner, P. (2004). "Hand on religious upbringing." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 38(121 - 128).

Gatchel, R. (1972). "The evolution of the concept". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, e., I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 9 - 16.

General Teaching Council (2003). *The Teachers' Professional Learning Framework: A guide to peer observation.* Accessed.28/7/04

http://www.gtce.org.uk/pdfs/peer.pdf

Goodall, J. (2002). *Using mind maps in teaching.* ESCalate www.escalate.ac.uk

Goodall, J., Day, C., Lindsey, G., Muijis, D. and Harris, A. (2005). *Evaluating Impact of Continuing Professional Development.* London, Department for Education and Skills.

Gorard, S., Rees, G. and Fevre, R. (1999). "Patterns of Participation in Lifelong Learning: Do Families Make a Difference?" *British Educational Research Journal* 25(4): 517-532.

Green, T. (1972). "Indoctrination and beliefs". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 25 - 46.

Greenback, P. (2003). "The Role of Values in Educational Research: the case for reflexivity." *British Educational Research Journal* 29(6): 791 - 801.

Gregory, R. G. and Woods, I. (1972). "Indoctrination: Inculcating doctrines". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, e., I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. International library of the Philosophy of Education, General Editor, R. S. Peters: 162 - 189.

Griffiths, V. (2000). "The reflective dimension in teacher education." *International Journal of Educational Research* 33: 5 - 539.

Groome, T. (1995). "Religious education". *The Harper Collins Encyclopedia of Catholicism.* McBrien, R. New York, Harper Collins: 1096 - 1097.

Hand, M. (2002). "Religious upbringing reconsidered." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36(4): 545 - 557.

Hansman, C. A. and Wilson, A. L. (1998). *Cognition and Practice: Adult Learning Situated in Everyday Activity AERC Proceedings.* Adult Education Research Centre Accessed.17.01.03
http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/1998/98hansman.htm

Hardy, D. W. (1982). "Truth in religious education: further reflections on the Implications of Pluralism". *New directions in religious education.* Hull, J. M. London, The Falmer Press.

Hauerwas, S. (1996). "The gesture of a truthful story". *Theological perspectives on Christian education: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 97 - 105.

Haywood, C. and Mac an Ghaill, M. (1998). "The making of men: theorizing methodology in 'uncertain times'". *Doing research about education.* Walford, G. London, Falmer Press. 17: 125 - 138.

Heelas, P. (1996). *The New Age movement.* Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Hillage, J., Uden, T., Aldreidge, J. and Eccles, J. (2000). *Adult learning in England: A review.* Leicester, NIACE.

Hillier, Y. (2002). *Reflective teaching in further and adult education.* London, Continuum.

Hobsons *The Hobsons Guide to Christian Colleges.* Accessed.04.08.03 http://www.collegeview.com/college/niche/christian/add_ced.html

Holley, R. (1978). *Religious education and religious understanding: An introduction to the philosophy of religious education.* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Holloway, I. and Todres, L. (2003). "The status of method: flexibility, consistency and coherence." *Qualitative Research* 3(3): 345 - 357.

Holmes, A. F. (2001). *Building the Christian Academy.* Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Hopkins, D. and Jackson, D. (2003). *Networked learning communities - capacity building, networking and leadership for learning*, National College for School Leadership.

Houle, C. (1984). *Patterns of Learning.* London, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Hudson, B. (2002). "Holding complexity and searching for meaning: teaching as reflective practice." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 34: 1 - 43.

Hull, J., Ed. (1982). *New directions in religious education.* New Directions Series^Ed. London, The Falmer Press.

Hull, J., Ed. (1984). *Studies in Religion and Education.* London, The Falmer Press.

Hull, J. (1985). *What prevents Christian adults from learning?* London, SCM Press Ltd.

Hull, J. (1990). "What is the theology of education?" *Christian perspectives for education.* Francis and Thatcher, A. Leominster, Hertfordshire, Gracewing: 2 -19.

