

Worldview literacy as intercultural citizenship education: A framework for critical, reflexive engagement in plural democracy

Education, Citizenship and
Social Justice
1–17

© The Author(s) 2022



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/17461979211062125
journals.sagepub.com/home/esj



Martha Shaw 

London South Bank University, UK

Abstract

Within plural democracies, the concept of ‘religious literacy’ is commonly understood as denoting the knowledge, skills and understanding *vis-à-vis* religious diversity required of the citizen. In schools across Europe such learning is traditionally housed within Religious Education (RE), the aims of which are increasingly framed in terms of citizenship education, yet the two school subjects are often helplessly siloed, and both criticised for lack of criticality and an over-focus on knowledge acquisition. This article introduces the concept of ‘worldview literacy’ as a reworking of ‘religious literacy’ that addresses concerns around inclusivity and criticality. Rather than a product of good RE or citizenship education, worldview literacy is envisaged as a transformational process of educational praxis through encounter in plurality, that forges a pathway between the two school subjects and contributes to the broader educational endeavour of engagement in social life.

Keywords

active citizenship, hermeneutics, plurality, praxis, religious literacy, worldview literacy

Introduction

The importance of understanding about religion/worldviews to engagement in plural democracies is more apparent now than ever (Nussbaum, 2012). Over the last few decades religion has ‘reappeared’ in the public sphere, often in violent ways and the role of religion in public life is a matter of continued debate (Dinham, 2020; Mendieta and VanAntwerpen, 2011). With increased migration and human mobility, the religious landscape of Western and Northern Europe has changed dramatically, reflecting both a decline in institutionalised Christianity and increased religious diversity (Davie, 2015a; Woodhead, 2012a, 2012b; Woodhead and Catto, 2012). At the same time

Corresponding author:

Martha Shaw, School of Law and Social Sciences, Education Division, London South Bank University, 103 Borough Road, London SE1 0AA, UK.

Email: shawm7@lsbu.ac.uk

public debate around religion is often ill-mannered and ill-informed (Davie, 2015b; Dinham, 2017), reflecting a wider lack of religious literacy (Dinham and Francis, 2016). It has been noted that in this context, religious symbols and acts may be more visible and considered more emotionally challenging signs of a changing reality than other markers of difference (Johannessen and Skeie, 2019). This is reflected in increased hostility, marginalisation and prejudice experienced by religious minorities (Nussbaum, 2012; UK Home Office, 2020). It is well recognised that as part of the increased diversification and interaction that comes with globalisation, identities become more complex, hybrid and fluid (Appiah, 2006; Modood, 1998, 2007, 2019), with religion or worldview often an important component therein (Moulin-Stožek and Schirr, 2017; Osler and Starkey, 2003).

Based on John Dewey's pragmatic conception of education as participation in social life (Dewey, 1909), understanding of religion/worldviews in society and in the lives of its members is then an important aspect of the educational endeavour. The concept of religious literacy is often used to denote such understanding and has found popularity in relation to both Religious Education (RE) and education for citizenship. Within related discourses, religious literacy is increasingly seen as an important prerequisite for positive engagement in plural democracies (Jackson, 2014; Moore, 2007; O'Grady, 2019; Dinham and Shaw, 2017). Alongside other literacies such as political, cultural and financial, having an understanding of religion, and the skills to engage positively with religious diversity, is considered an important part of education for the 21st century (Council of Europe [COE], 2008; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017; United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2015). Yet the term and the concept of 'religious literacy' are often understood in reductive terms as the acquisition of substantive knowledge of the majority religions, alongside the development of certain skills and attitudes *vis-à-vis* religious diversity. This conception is challenged along the lines of content by those who stress the diversity and fluidity of religions and non-religious worldviews (Hannam et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2021; XX, 2017) and by those who stress the importance of the critical dimension. The latter highlight the need for an understanding of the socio-political dimension of religion, the role (good and bad) that religion plays in history and contemporary society (Davie, 2015b; Moore, 2007). Others stress the power dimension and the need for critical deconstruction of the very notion of 'religion' and its representation in society, including in education (Goldburg, 2010; Shaw, 2018, 2020).

These critiques can be broadly characterised by a commitment to inclusivity, reflexivity and transformative pedagogy, and reflect a set of wider educational concerns; how to create an acceptance and appreciation of difference in the context of rising popularism and xenophobia, the need to challenge the historic Westernisation of knowledge and the dominance of content-based, transmissive approaches to education within a system governed by performativity. These concerns are played out in varying degrees across national and supranational education policy and practice, and of course, depending upon where you look. Relevant to all school subjects and to education as a whole, I argue that these concerns have a particular significance for RE and for citizenship education as educative spaces with potential to address the challenges they pose. To use the broad descriptors 'RE' and 'Citizenship' does not of course give recognition to the range of approaches and perspectives that inform practice within each. Both have been subject to criticism for being exclusivist, reductionist and lacking in criticality and both are subject to the influence of broader knowledge focused, transmissive approaches that dominate teaching and learning in education systems across Europe. However, progressive, critical approaches¹ within both areas share a commitment to a more inclusive, reflexive and transformative education. In addition, whilst in England both subjects must be provided by law, each faces marginalisation within the current curriculum (Castelli and Chater, 2018; Chater, 2020; Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement,

2018) and are excluded from the suite of examined subjects that contribute to performance measures.² Sitting outside the performativity agenda in this sense may strengthen their potential as educative spaces in which to develop more human-centred, transformational approaches.

It is in this space that worldview literacy has much to contribute. Beyond ‘religious literacy’, understood as knowledge and skills or competencies for engagement with religious diversity, I argue that ‘worldview literacy’ should be understood as a transformative process of critical engagement *in* plurality. Rather than an outcome of education, worldview literacy can be understood as a process of dialogical encounter with difference, an educational praxis that brings the pupil to a greater understanding of the diversity and dynamism of worldviews and of themselves as social actors therein. Understood in this way, worldview literacy forges a pathway between the aims of Religious Education and citizenship education as an enactment of democracy (Biesta, 2011) that develops pupils’ critical awareness and understanding of difference and skills in intercultural competency. The concept of worldview literacy, so understood, draws on ‘progressive’³ approaches within RE and citizenship education to make an important contribution to the broader aim of education as the space in which young people become actors in plurality (Hannam, 2019) and practice democracy (Biesta, 2010).