Hull, J. M. (1999). "Religionism and religious education". *Education, Culture and Values.* Leicester, M., Modgil, C. and Modgil, S. London, RoutledgeFalmer. V: 75 - 85.

Humphries, B. (1997). *From Critical Thought to Emancipatory Action: Contradictory Research Goals?* Accessed. 1 http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/1/3.html

Hyperdictionary *Preaching.* Webnox.corp Accessed.6.08.03

http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/preaching

Imel, S. *Transformative Learning in Adulthood. ERIC Digest No. 200.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Columbus, OH. Accessed.15 January http://www.ovid.bids.ac.uk/ovidweb/ovidweb.cgi?T=selCit&F=ftwarn&A=display&ST=1&R=6&totalCit=51&D=eric&S=AIPPPPOPIFLPBL

Infed.Org *Models of learning.* infed.org: the home of informal education Accessed.24.1.03 http://www.infed.org/support/ohps/exhibits/models_of_learning.htm

International Council for Catechesis *Adult catechesis in the Christian community: Some principles and guidelines.* Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Jackson, R. (1999). "Law, politics and religious education in England and Wales: Some history, some stories and some observations". *Spiritual and Religious Education.* Leicester, M., Modgil, C. and Modgil, S. London, RoutledgeFalmer. V: 86 - 99.

Jarvis, P. (1993). "Learning as a religious phenomenon?" *Adult education and theological interpretations.* Jarvis, P. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 3 - 16.

Jarvis, P. (1995). *Adult and continuing education: Theory and practice.* London, Routledge.

Jarvis, P. (1997). *Ethics and education for adults in a late modern society.* Leicester, NIACE.

Jarvis, P. (2002). *International dictionary of adult and continuing education.* 1990 London, Kogan Page.

Jarvis, P. and Walters, N. (1993). *Adult Education and theological interpretations.* Florida, Krieger Publishing.

Jepson, R. (1997). *Unravelling the Mishmash in Relation to the Teaching of a Multi-faith Approach to RE*, Farmington Institute.

John Paul Ii (1979). *Catechesi Tradendae (Catechesis in our time)*Electronic version.

John Paul Ii (1983). *The Gode of Canon Law in English Translation.* The Canon Law Society Of Great Britain And Ireland,
The Canon Law Society Of Australia And New Zealand, Accessed.06.04.02 www.deacons.net/Canon_Law/Default.htm

John Paul Ii (1990). *Ex Corde Ecclesiae.* Accessed.14 August, 2000 www.listserv.aremican.edu/catholic.church/papal.html

Joyce, B., Calhoun, E. and Hopkins, D. (1997). *Models of learning: tools for*

teaching. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Karakowsky, L. and Mcbey, K. (1999). "The lessons of work: Toward an understanding of the implications of the workplace for adult learning and development." *Journal of workplace learning: Employee counselling today* Vol. 11, no. 6: pp. 192 - 201.

Karmran, S. (1999). *Active learning in religious education*, Farmington Institute.

Kelly, T. (1992). *A History of adult education in Great Britain from the middle ages to the twentieth century.* Third edition. First edition, 1962 Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

Kilpatrick, W. (1972). "Indoctrination and respect for persons". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. International library of the Philosophy of Education, General Editor, R. S. Peters: 47 - 54.

King, A. (1996). "Spirituality: Transformation and metamorphosis." *Religion* 26: pp. 343 - 351.

Knowles, M. (1962). "A theory of Christian adult education methodology". *Wider horizons in Christian adult education: Selected addresses and papers presented in a workshop on the curriculum of Christian education for adults, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 19-30, 1961.* Little, L. C. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.

Knowles, M. E. A. (1984). *Andragogy in Action. Applying modern principles of adult education.* San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Koszarycz, Y. *Models of the church (Avery Dulles).* Accessed.25.7.04 http://www.mcauley.acu.edu.au/~yuri/ecc/chap3.html

Kubler-Ross, E. (1970). *On death and dying.* London, Tavistock Publications.

Kuhn, T. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S. (2002). "The social construction of validity". *The qualitative inquiry reader.* Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 299 - 326.