Religious literacy: Normative – functional – critical

The concept of ‘religious literacy’ has become a firm part of discussions around RE (APPG, 2016; Biesta et al., 2019; Dinham and Shaw, 2017; Shaw, 2020) and more generally in relation to a range of professions and settings (Dinham, 2017; Dinham and Francis, 2016; Walker et al., 2021). Analysis of the history and usage of the concept ‘religious literacy’ is explored elsewhere (Biesta et al., 2019; Dinham, 2020; Shaw, 2020) and need not be rehearsed at length here. It is important however to the argument presented that religious literacy has often been understood in reductive terms as knowledge about the ‘main’ religious traditions and the skills to be able to engage with them, reflecting a functional and normative interpretation.

Understandings outside RE reflect concern around a broad social phenomenon of religious illiteracy. For example, Prothero (2007) draws on Hirsch’s (1987) ideas on cultural literacy, arguing that Americans have lost their understanding about religion and proposes a set of normative ‘building blocks’ of religious traditions that the religiously literate person should know in order to ‘participate fully in social, political and economic life in a nation and a world in which religion counts’ (Prothero, 2007: 15). Taking a cultural studies approach, Moore (2007) expands the focus to include understanding the social and historical manifestations of religions and defines religious literacy as, ‘the ability to discern and analyse the fundamental intersections of religion and social/political/cultural life through multiple lenses’ (Moore, 2007: 56). Here religion is viewed alongside other markers of difference such as ethnicity, gender and class as a concept central to an understanding of society and its history, and religious literacy as central to the peaceful functioning of a plural democracy.

Within RE, aside from Wright’s understanding which concerns skills of theological and philosophical reflection in coming to understand the nature of reality (Wright, 1993), the concept of ‘religious literacy’ is generally employed to denote a functional literacy – a level of knowledge and understanding about the diverse religion and worldview landscape and the skills to be able to engage with that diversity in a positive way. It is with such an understanding that the English Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) called in 2010 for a stronger focus in RE on deepening pupils’ understanding of the nature, diversity and impact of religion and belief in the contemporary world (Ofsted, 2010: 7). Part of this concerns pupils’ response to religion(s) and implies a positive disposition towards difference. For example, the Religious Education Council for England and Wales’s

2013 review of RE promotes religious literacy that enables pupils to ‘respond to religions and worldviews in an informed, rational and insightful way’ (Religious Education Council of England and Wales [REC], 2013: 10). Likewise in the report presented by the UK All Party Parliamentary Group on religious literacy (APPG, 2016), the concept includes knowledge about the ‘main’ traditions and the changing religious landscape and how they might be interpreted in the lives of individuals, alongside the ability to respond with critical awareness to questions raised by religion and the ability to engage with religious groups in a way which promotes respect and plurality (APPG, 2016).

A more comprehensive understanding is reflected in Dinham’s (2017) framework which suggests religious literacy should involve four phases; *category*, *disposition*, *knowledge* and *skills*. Intentionally broad, Dinham’s framework is applicable to a wide range of professional and practice settings including schools (Davie and Dinham, 2018; Dinham and Jones, 2012) with the acknowledgement that the knowledge and skills required to be ‘religiously literate’ are context specific and will vary from one setting to another (Dinham and Francis, 2016). Alongside knowledge and skills, Dinham’s framework draws on a sociological perspective and incorporates a critical dimension through a focus on *category*, which implies thinking critically about the concept of religion in relation to the secular. It suggests too a reflexive element through *disposition* which involves the questioning of one’s assumptions about or prejudices towards religion, non-religion or another’s worldview.

Critical literacy has its roots in the work of Freire (1970), which promotes the challenging of received ideas in a dialectic and transformative process. Goldburg draws on a Freirean approach to advocate an expanded idea of religious literacy to include the functional, cultural and critical dimensions. This involves the questioning of received knowledge about religion; ‘What knowledge is revered? Whose histories are legitimated? Whose voices are silenced? What religions are marginalised or excluded within dominant discourses?’ (Goldburg, 2010: 353). Critical religious literacy requires that ‘students are encouraged and enabled to identify, examine and critique problematic, contradictory and multiple ways of seeing the world’ (Goldburg, 2010: 352). The student is brought into a dialectic relationship with the subject matter, emphasising student agency. Here the idea of ‘self-critical scholarship’ (Goldburg, 2010: 352) is important in emphasising the reflexive element of critical literacy, which is central to the transformational pedagogy underpinning a Freirean approach.

Religious literacy is an evolving concept, yet, as I have argued elsewhere (xx, 2019, 2020), remains insufficiently theorised in relation to the classroom context. In my theorisation of ‘worldview literacy’, I draw upon ideas of critical religious literacy to suggest a framework for a pedagogical model that; (a) makes explicit the extension of ‘religion’ to ‘worldview’ to better categorise lived reality and diversity, (b) explicitly focuses on the construction and deconstruction of knowledge, (c) foregrounds the reflexive element in understanding and (d) moves from a linear to a circular model of praxis (see xx, 2020).

In this expanded theorisation the critical and reflexive dimensions are what takes worldview literacy beyond a functional literacy and gives it truly educational potential. Rather than objective knowledge about religion(s), along with a set of skills and attitudes that can be learnt, ‘worldview literacy’ can be understood as a process of educational praxis in which understanding, application and interpretation are interwoven and interdependent dimensions of an *I-Thou* dialogue (Gadamer, 1975).

This conceptualisation differs from most conceptualisations of religious literacy in its explicit focus on *interpretation*, categorisation, *reflexivity* and *transformation through encounter*. These components build on ‘critical-progressive’ approaches within RE and citizenship education to form a framework for learning about worldviews that contributes to the aims of both school

subjects and to the broader educational aim of participation in social life (Dewey, 1909). Having provided a background to the idea of worldview literacy and its roots in critical literacy, the following section explores these dimensions and their contribution to this endeavour.

Interpretability

In a notable shift from ‘religious literacy’, the use of the term ‘worldview’ widens the scope to explicitly include religious and non-religious ways of understanding the world and one’s place within it. Although debates around terminology can often be an unhelpful distraction from broader issues around the aims and purposes of education, this change in terminology is important, both in that it broadens the scope beyond religions and challenges that categorisation, and because it reflects the direction of Religious Education in England and other European countries that are embracing a ‘worldviews approach’ (Commission on Religious Education [CoRE], 2018; Cooling et al., 2020).

The term ‘worldview’ is employed in a number of ways across academic disciplines (Benoit et al., 2020) and is gaining popularity within RE, although it remains contested both within and across national contexts (Bråten and Everington, 2019). In England the recent national Commission on RE proposed ‘Religion and Worldviews’ as the way forward for the subject (CoRE, 2018). Here the term is inclusive of religious and non-religious, ‘institutional’ and ‘personal’ worldviews, alongside the recognition that worldviews are interpreted in different ways. This ‘paradigm shift’ in RE is both a recognition of the changing religion and belief landscape (XX, 2020) and a response to long standing critique of the world religions paradigm that has dominated the school subject. A key criticism of the latter rests on the representation of worldviews as static blocks of belief and practice (Barnes, 2012; Jackson, 2004; XX, 2017) that ignores the diversity within worldviews and the dynamism of worldviews as both traditions and identity.