Lambert, L. (2000). "Active learning for the kingdom of God." *Teaching Religion and Theology* 2(3): 71 - 80.

Latourette, K. (1975). *A history of Christianity: Beginnings to 1500.* Hardcover edition, 1953 San Francisco, Harper Collins.

Leahy, M. and Laura, R. S. (1997). "Religious 'doctrines' and the closure of minds." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 31(2): 329 - 343.

Lee, J. *The Content of Religious Education.* Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press.

Lee, J. M. (1971). *The Shape of Religious Education: A Social Science Approach.* Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press.

Lee, J. M. (1973). *The flow of religious instruction: A social science approach.* Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press.

Lee, J. M. (1996). "Religious education and theology". *Theological perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 45 - 68.

Leitch, R. and Day, C. (2001). "Reflective Processes in Action: mapping personal and professional contexts for learning and change." *Journal of In-Service Education* 27: 2 - 237.

Lindeman, E. C. (1926). *For those who need to be learners.* infed: the home of informal education Accessed.4.2.03 http://www.infed.org/archives/e-texts/lindem1.htm

Little, L., Ed. (1962). *Wider horizons in Christian adult education: Selected addresses and papers presented in a workshop on the curriculum of Christian education for adults, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, June 19-30, 1961.* Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.

Mackenzie, J. (1998). "David Carr on religious knowledge and spiritual education." *Journal of the Philosophy of Education* 32(3): 409 - 427.

Mackenzie, J. (2004). "Religious upbringing is not as Michael Hand describes." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 38(1): 129 - 142.

Martin, J. P. (5-7 December 2001). *Adult Learning at the OECD . Will Cinderella Get to the Ball? Speech delivered to the International Conference on Adult Learning Policies Seoul, Korea.* OECD and the KRIVET Accessed.January 15

Marvell, J. (1982). "Phenomenology And The Future Of Religious Education". *New directions in religious education.* Hull, J. London, The Falmer Press. New Directions Series: 4 - 8.

Maslow, A. (1971). *Farther reaches of human nature.* New York, Penguin Books.

Matthew, H. F. (1966). *Revolution in religious education: A commentary.* Wallington, Surrey, The Religious Education Press.

Mcbrien, R., Ed. (1995). *The Harper Collins Encyclopedia of Catholicism.* New York, Harper Collins.

Mccaffry, T. (1993). "The priesthood of the teacher - Language and the teaching of the word". *Adult Education and theological interpretations.* Jarvis, P. and

Walters, N. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 53 - 66.

Mckenna, E. (1994). *Business Psychology and Organisational Behaviour: A students' (sic) Handbook.* Hove, Lawerence Erlbaum Associates Ltd., Publishers.

Mckenzie, L. (1986). "The purposes and scope of adult religious education". *Handbook of Adult Religious Education.* Foltz, N. Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press: 7 - 23.

Mclaughlin, D. (2000). "A school for the human person and of the human person." *British Journal of Religious Education* 22(3): 150 - 164.

Mclaughlin, T. H. (1984). "Parental rights and the religious upbringing of children." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 18: 75 - 83.

Mezirow, J. (1998). "Cognitive processes: Contemporary paradigms of learning". *Adult learning: A reader.* Sutherland, P. Original edition: 1997 London, Kogan Page: 2 - 13.

Mezirow, J. (2000). "Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory". *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory-in-progress.* San Francisco, Jossey Bass Wiley: 3 - 33.

Midgley, M. (1992). *Science as salvation.* London, Routledge.

Minton, D. (1997). *Teaching skills in Further and Adult Education.* City & Guilds/Macmillan. Second. 1991 Basingstoke, Macmillian Press, Ltd.

Moore, W. (1972). "Indoctrination and democratic method". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. A. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. International library of the Philosophy of Education, General Editor, R. S. Peters: 93 - 100.