Worldview literacy, in keeping with the ‘worldviews approach’, as articulated by its proponents (see Cooling et al., 2020), assumes an understanding of worldviews as diverse, dynamic and interpretable. As evidenced in sociological research, worldviews are internally contested and fuzzy-edged and the boundaries between religion/non-religion, public/private often blurred (Lee, 2015; Woodhead, 2012b). This draws on approaches within RE that focus on the centrality of interpretation, key among which is the work of Robert Jackson and his ‘interpretive approach’ developed in the 1980s and 90s at the University of Warwick (Jackson, 1997). Based on ethnographic research into transmission of religious culture, this approach reflects the dynamic nature of the changing landscape and an understanding of culture as ‘demotic discourse’ (Baumann, 1999). Rather than static entities, worldviews can then be understood as ‘traditions in transition’ (Meijer, 2006) being constantly modified through processes of interpretation in which individuals reshape culture through their ‘personal syntheses which might draw from a wide range of cultural resources, including their own ancestral traditions’ (Jackson, 2009: 1). This draws on Gadamer and Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of historical consciousness to understand how ‘traditions are developing and evolving historically – in and through the historical interpretations and actions of human beings over time, and of how the vitality of traditions depends on such constant reinterpretation’ (Meijer, 2006: 12). Within such an understanding, personal identity is also seen as a process of interpretation, which actively draws on and negotiates aspects of tradition; ‘Like any interpretation, [this] personal identity is not unchanging and universally valid. It is, like any interpretation, tentative and open to deliberation’ (Meijer, 2006: 8). In this sense, tradition and identity are interwoven through a continual process of interpretation. People ‘live in and from and through tradition’ (Meijer, 2006: 13).

Understanding that worldviews are interpretable is essential to comprehending the complexity of identity in global democracies and is characteristic of the worldviews dimension of intercultural

education (Jackson, 2019). Whilst appreciation of difference, and religion and belief identity as part of this, is a key part of citizenship education in most European democracies (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017) the cultural dimension of citizenship is often sidelined within a ‘soft’ (Andreotti, 2006) or ‘minimal’ conception of citizenship (McLaughlin, 1992). Within the English Citizenship curriculum for example, ‘religion and belief’ feature as an aspect of diversity which pupils are expected to understand, yet the complexities of identity and belonging in plurality are left unexplored amidst a focus on knowledge of national civic processes and the promotion of ‘British Values’⁴ (Department for Education [DfE], 2014). This can be seen as the result of the struggle faced by schools to promote acceptance of diversity alongside national unity (Banks, 2009; Osler and Starkey, 2006; Starkey, 2018), yet a ‘global turn’ in curricula, encouraged at the supranational level (COE, 2017; OECD, 2016; UNESCO, 2015) promotes education for global citizenship which requires pupils to ‘think critically, transcend local loyalties, and sympathetically imagine the situation of others’ (Bamber et al., 2018). Worldview literacy contributes to this endeavour and to understandings of ‘global’ or ‘cosmopolitan’⁵ citizenship which emphasise the liquidity, historicity and evolution of difference (Bamber et al., 2018). Religion is increasingly an important identity marker, particularly for minority groups and is often the marker of difference and hostility (Johannessen and Skeie, 2019; Kessler and Hageaves, 2020). Understanding worldview identity as dynamic and socially contingent challenges zero-sum conceptions of identity (Kymlicka, 1995) that underpin nationalist or assimilationist notions of citizenship. Rather than seeing allegiance to a religious group as a threat to national identity, one’s worldview is understood as one aspect of a complex and dynamic set of loyalties and allegiances that make up peoples’ sense of belonging. It can therefore contribute to ideas of cosmopolitan citizenship and the ‘recognition that British identity, for example, may be experienced differently by different people’ (Osler, 2011: 3).

Categorisation

A key critique of both traditional approaches within RE and ‘soft’ approaches to citizenship education is the failure to engage in issues of power and its relationship to representation of the ‘other’ (see Andreotti, 2006; Gearon, 2002). Scholars of critical citizenship education emphasise the need to address the normalising of Western ‘ways of knowing’ as global, without laying bare the colonial history, power inequality that sustains Western dominance (see e.g. Andreotti, 2006; Dobson, 2006). The focus on interpretability that is central to worldview literacy challenges stereotypes which are often based on the representation of religion/worldviews in broader society, notably the media, and perpetuated by misrepresentation in curricula. Despite anti-essentialism being long established within identity studies (Modood, 1998), many issues persist in curricula, particularly in relation to religion. Many scholars have noted the essentialist and reductionist ways in which religion and particularly minority religions are represented within RE (Revell, 2012; Smith et al., 2018; Thobani, 2017; XX, 2018). Critique focuses on the Western, secular framing of the ‘world religions’ paradigm, that has dominated school RE and that in practice often ignores non-religious worldviews and minority religions (Thobani, 2017). Revell for example argues that a focus on ‘the big 6’ religions perpetuates the ‘otherness’ of minority religions that do not fit a framework based on themes drawn from the study of Christianity such as ‘founding fathers’ or ‘holy books’ (Revell, 2012). Such a framework sits uncomfortably with the reality of the changing landscape; the rise of spirituality (see Woodhead, 2012a, 2012b), the changing relationship between the formal and the informal (Davie, 1994) and the complexity and bricolage (Hervieu-Léger, 2000) of personal faith that make up the ‘lived-ness’ of worldviews.

These analyses draw on established scholarship within religious studies which question the category ‘religion’ (Asad, 1993; Smith, 1982) and its Western, colonial origins (Fitzgerald, 2007; Flood, 1999; Nongbri, 2013; Nye, 2018). Developments within RE place increased emphasis on the study of religion as a conceptual category (Earl, 2015; Dinham and Shaw, 2015), now a key part of the proposed National Entitlement in England (CoRE, 2018). These developments reflect the need identified by Freathy and John (2019) for approaches to learning about religion and worldviews that highlight epistemological concerns and Goldberg’s suggestion that a ‘hermeneutic of suspicion’ is applied to textbooks depicting the world religions (Goldburg, 2010). They mirror concerns within critical citizenship education around challenging cultural assumptions in knowledge production (Banks, 2009) and the exploration of knowledge as power as part of decolonisation of the curriculum (Andreotti, 2006).

With a focus on ‘categorisation’, the development of worldview literacy necessarily involves challenging ‘knowledge’ about religions through an exploration of knowledge construction and the power relationships embedded in representations of religion and worldviews. This goes beyond exploring worldviews in their complexity and fluidity, although this is important, to an explicit deconstruction of traditional representations. As suggested by Nye (2019) this entails working ‘from the present backwards — through looking at the postcolonial present and how that has been created by the forces of the past’. As such, it can be part of much needed strategies to support the maintenance of anti-essentialist categorisations of religion in the classroom setting (Skeie, 2015) through the deconstruction of Western, colonial framings of knowledge and the development of critical consciousness.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a central component of intercultural (Jackson, 2019) and critical global citizenship education (Johnson and Morris, 2010) that is gaining increasing focus within RE across Europe (Franken, 2021; O’Grady, 2019; Ubani et al., 2020). As the ‘worldviews approach’ is gaining momentum in the English context, and its implications for classrooms explored, it is associated with hermeneutic approaches in which understanding is the result of a dialogic, reflexive process. This reflects a longstanding focus amongst some scholars, notably Aldridge (2011, 2015), on hermeneutic understanding in RE and builds on Jackson’s interpretivist approach which is rooted in reflexive encounter (Jackson, 1997) and has been influential at the European level as a basis of the religion/worldviews dimension of intercultural education promoted by the Council of Europe (COE, 2008). Jackson’s *Signposts* (Jackson, 2014) and related research emphasise the value of interreligious dialogue and dialogical approaches for exploring difference as a key contribution to citizenship and human rights education (COE, 2016; Jackson, 2016; O’Grady, 2019; Weisse, 2019).

As O’Grady (2019) explains ‘the meaning of a dialogue with difference, distinct from simply learning about difference is that the pupils are enabled to reflect on their own beliefs and values in relation to their studies, as part of their identity development’ (p. 120). Dialogue between the pupil and the subject matter necessarily involves the pupils’ exploration of their own worldview (Cooling et al., 2020). This reflects Gadamer’s argument that when encountering religion and worldviews as ‘other’, students can understand best when this ‘other’ is explored in relation to their own ‘fore-meanings’ (Gadamer, 1975). As Gadamer (1975) explains this sensitivity to alterity ‘involves neither “neutrality” with respect to content nor the extinction of one’s self, but the foregrounding and appropriation of one’s own fore-meanings and prejudices’ (p. 271). Within the idea of worldview literacy, the epistemic awareness nurtured through a focus on categorisation is mirrored at the personal level through the challenging of pupils’ own ‘knowledge’ about worldviews. As research

from the ReDi⁶ project has shown, challenging students' stereotypes about religions and worldviews through personal encounter contributes to the development of 'deeper and more nuanced subject knowledge' (Vikdahl and Skeie, 2019: 126) and contributes to a critical consciousness in relation to religion/worldviews (Gearon, 2002).

Such critical literacy is central to critical citizenship education (Johnson and Morris, 2010), combining critical thinking and autobiography (Giroux, 2003) and reflection upon one's own positionality and cultural context (Andreotti, 2006). As Andreotti highlights, this critical literacy is 'not about "unveiling" the "truth" for the learners, but about providing the space for them to reflect on their context and their own and others' epistemological and ontological assumptions: how we came to think/be/feel/act the way we do and the implications of our systems of belief in local/global terms' (Andreotti, 2006: 49). This metacognition is an essential part of 'self-critical scholarship' (Goldburg, 2010) that develops critical awareness and open-mindedness and is central to the practice of worldview literacy in the classroom context.

Transformative encounter

Dialogical approaches are distinguished from traditional transmissive approaches by the focus on transformative encounter with the subject matter. Rather than the acquisition of knowledge, dialogical encounter emphasises the connection between subject (or substantive) knowledge and relational knowledge (learning about each other) and the dialectical nature of understanding (O'Grady, 2019).

Understood in this way, worldview literacy is about more than the simple acquisition of knowledge or socialisation into a set of desired attributes or dispositions. With a focus on encounter, learning about worldviews and developing the skills to engage in worldview diversity are inseparable from interpretation of others' and one's own worldview. Worldview literacy can then be understood as engagement with difference and different ways of understanding the world through which one's own self is put into question and ultimately transformed. This transformative element echoes Jackson's (1997) concept of 'edification' to point out the potential for gaining a new perspective on one's own religious tradition or worldview through learning about other belief systems and may involve what Biesta calls 'transcendental violence', an experience of disintegration and reconstruction (Biesta, 2006: 26).

The practice of worldview literacy goes beyond critical thinking, which is mostly understood as related to the realm of thought (Johnson and Morris, 2010), to include critical self-reflection (metacognition) and critical action (Barnett, 1997). As such it is aligned with critical pedagogy within RE such as Baumfield's (2003) 'community of enquiry approach' and transformational approaches to critical citizenship. Transformational approaches are recognised as making an important contribution to global citizenship education (UNESCO, 2015), yet as argued by Bamber et al. (2018) there is little evidence of what this looks like in practice or the theoretical ideas that underpin it. Bamber et al. (2018) assert that 'transformative education involves an ontological process that elevates the importance of existential change for the learner, as regards both their way of being in the world and ways of knowing that world' (Bamber, 2016, cited in Bamber et al., 2018: 217). They draw on Palmer (1980) and Barnett (2011) to foreground education as 'being' rather than simply knowledge acquisition, quoting Palmer's assertion that 'we don't think our way into a new kind of living; rather we live our way into a new kind of thinking' (Palmer, 1980, cited in Bamber et al., 2018: 218).

The reflexive, dialogical encounter inherent in the development of worldview literacy can be best understood as a process of educational *praxis* in which the three elements of hermeneutics; *understanding*, *interpretation* and *application* (Bernstein, 1983), operate in a continual spiral (XX,

2019). This highlights Gadamer's assertion that these are not three separate elements, but that 'they are internally related; every act of understanding involves interpretation, and all interpretation involves application' (Bernstein, 1983: 39). The emphasis is on encounter as a process of reflection and action through which students develop a critical understanding of worldviews and of their own position in relation to difference as actors in plurality. This is inseparable from the application and development of skills and dispositions of intercultural navigation (self-awareness, sensitivity, discernment) required of active global citizens.

Understanding worldview literacy as praxis highlights the inseparability of knowledge, skills and dispositions, or the academic and formational. RE has traditionally been seen as playing a particular role in pupils' personal development. Grimmitt's (1987) influential framing of the central aims of RE as *learning about* and *learning from* religion have shaped the school subject since. Yet these two aims are often seen as in tension and personal development considered by many as a by-product rather than an explicit goal of RE (xx, 2015; White, 2004; Wright, 1993). Such debates sit within an ongoing lack of consensus over the aims of RE and its intrinsic or instrumental worth (see Castelli and Chater, 2018; Conroy et al., 2013; Jackson, 2015; Lundie, 2018; Ofsted, 2010). In relation to these debates, the conceptualisation of worldview literacy presented here reconciles the intrinsic and instrumental value of studying worldviews. Whilst personal identity formation is not a central aim of the practice of worldview literacy, transformation of the self and one's perception of the world is an intrinsic part of the hermeneutic process of understanding through encounter.