Mott-Thornton, K. (1996). "Language, dualism and experiential religious education: A critical appraisal of the debate between Adrian Thatcher and the ethos of *New Methods in R.E. Teaching.*" *British Journal of Religious Education* 18(3): 155 - 165.

Nccb/Uscc (1999). *Our Hearts were burning*, United States Catholic Conference.

Nccb/Uscc (2000). *In support of catechetical ministry.* Accessed.7.08.03 http://www.usccb.org/education/catechetics/support.htm

Newbigin, L. (1982). "Teaching Religion In A Secular Plural Society". *New directions in religious Education.* Hull, J. London, The Falmer Press: 82 - 88.

Newbigin, L. (1998). "Religion, science and truth in the school curriculum". *Christian perspectives for education.* Francis and Adrian Thatcher, e. s., L. Leominster, Hertfordshire, Gracewing: 93 -99.

Nichols, K. (1992). "The logical geography of catechesis". *The contours of*

Christian education. Astley, J. and Day, D. Great Wakering, McCrimmon Publishing Co. Ltd.: 54 - 65.

Nipkow, K. E. (1996). "Theological and educational concepts: problems of integration and differentiation". *Theological Perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education*. Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 14 - 30.

Orr, M. (2000). "The role of the teacher in the theological education of the laity". *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection adult Christian education*. Astley, J. Leominster, Gracewing: 72 - 89.

Paechter, C., Edwards, R., Harrison, R. and Twining, P. (2001). *Learning, space and identity*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Parker, S. (2000). "Higher education and an adult curriculum". *The adult curriculum*. Nottingham, Continuing Education Press, University of Nottingham: 41 - 61.

Paul Vi (1967). *Sacrum Diaconatus Ordinem*. Accessed.06.04.02 www.deacons.net/Documents/Sacrum_Diaconatus_Ordinem.htm

Paul Vi (1975). *Evangelii Nuntiandi*. Accessed.14 August, 2000 www.listserv.aremican.edu/catholic.church/papal.html

PEBBLE (2004). Accessed.6.12.04 http://pebble.wiccauk.com/component/option,com_frontpage/Itemid,1/

Pendlebury, S. and Enslin, P. (2001). "Representation, identification and truth: Towards an ethics of educational research." *Jounmal of the philosophy of education* 35(3): 261 -270.

Peters, J. M. and Jarvis, P., Ed. (1991). *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study*. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series^Ed. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Peters, R. S. (1970). *Ethics and education*. 2nd. First edition, 1966 London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Pius X (1905). *Acerbo nimis*. Accessed.14 August, 2000 www.listserv.aremican.edu/catholic.church/papal.html

Pius Xi (1929a). *Divini illius magistri (On Christian education*.

Pius Xi (1929b). *Divini illius magistri (On Christian education)*. Accessed.1999

Plotnick, E. (1997). *Concept Mapping: A Graphical System for Understanding the Relationship Between Concepts*. ERIC Digest Accessed.28.1.02 http://ericit.org/digests/EDO-IR-1997-05.shtml

Potter, J. (2001). "Visualisation in research and data analysis". *Doing practitioner research differently*. Dadds, M. and Hart, S. London, RoultedgeFalmer: 26 - 46.

Power, S. (1998). "Researching the 'pastoral' and the 'academic': an ethnographic exploration of Berstein's sociology of the curriculum". *Doing research about education*. Walford, G. London, Falmer Press. 17: 11 - 26.

Quality Assurance Agency (2000). *Handbook for academic review*. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Accessed.13.02.02 http://www.qaa.ac.uk/public/acrevhbook/intro.htm

Quality Assurance Agency (2002). *Code of practice: Quality and standards in HE: Appendix three, Academic review*. Accessed.22.4.03 http://www.qaa.ac.uk/public/cop/coppamr/appendix3.htm

Rachal, J. R. (2002). "Andragogy's detectives: A critique of the present and a proposal for the future." *Adult Education Quarterly* 52(3): 210-227.

Raelin, J. (1998). "Work-based learning in practice." *Journal of Workplace Learning* Vol. 10, No. 6/7: pp. 280 - 283.