Encounter as engagement in democracy

Conceptualised as a transformative process of encounter in plurality, worldview literacy contributes to understandings of citizenship as practice (Biesta, 2011). Despite longstanding recognition of the importance of practice to citizenship education (Apple and Beane, 1995; Davies, 2012; Osler and Starkey, 2006), education policy and curricula across much of Europe frame citizenship as 'first and foremost a matter of individuals and their knowledge, skills, dispositions and individual responsibilities' (Biesta, 2011: 2) and children as future citizens, or 'citizens-in-waiting' (Osler and Starkey, 2003). This conceptualisation is reflected in educational approaches and frameworks based on the transmission of knowledge and socialisation into values and attitudes required of the 'good citizen'. Rather than an outcome of education, Biesta argues that citizenship should be understood as something that people continuously do (Biesta, 2010, 2011) and draws out the significance to education of Arendt's conception of the political as being. Thus rather than seeing education as preparation for engagement in political life, through the learning of skills and moral attitudes, the process of understanding (through interaction with others) itself is foregrounded as living politically which 'allows for a way of connecting education and democratic politics rather than in terms of preparation or developmentalism' (Biesta, 2011: 571).

Based on John Dewey's principle of education as the practice of democracy the focus of citizenship education should be on 'individuals-in-interaction and individuals-in-context and on the crucial role that people's "actual condition of citizenship" plays in the ways in which they learn and enact their democratic citizenship' (Biesta, 2011: 2). If we take Biesta's argument that citizenship is strengthened through investing in young people's 'condition of citizenship', reflexive, self-aware and critical engagement with diverging ways of being in the world (worldviews) is an essential part of their 'civic learning'. It is an example of 'engagement, contestation, deliberation and participation' (Biesta, 2011: 85) in democracy that is crucial to its foundation and good health.

There is much in Biesta's description of civic learning that chimes with the idea worldview literacy as *praxis*. Rather than a linear process (as religious literacy has been imagined) in which worldview literacy is somehow achieved as an end-product, the hermeneutic element of worldview

literacy is key to recognising this as a practice, rather than a product of good RE, citizenship or any other education. Rather than preparation for engagement with diversity, worldview literacy should, as in the case of Biesta's notion of wider 'civic learning', be conceived of as *recursive* and *cumulative* (Biesta, 2011).

I have argued that worldview literacy can be understood as an interwoven practice of understanding, interpretation and application that operates in a hermeneutic spiral. In this process understanding is constantly applied (as *phronesis*⁷) and re-evaluated through dialogical encounter. The developing understanding of oneself and others and actual experience of encounter with difference that is its source, will have a bearing on future learning and interaction. As argued by Biesta (2011), 'reflective engagement with the experience of democracy requires that we learn from, in and through our engagement with it' (p. 3). Worldview literacy can then be part of schools' endeavour to 'insert processes of reflection and learning into attempts to exist politically' (Biesta, 2011: 571) as a contribution to the process of 'subjectfication', empowering young people to 'come into the world' and enabling them to engage with it (Biesta, 2013).

Bridging RE and intercultural citizenship education

I have shown that understood as a process of reflexive dialogical encounter with difference, worldview literacy draws together and reflects the aims of 'progressive-critical' approaches within both RE and citizenship education. As such it can provide a useful framework for thinking about the crossover between these fields and for a more integrated approach to the place of worldviews in curricula.

The compatibility between RE and citizenship education has long been recognised (Gearon, 2003; Jackson, 2003) and is most obvious in approaches to intercultural education (Jackson, 2014, 2019; Johannessen and Skeie, 2019). Across Europe, the aims of RE are increasingly couched in terms of its contribution to positive engagement in multicultural society (Franken, 2021; Gunnarsson, 2021; O'Grady, 2019; Ubani et al., 2020; XX, 2015). Likewise, there is growing recognition that RE has a role in developing students as global citizens (Sarbicki, 2020). This is reflected in national curriculum reforms that draw the subjects closer together, for example in Norway (see Bråten and Skeie, 2020), Luxemburg (see Franken, 2021), Iceland (see Gunnarsson, 2021) and Quebec (see Boisvert, 2016).

Despite the convergence of aims, in the English context, the school subjects RE and Citizenship share a history of 'reciprocal neglect' (Gearon, 2009) rooted in secular assumptions about public life and outdated understandings of RE as moral education (Jackson, 2003). Whilst existing as two separate subjects, in practice the boundaries are often blurred, if more at primary (ages 5–11) than secondary level (ages 11–18), yet thinking about curriculum development in the two is often unhelpfully siloed. Where RE's contribution to citizenship education is recognised, it is often sustained by the idea that 'if one fails to understand the world's beliefs and practices, then one fails to understand the world' (Sarbicki, 2020: 44). This echoes traditional notions of 'religious literacy' that rest on the value of substantive knowledge along with the skills and dispositions to engage positively with religious diversity. The concept of worldview literacy presented in this article builds on these notions of religious literacy and on the growing emphasis on dialogical encounter evident in approaches to RE across Europe to suggest that 'learning about worldviews' can make a much broader contribution to intercultural citizenship and the wider educational endeavour of engagement in social life as a process of transformational engagement *in* plurality.

I have argued that the understanding of tradition and identity as hybrid, complex and evolving contributes to ideas of global and 'cosmopolitan' citizenship and supports comprehension of the complexities of citizenship as identity and belonging. Furthermore, I have made the case that

worldview literacy should entail the critical deconstruction of unjust/ skewed understanding of religious and cultural identity and thereby contribute to a critical consciousness in relation to the 'other' that is a key part of critical global citizenship education. Crucial to understanding this contribution, is that culture and identity are not explored as entities 'out there' but as living through human interpretation. Through a focus on the interpretability of worldviews as tradition and identity, the personal or private is inherently entwined with the public as worldviews are lived through interaction. This challenges the false dichotomy between public and private that underpins both much representation of religion in curricula and its historical neglect within citizenship education.

Worldview literacy can provide a framework for strengthening the cultural/personal dimension of citizenship education that, whilst developed in some European models such as that of the COE (2008, 2016) and recognised as essential to effectively engage learners (Osler and Starkey, 2006), is often subordinate to a focus on knowledge about political processes. Moreover, the focus on reflexivity and encounter highlights the inseparability of the personal and the public as one is transformed through engagement in plurality. This process of transformation brings the subjective into the classroom. As Hannam (Biesta and Hannam, 2021) contends, this is nothing new and as I have outlined, is a firm focus of many approaches to RE and intercultural/critical citizenship education, but it is something that is perhaps neglected in (particularly secondary) schooling, with focus on accumulation of substantive knowledge and on critical thinking at the expense of critical reflection (Biesta and Hannam, 2021).

As with Biesta's 'subjectification', it is the centrality of praxis that makes worldview literacy 'educational'. As noted by Hannam and Biesta (2019) this 'educational' dimension is not explicit in RE policy and curriculum development, although reflexive pedagogies are increasingly understood as central to the 'worldviews approach' as translated to the classroom (Cooling et al., 2020). Likewise, Nussbaum (2006) calls for increased focus on pedagogy alongside content within education policy relating to the capabilities essential to democracy. Worldview literacy as presented here can contribute to a stronger theorisation underpinning pedagogy in these fields and provide a framework for thinking more broadly about the significance of worldview in both understanding of and in the practice of citizenship.

Concluding remarks

In the English school system, both RE and Citizenship compete for curriculum time and both face challenges in terms of pupil perception⁸ and in relation to their status within the wider educational offer (Castelli and Chater, 2018; Chater, 2020; Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement, 2018), due in no small part to their exclusion from the English Baccalaureate (EBacc) framework of core, examined academic subjects. Often seen to be lacking in academic rigour, the response in both has been to bolster the 'knowledge' content, as reflected in the revised curriculum for Citizenship (DfE, 2013) and the most recent exam specifications for RE.⁹ Whilst such developments are in keeping with the rest of the curriculum and its prioritisation of content, they diminish the potential for transformative learning that is a key strength of both subjects. The concept of worldview literacy, as outlined in this article reframes 'learning about' and 'learning from'¹⁰ religion/worldviews as intertwined within a process of praxis through reflexive engagement in plurality, an educational experience that is often side-lined amidst a focus on outcomes, yet central to its very purpose. As global education policy looks towards more 'regenerative' approaches that challenge received 'knowledge' through human interaction, dialogue and exchange (UNESCO, 2021), the idea of worldview literacy as a process of critical engagement in lived plurality provides a framework for both re-thinking the crossover between

RE and citizenship education and for strengthening the inclusivity, criticality and transformative potential of both.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Martha Shaw  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7483-8645>

Notes

1. Whilst ‘critical citizenship education’ is a recognised field, the term ‘critical’ is not used in a homogenous way and its meaning ranges from the development of critical thinking skills to transformative action rooted in critical pedagogy (see Johnson and Morris, 2010).
2. English Baccalaureate (EBacc).
3. Transformative approaches are not progressive in the sense that they are new to either RE or citizenship education. The term is used here in a broad sense to indicate approaches that challenge transmissive models of education.
4. The duty on English schools to promote Fundamental British Values is not part of the Citizenship curriculum but a whole school duty as part of a broad education for citizenship.
5. Whilst the terms ‘global’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ citizenship are often used interchangeably, there are distinct features of both in relation to citizenship as identity and belonging, political and legal status (See Osler and Starkey, 2006).
6. Religion and Dialogue in Modern Societies: <https://www.awr.uni-hamburg.de/website-content/pdfs-flyer/redi-flyer-englisch.pdf>.
7. Practical wisdom.
8. In a recent YouGov survey only 12% of pupils said they enjoy RE and only 6% Citizenship. See www.yougov.co.uk/topics/education/articles-reports/2018/09/03/which-school-subjects-do-boys-and-girls-enjoy-more.
9. See for example OCR (2021) GCSE (9-1) specification, religious studies J625. Available at: <https://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/240547-specification-accredited-gcse-religious-studies-j625.pdf>.
10. Interconnected aims of RE as formulated by Grimmit (1987).

References

- Aldridge D (2011) What is religious education all about? A hermeneutic reappraisal. *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 32(1): 33–45.
- Aldridge D (2015) *A Hermeneutics of Religious Education*. London: Bloomsbury.
- All Party Parliamentary Group on religious education (APPG) (2016) *Improving Religious Literacy: A Contribution to the Debate*. London: Religious Education Council of England and Wales.
- Andreotti V (2006) Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review* 3(Autumn): 40–51.
- Appiah KA (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin Books.
- Apple MW and Beane JA (1995) *Democratic Schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Asad T (1993) *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Bamber P (2016) *Transformative education through international service-learning: Realising an ethical ecology of learning*. London: Routledge.
- Bamber P, Lewin D and White M (2018) (Dis-) Locating the transformative dimension of global citizenship education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 50(2): 204–230.
- Banks JA (ed.) (2009) *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Barnes P (ed.) (2012) *Debates in Religious Education*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- Barnett R (ed.) (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Barnett R (2011) *Being a University*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Baumann G (1999) *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Baumfield V (2003) Democratic RE: Preparing young people for citizenship. *British Journal of Religious Education* 25(3): 173–184.
- Benoit C, Hutchings T and Shillitoe R (2020) *Worldview: A Multidisciplinary Report*. Nottingham: Religious Education Council of England and Wales.
- Bernstein R (1983) *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism; Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Biesta GJJ (2006) *Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta GJJ (2010) How to exist politically and learn from it: Hannah Arendt and the problem of democratic education. *Teachers College Record* 112(2): 556–575.
- Biesta GJJ (2011) *Learning Democracy in School and Society. Education, Lifelong Learning and the Politics of Citizenship*. Rotterdam, Boston, MA, Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Biesta G (2013) *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Biesta GJJ, Aldridge A, Hannam P, et al. (2019) Religious literacy: A way forward for religious education? Report submitted to the Culham St Gabriel's Trust. Available at: <https://www.reonline.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Religious-Literacy-Biesta-Aldridge-Hannam-Whittle-June-2019.pdf> (accessed 22 November 2021).
- Biesta GJJ and Hannam P (eds) (2021) *Religion and Education. The Forgotten Dimensions of Religious Education?* Leiden: Brill.
- Boisvert DL (2016) Quebec's ethics and religious culture school curriculum: A critical perspective. In: Halafoff A, Arweck E and Boisvert DL (eds) *Education About Religions and Worldviews: Promoting Intercultural and Interreligious Understanding in Secular Societies*. London/New York, NY: Routledge, pp.131–145.
- Bråten OMH and Everington J (2019) Issues in the integration of religious education and worldviews education in an intercultural context. *Intercultural Education* 30(3): 289–305.
- Bråten OMH and Skeie G (2020) 'Deep Learning' in studies of religion and worldviews in Norwegian schools? The implications of the national curriculum renewal in 2020. *Religions* 11(11): 579.
- Castelli M and Chater M (eds) (2018) *We Need to Talk About Religious Education – Manifestos for the Future of RE*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Chater M (ed.) (2020) *Reforming Religious Education: Power and Knowledge in a Worldviews Curriculum*. Woodbridge: John Catt Education Ltd.
- Commission on Religious Education (CoRE) (2018) *Final Report. Religion and Worldviews: The Way Forward—A National Plan for RE*. London: Religious Education Council of England and Wales.
- Conroy JC, Lundie D, Davis RA, et al. (2013) *Does Religious Education Work? A Multi-Dimensional Investigation*. London/New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Cooling T, Bowie B and Panjwani F (2020) *Worldviews in Religious Education*. London: Theos.
- Council of Europe (2008) Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the dimension of religious and non-religious convictions within intercultural education. Available at: https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805d20e8 (accessed 5 June 2021).