Raman, V. V. (2004). "Faith and doubt in science and religion." *Zygon* 39(4): 941 - 956.

Raviv, A., Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A., Rbiran, B. and Sela, Z. (2003). "Teachers' epistemic authority: perceptions of students and teachers." *Social Psychology of Education* 6(1): 17 - 42.

Reece and Stephen Walker, I. (2000). *Teaching, training and learning: A practical guide*. Fourth. 1992 Sunderland, Business Education Publishers Limited.

Reece, I. and Walker, S. (2000). *Teaching, training and learning: A practical guide*. Fourth. 1992 Sunderland, Business Education Publishers Limited.

Rhem, J. (2002). *Of Diagrams and Models: Learning as a Game of Pinball*. The National Forum for Teaching and Learning Accessed.24.1.03

Robenstine, C. (1998). *Aristotle for Teachers as Moral Educators*. http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/eps/PES-Yearbook/1998/robenstine.html

Robertson, E. (1994). *Teacher authority and teaching for liberation*. http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/94_docs/ROBERTSO.HTM

Robinson, R. and Carrington, S. (2002). "Professional development for inclusive schooling." *The International Journal of Educational Management* 16(5): 239 - 247.

Robson, C. (1993). *Real World Research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rock, A., Op, (1953). *Unless they be sent.* Dubuque, Iowa, Wm. C. Brown & Co.

Rogers, A. (1996). *Teaching adults.* Original edition: 1986 Buckingham, Open University Press.

Rogers, A. (2000). "Introduction". *The adult curriculum.* Cox, D., Dale, M., Jones, D. and Parker, S. Nottingham, Continuing Education Press, University of Nottingham: 1 - 6.

Rogers, C. (1967). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy.* London, Constable.

Rogers, C. (1990). "The politics of education". *The Carl Rogers reader.* and Henderson, V. L. Journal of Humanistic Education, 1977, vol. 1, No. 1, pg. 6 - 22 London, Constable.

Rømer, T. A. (2002). "Situated Learning and Assessment." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 27(3): 233 - 241.

Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum Ii (Second Vatican Council) (1966). *Contstitutiones decret declarationes.* Rome, Vatican Press.

Savage, M. D. J. (2000). "Adult learning and the churches". *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection on adult Christian education.* Astley, J. Leominster, Gracewing: 143 - 160.

Schauffele, S. and Baptiste, I. (2000). "Appealing to the soul: Towards a Judeo-Christian theory of learning." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 19(5): 448–458.

Schön, D. A. (1995). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Aldershot, Arena.

Second Vatican Council (1965). *Declaration on religious freedom: Dignitatis Humanae: On the right of the person and of communities to social and civil freedom in matters of religion.* Accessed.7.08.03 http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html

Seymour, J. L. (1996). "Contemporary approaches to Christian education". *Theological Perspectives on Christian formation: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 3 - 12.

Sharples, D. and Wickteed, D. (1991). "Can an agnostic teach RE?" *Education 3 - 13* 19(03): 16 - 19.

Shea, J. J. (2003). "The adult self: Process and paradox." *Journal of Adult Development* 10(1): 23 - 30`.

Shkedi, A. (1998). "Teachers' attitudes towards research : a challenge for qualitative researchers." *Qualitative studies in education* 11(4): 559 - 577.

Sims-King, S. (1997). "Faith, the RE teacher, and Year 9." *Pastoral Care* June, 1997: 37 - 40.

Slee, N. (1998). "Conflict and reconciliation between competing models of religious education: some reflections on the British scene." *British Journal of Religious Education* 11(3): 126 - 135.

Smart, N. (1966). *The teacher and Christian belief.* London, James Clarke and Co. Ltd.