- Council of Europe (2016) *Competences for Democratic Culture: Living Together as Equals in Culturally Diverse Democratic Societies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2017) Learning to live together: Council of Europe Report on the state of citizenship and human rights education in Europe. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/the-state-of-citizenship-in-europe-e-publication/168072b3cd> (accessed 5 June 2021).
- Davie G (1994) *Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing Without Belonging*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davie G (2015a) *Religion in Britain: A Persistent Paradox*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Davie G (2015b) Video for RE for REal project. Available at: <https://www.gold.ac.uk/faithsunit/current-projects/reforreal/interviews/grace-davie/> (accessed 5 June 2021).
- Davie G and Dinham A (2018) Religious literacy in Modern Europe. In: Alberto M and Francesca C (eds) *Religious Literacy, Law and History: Perspectives on European Pluralist Societies*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 17–28.
- Davies I (2012) Perspectives on citizenship education. In: Arthur J and Cremin H (eds) *Debates in Citizenship Education*. Oxon: Routledge, pp.32–40.
- Department for Education (DfE) (2013) *Citizenship programmes of study: Key stages 3 and 4. National curriculum in England* (September). London, UK: DFE. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/23906
- Department for Education (DfE) (2014) *Promoting Fundamental British Values as Part of SMSC in Schools: Departmental Advice for Maintained Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Dewey J (1909) *Moral Principles in Education*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.
- Dinham A (2017) Religious literacy and public and professional settings. In: Crisp B (ed.) *Routledge International Handbook of Religion, Spirituality and Social Work*. Melbourne, VIC: Routledge, pp. 257–264.
- Dinham A (2020) *Religion and Belief Literacy: Reconnecting a Chain of Learning*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dinham A and Francis M (eds) (2016) *Religious Literacy in Policy and Practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dinham A and Jones SH (2012) Religion, public policy and the academy: Brokering public faith in a context of ambivalence? *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 27: 185–201.
- Dinham A and Shaw M (2015) *RE for Real – The future of teaching and learning about religion & belief*. Goldsmiths, University of London. Available at: <https://www.gold.ac.uk/media/documents-by-section/departments/research-centres-and-units/research-units/faiths-and-civil-society/REforREal-web-b.pdf> (accessed 22 November 2021).
- Dinham A and Shaw M (2017) Religious literacy through religious education: The future of teaching and learning about religion and belief. *Religions* 8(7): 119.
- Dobson A (2006) Thick cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies* 54: 165–184.
- Earl M (2015) *Re-framing Education About Beliefs and Practices in Schools: A Lens and Tools (Concept Based) Approach*. University of Cambridge/Woolf Institute. Available at: <https://www.woolf.cam.ac.uk/assets/file-downloads/Education-Project-Report.pdf> (accessed 5 June 2021).
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2017) *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017*. Eurydice report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fitzgerald T (2007) *Religion and the Secular: Historical and Colonial Formations*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Flood G (1999) *Beyond Phenomenology. Rethinking the Study of Religion*. London: Cassell.
- Franken L (2021) Autonomy and shared citizenship: A ‘neutral’ justification for RE? In: Franck O and Thalen P (eds) *Religious Education in a Post-Secular Age: Case Studies From Europe*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.83–97.
- Freathy R and John HC (2019) Religious education, big ideas and the study of religion(s) and worldview(s). *British Journal of Religious Education* 41(1): 27–40.
- Freire P (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder & Herder.
- Gadamer HG (1975) *Truth and Method* (Trans. J Weinsheimer and DG Marshall), 2nd rev edn. London/New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Gearon L (2002) Human rights and religious education: Some postcolonial perspectives. *British Journal of Religious Education* 24(2): 140–151.

- Gearon L (2003) *Citizenship Through Secondary Religious Education*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Gearon L (ed.) (2009) *Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.
- Giroux HA (2003) Critical theory and educational practice. In: Darder A, Baltodano M and Torres RD (eds) *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. New York, NY and London: RoutledgeFalmer, pp.7–56.
- Goldburg P (2010) Developing pedagogies for inter-religious teaching and learning. In: Engebretson K, de Souza M, Durka G, et al. (eds) *International Handbook of Inter-Religious Education*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp.341–359.
- Grimmitt M (1987) *Religious Education and Human Development*. Great Wakering: McCrimmons.
- Gunnarsson GJ (2021) What about transformative religious education? In: Franck O and Thalen P (eds) *Religious Education in a Post-Secular Age: Case Studies From Europe*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.83–98.
- Hannam P (2019) *Religious Education and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Hannam P and Biesta G (2019) Religious education, a matter of understanding? Reflections on the final report of the commission on religious education. *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 40(1): 55–63.
- Hannam P, Biesta G, Whittle S, et al. (2020) Religious literacy: A way forward for religious education? *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 41(2): 214–226.
- Hervieu-Léger D (2000) Le Pèlerin et le Converti, La Religion en Mouvement. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 41: 395–398.
- Hirsch E (1987) *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jackson R (1997) *Religious Education: An Interpretive Approach*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Jackson R (ed.) (2003) *International Perspectives on Citizenship, Education and Religious Diversity*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Jackson R (2004) *Rethinking Religious Education and Plurality: Issues in Diversity and Pedagogy*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Jackson R (2009) *Studying Religions: The Interpretive Approach in Brief*. Oslo: European Wergeland Centre.
- Jackson R (2014) *Signposts: Policy and Practice for Teaching About Religions and Non-religious Worldviews in Intercultural Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jackson R (2015) Inclusive study of religions and other worldviews in publicly-funded schools in democratic societies. In: Stoeckl K and Roy O (eds) *The Future of Religious Education in Europe*. San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute, pp.7–18.
- Jackson R (2016) *Inclusive Study of Religions and World Views in Schools: Signposts From the Council of Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jackson R (2019) Signposts and the Council of Europe: Special issue on the contribution of ‘inclusive’ religious education to intercultural understanding. *Intercultural Education* 30(3): 237–246.
- Johannessen ØL and Skeie G (2019) The relationship between religious education and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education* 30(3): 260–274.
- Johnson L and Morris P (2010) Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal* 21(1): 77–96.
- Kessler E and Hageaves J (2020) *How We Get Along: The Diversity Study of England and Wales*. Cambridge: Wolf Institute.
- Kymlicka W (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee L (2015) *Recognizing the Non-religious, Reimagining the Secular*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lundie D (2018) Is RE still not working? Reflections on the does RE work? Project 5 years on. *British Journal of Religious Education* 40(3): 348–356.
- McLaughlin TH (1992) Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education* 21(3): 235–250.
- Meijer WAJ (2006) Plural selves and living traditions: A hermeneutical view on identity and diversity. In: Souza M, Engebretson K, Durka G, et al. (eds) *International Handbook of the Religious, Moral and Spiritual Dimensions of Education*. Dordrecht: Springer Academic Publishers, pp.321–332.

- Mendieta E and VanAntwerpen J (eds) (2011) *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Modood T (1998) Anti-Essentialism, multiculturalism and the ‘recognition’ of religious groups. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 6(4): 378–399.
- Modood T (2007) *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Modood T (2019) A multicultural nationalism. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* XXV(II): 233–246.
- Moore D (2007) *Overcoming Religious Illiteracy: A Cultural Studies Approach to the Study of Religion in Secondary Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moulin-Stožek D and Schirr BJ (2017) Identification and disidentification in reported schooling experiences of adolescent Muslims in England. *Oxford Review of Education* 43: 580–595.
- Nongbri B (2013) *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nussbaum MC (2006) Education and Democratic citizenship: Capabilities and quality education. *Journal of Human Development* 7(3): 385–395.
- Nussbaum MC (2012) *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nye M (2018) Response: On deconstructing the deconstruction of the deconstruction of the category of religion. *Implicit Religion* 20(4): 413–420.
- Nye M (2019) Decolonizing the study of religion. *Open Library of Humanities* 5(1): 43.
- OCR (2021) GCSE (9-1) *Specification Religious Studies J625*. Cambridge: OCR. Available at: <https://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/240547-specification-accredited-gcse-religious-studies-j625.pdf>
- OECD (2016) *Global Competency for an Inclusive World*. Paris: OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf> (accessed 5 June, 2021).
- Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2010) *Transforming Religious Education: Religious Education in Schools 2006 – 09*. London: Crown Copyright.
- Osler A (2011) Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: National identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 43(1): 1–24.
- Osler A and Starkey H (2003) Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young People's experiences. *Educational Review* 55(3): 243–254.
- Osler A and Starkey H (2006) Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice 1995–2005. *Research Papers in Education* 21: 433–466.
- O’Grady K (2019) *Religious Education as a Dialogue With Difference. Fostering Democratic Citizenship Through the Study of Religions in Schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Palmer P (1980) *The Promise of Paradox*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Prothero S (2007) *Religious Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know and Doesn't*. New York, NY: HarperOne.
- Religious Education Council of England and Wales (REC) (2013) *A Review of Religious Education in England*. London: Religious Education Council of England and Wales.
- Revell L (2012) *Islam and Education: The Manipulation and Misrepresentation of a Religion*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Sarbicki A (2020) New identity and national entitlement. In: Chater M (ed.) *Reforming Religious Education: Power and Knowledge in a Worldviews Curriculum*. Woodbridge: John Catt Education Ltd, pp.43–44.
- Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement (2018) The ties that bind: Citizenship and civic engagement in the 21st century. Report of Session 2017–2019. *HL Paper 118*. UK Parliament.
- Shaw M (2018) *New representations of religion & belief in schools*. *Religions* 9(11): 364.
- Shaw M (2020) Towards a religiously literate curriculum – Religion and worldview literacy as an Educational model. *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 41(2): 150–161.
- Skeie G (2015) What does conceptualisation of religion have to do with religion in education? In: Beaman L and Arragon L (eds) *Issues in Religion and Education; Whose Religion?* Leiden: Brill, pp.26–141.
- Smith D, Nixon G and Pearce J (2018) Bad religion as false religion: An empirical study of UK religious education teachers’ essentialist religious discourse. *Religions* 9(11): 361.
- Smith JZ (1982) *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Starkey H (2018) Fundamental British values and citizenship education: Tensions between national and global perspectives. *Geografiska Annaler Series B: Human Geography* 100: 149–162.
- Thobani S (2017) The religious–secular interface and representations of Islam in phenomenological religious education. *Oxford Review of Education* 43: 612–625.
- Ubani M, Hyvärinen E, Lemettinen J, et al. (2020) Dialogue, worldview inclusivity, and intra-religious diversity: Addressing diversity through religious education in the Finnish basic education curriculum. *Religions* 11(11): 581.
- UK Home Office (2020) *Hate Crime 2019 to 2020*. Crown Copyright. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2019-to-2020/hate-crime-england-and-wales-2019-to-2020> (accessed 5 June 2021).
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2015) *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2021) Progress update of the international commission on the futures of education. Meeting document: ED-2021/FoE-OD/1. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375746> (accessed 5 June 2021).
- Vikdahl L and Skeie G (2019) Possibilities and limitations of religion-related dialog in schools: Conclusion and discussion of findings from the ReDi project. *Religion & Education* 46(1): 115–129.
- Walker NC, Chan WYA and McEver HB (2021) Religious literacy: Civic education for a common good. *Religion & Education* 48(1): 1–16.
- Weisse W (2019) The European Research Project ReDi: Religion and dialogue in modern societies. An overview. *Religion & Education* 46(1): 1–19.
- White J (2004) Should religious education be a compulsory school subject? *British Journal of Religious Education* 26(2): 151–164.
- Woodhead L (2012a) Plenary. Podcast. In: *New Forms of Public Religion Conference*. Cambridge: St John's College, University of Cambridge. AHRC/ESRC. Available at: http://www.religionandsociety.org.uk/publications/podcasts/show/nfpr_conference_plenary1_woodhead (accessed 22 November 2021).
- Woodhead L (2012b) Religion in Britain has changed, our categories haven't. In: Westminster Faith Debates. Available at: http://faithdebates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/1335118113_Woodhead-FINAL-copy.pdf (accessed 5 June 2021).
- Woodhead L and Catto R (eds) (2012) *Religion and Change in Modern Britain*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Wright A (1993) *Religious Education in the Secondary School, Prospects for Religious Literacy*. London: David Fulton.