Smart, N. (1998). *The world's religions.* Second. 1989 Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. K. (1996a). *Humanistic orientations to learning.* Infed; the home of informal education Accessed.3.2.03 http://www.infed.org/biblio/learning-humanistic.htm

Smith, M. K. (1996b). *The social/situational orientation to learning.* infed.org: the home of informal education Accessed.24.01.03 http://www.infed.org/biblio/learning-social.htm

Smith, M. K. (1999a). *The behaviourist orientation to learning.* infed.org: the home of informal education Accessed.24.01.03 http://www.infed.org/biblio/learning-behavourist.htm

Smith, M. K. (1999b). *The cognitive orientation to learning.* infed.org: the home of informal education Accessed.24.01.03 http://www.infed.org/biblio/learning-cognitive.htm

Snook, I. A. (1972a). *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Peters, R. S. International library of the Philosophy of Education. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Snook, I. A., Ed. (1972b). *Indoctrination and education.* Students library of Education^Ed. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Snook, I. A. (1972c). "Indoctrination and moral responsibility". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 152 - 161.

Snook, I. A. (1972d). "Introduction". *Concepts of Indoctrination.* Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 1 - 8.

Southern, R. W. (1970). *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages.* Chadwick, O. The Pelican History of the Church. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, California, Sage Publications.

Stubblefield, H. (1993). "Self, soul and learning". *Adult Education and theological interpretations*. Jarvis, P. and Walters, N. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 127 - 139.

Sutherland, P. (1998a). *Adult learning: A reader.* Original edition: 1997 London, Kogan Page.

Sutherland, P. (1998b). "Experiential learning and construcivism: Potential for a mutually beneficial synthesis". *Adult learning: A reader.* Sutherland, P. Original edition: 1997 London, Kogan Page.

Tan, C. (2004). "Michael Hand, indoctrination and the inculcation of belief." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 38(1): 257 - 267.

Tatarkowski, M. (1997). "Should spirituality be taught in post-compulsory education? Justifications for its inclusion in the further education curriculum." *Pastoral Care*: 40 - 41.

Teare, R. (1997). "Enabling organizational learning." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 9(7): 315-324.

Telles, J. A. (2000). "Biographical connections: experiences as sources of legitimate knowledge in qualitative research." *QUALITATIVE STUDIES IN EDUCATION*(13, 3): 251- 262.

Teresa of Avila, S. (1979). *The Interior Castle.* Payne, R. J. The Classics of Western Spirituality. London, SPCK.

Thackwray, B. (1997). *Effective evaluation of training and development in higher education.* London, Kogan Page.

Thatcher, A. (1991). "A critique of inwardness in religious education." *British Journal of Religious Education* 14:01: 22 - 27.

The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (1994a). *Model Syllabus for Religious Education 1*, The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (1994b). *Model Syllabus for Religious Education, 2*, The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority,.

Theissen, E. (1982). "Indoctrination and doctrines." *Journal of the philosophy of education* 16(1): 3 - 17.

Thiessen, E. (1998). "Indoctrination and religious education". *Christian perspectives for education: A reader in the theology of education.* Francis, L. J. and Thatcher, A. 1990 Leominster, Gracewing: 215-230.

Thiessen, E. J. (1992). "Christian nurture, indoctrination and liberal education". *The contours of Christian Education.* Astley, J. and Day, D. Great Wakering, McCrimmon Publishing Co. Ltd.: 67 - 86.

Thomas, J. E. (1982). *Radical adult education: Theory and practice.* Nottingham Studies in the Theory and Practice of the Education of Adults. Nottingham, Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham.

Tight, M. (1996). *Adult education and training.* London, Routledge.

Tinsley, J. (1996). "'Tell it slant'". *Theological perspectives on Christian education: A reader on theology and Christian education.* Astley, J., Francis, L. J. and Crowder, C. Leominster, Gracewing: 88 - 94.

Tom, S. (1998). "Social capital, human capital and the learning society." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 17(:4): 226 - 235.

Trilling, B. and Hood, P. (2001). "Learning, technology and education reform in the Knowledge Age, or 'We're wired, webbed and windowed, now what'". *Learning, space and identity.* Paechter, C., Edwards, R., Harrison, R. and Twining, P. London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.: 7 - 30.

Tuijnman, A. and Boström, A.-K. (2002). "Changing notions of lifelong education and lifelong learning." *International Review of Education* 48((1/2)): 93-110.

Unesco (2000). *World education report 2000, The right to education: Towards education for all throughout life.* Paris, UNESCO Publishing.

Van Driel, J., Beijaard, D. and Verloop, N. (2001). "Professional development and reform in science education: The role of teachers' practical knowledge." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 38(2): 137-158.

Walford, G., Ed. (1998a). *Doing research about education.* Social research and educational series^Ed. London, Falmer Press.

Walford, G. (1998b). "Introduction: Research accounts count". *Doing research about education.* Walford, G. London, Falmer Press. 17: 1 - 10.

Wallace, G., Rudduck, J., Flutter, J. and Harris, S. (1998). "Using ethnographic methods in a study of student's secondary school and post-school careers". *Doing research about education.* Walford, G. London, Falmer Press. 17: 76 - 92.

Waller, R. and Ward, B. (1999). *An introduction to Christian spirituality.* London, SPCK.

Walton, R. L. (2000). "Assessment in adult Christian education". *Learning in the Way: Research and reflection on adult Christian education.* Astley, J. Leominster, Gracewing: 90 - 112.

Watson, B., Ed. (1992). *Priorities in religious education: A model for the 1990s and beyond.* London, The Falmer Press.

Watson, F. (1906). "The freedom of the teacher to teach -- religion." *Mind* New

series, 15(59): 360 - 374.

Webb, S. H. and Placher, W. C. (2000). "Teaching religion religiously: A dialogue." *Teaching Religion and Theology* 3(2): 81 - 87.

Welton (1993). "Seeing the light: Christian conversion and conscientiazation". *Adult Education and theological interpretations*. Jarvis, P. and Walters, N. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 105 - 123.

Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic, narrative and semi-structured methods*. London, Sage Publications Ltd.

West-Burnham, J. (1997). "Leadership for learning: Reengineering 'mind sets'." *School Leadership & Management* 17(2).

White a, J. (1972). "Indoctrination and intentions". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 117 - 130.

White B, J. (1972). "Indoctrination without doctrine". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, e., I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 190 - 201.

White, J. (1972). "Indoctrination without doctrine". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, e., I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 190 - 201.

Wickett, R. E. Y. (1991). *Models of adult religious education practice*. Birmingham, Alabama, Religious Education Press.

Wilde, J. (1998). "Religious Education in Further Education: A study in under provision." *British Journal of Religious Education* 21(1): 44-54.

Williams, P. L. (1998). "Using theories of professional knowledge and reflective practice to influence educational change." *Medical Teacher* 20: 1 - 28.

Willis, P. (1993). "Teaching - Catechism, preaching and indoctrination". *Adult Education and theological interpretations*. Jarvis, P. and Walters, N. Florida, Krieger Publishing: 67 - 87.

Wilson, B. and Cresswell, J., Ed. (1999). *New religious movements: Challenge and response*. London, Routledge.

Wilson, J. (1972a). "Indoctrination and freedom". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 101 - 105.

Wilson , J. (1972b). "Indoctrination and rationality". *Concepts of Indoctrination*. Snook, I. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 17 - 24.

Wilson, J. (1992). "First steps in religious education". *Priorities in religious education: A model for the 1990s and beyond*. Watson, B. London, The Falmer Press: 10 - 25.

Winch, C. and Gingell, J. (1999). *Key concepts in the philosophy of education.* Key Concepts Series. London, Routledge.

Withnall, A. (1986). *The Christian churches and adult education.* Review of research and practice in adult education. Leicester, NIACE.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations.* Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Working Party of the Board of Social Responsibility *Something to Celebrate: Valuing families in church and society.* London, Church House Publishing.

Zepke, N. (2005). "Diversity, adult education and the future: A tentative exploration." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 24(2): 165–178.

Zmeyov, S. I. (1998). "Andragogy: Origins, developments and trends." *International Review of Education* 44(1): 103–108.