

1994 AARE Conference

(27/11/94 to 1/12/94)

Paper Title: (Reference Number LAMB194.125)

Monday, 3.00 pm in Room V02.

"Collective Action Frames: Shaping meaning through inservice courses with a teacher as researcher focus" by Dr Ian P.M. Lambert.

Rationale for AARE Conference Symposium (Dr Doug Blomberg, Dr Stuart Fowler and Dr Ian Lambert).

"Transforming the Practice of Teaching through Research Partnership."

One of the persistent challenges for educational research is to ensure that research makes a difference in improving the quality of teaching practice. The ideas of teacher as researcher and collaborative research have been developed over the last two decades, in part as a response to this challenge. Yet to date there seems to have been limited impact on the practice of teaching from these movements. This suggests a need for further rethinking and investigation in four areas: the dynamics of the relation between practice and beliefs, the nature of professional development programs for teachers, the distinction of theory and practice, and the structure of collaborative research. The three papers in this symposium explore these in the light of innovative research and professional development projects.

Abstract

"Collective Action Frames © shaping meaning through inservice courses with a teacher as researcher focus."

Too often, research has focused on the organisation of specific social movements rather

than the values, beliefs or points of concern underlying them. This paper addresses this question within the contextual framework of recent research I conducted in schools in Britain.

Recently, researchers have adapted Goffman's term "framing", to conceptualise how ideological meanings are proposed to would-be supporters by movement organisers. Four types of alignment have been identified by researchers, which they call "frame bridging", "frame amplification", "frame expansion", and "frame transformation". This

paper shall argue that "frame transformation" implies that the teacher-as-researcher plays a significant role in the school community by grappling with questions about whether or not new values may have to be planted and nurtured in the school, old meanings or understandings jettisoned, and erroneous beliefs or "misframings" reframed.

It will seek to provide some insight into the largely unresolved questions of how collective beliefs are constructed and how they contribute to collective action by attempting to show how, in addition, ideological symbols have been shaped by movement organisers, how effective they have been in mobilising opinion, how they have evolved over time, and how the mobilisation of consensus relates to collective action.

PART 1: THE NEW CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN ; the research context.

This paper draws upon research I conducted between October, 1990 and October, 1993, in Britain as part of my doctoral research at Cambridge University. The purpose for conducting the research was to investigate and evaluate the educational philosophy and practice of a significant and increasing number of independent conservative Evangelical Christian schools who subscribe to the general philosophy of the 'new Christian Schools' movement' in Britain. Central to the focus of the research was the question of whether

these new Christian schools should be encouraged to exist and flourish in British society, or whether they should be denied public support, and by implication, monies.

In recent years in Britain these new kinds of Christian schools have been established by independent groups of parents, and churches for "particular religious, philosophical and pedagogical reasons because of the lack of any acceptable State provision" (Deakin, 1989a). The reasons commonly given for the emergence of these new Christian schools centre on what their supporters perceive to be the failure of the multi-faith approach in many schools which they argue has led to chaos in the area of personal values and morality, and a devaluation and/or marginalisation of Christian perspectives in the curriculum in many schools. The new Christian schools claim to be offering an education based on Christian rather than secular principles, and they have deliberately sought to create stronger links between family, the school and the supporting Christian community. These schools, although only a fragment of the total number of Christian schools

provided by different denominations in Britain, can be identified by the ways in which those involved in these schools understand the particular kind of Christian education they are seeking to provide and how, in practice, they provide it.

From the Charismatic renewal that took place in Britain in the 1960's, numerous independent groupings of Charismatic churches, operating outside the historic denominations, grew rapidly (Wright, 1991). While the Charismatic 'House Church' movement has influenced and supported a large number of these new Christian schools, and can be correctly understood as one of the primary forces behind the movement (Walker, 1988), it is important to recognise that a number of the associated schools are administered and supported by Baptist, Free Evangelical, Evangelical Anglican, Methodist, Reformed Presbyterian, and Pentecostal churches, and a

number of parent™controlled schools exist which have no single church affiliation. The large majority of parents, teachers, and governors in these schools hold Christian convictions that can be loosely classified as Protestant, conservative, Evangelical, and Free church@based.

The first school opened in 1969. While the movement at present does not affect a large number of children, approximately ninety primary and secondary new Christian schools currently exist in Britain and between five and ten schools have indicated that they intended opening at the beginning of the 1994@95 academic year. All of the schools are day schools and vary between twenty@five and 300 pupils, meaning that the overall number of pupils involved in the national movement is still relatively small.

Pluralism, Liberalism and Christian Nurture © A Conflict of Ideas?f

It is widely felt that in a pluralist liberal democratic society which is both multiracial and culturally diverse, ethical considerations point decisively against separate Christian schooling. Yet, in recent years, thousands, possibly millions, of Christian parents in various countries around the world are withdrawing their children from government schools and setting up their own schools because they think that, "their children are being given a false account of the world and of human life" (Newbigin, 1990, p.93). People who call themselves 'mainline' Christians often dismiss them as 'fundamentalists' and think that if the rest of us laugh long enough they will go away. The fact of the matter is that they are showing no signs of doing so.

However, because theorists of liberal education differ quite widely in

the interpretation and emphasis that they give to the various elements of liberal education, a growing number of writers, in recent years, have sought to defend religious upbringing against the concern that it may involve the transmission of non@critical and uncritical learning

(Deakin, 1989a; Laura & Leahy, 1989; McLaughlin, 1984, 1985, 1992; Shortt, 1992; Thiessen, 1987, 1991, 1993). While recognising that competition between paradigms is not the sort of battle that can be resolved by proofs" (Kuhn, 1962, p.149), it is possible to clarify positions held by supporters of alternative Christian schools, and begin to show how they are worked out in practice in the settings of selected Christian schools in a number of countries. Unfortunately, opinions are too easily polarised on this topic, especially among Christians. Therefore, it is also important to take seriously the point McLaughlin makes when he stresses that:

It is rash [...] to condone or condemn certain kinds of separate schools solely on the grounds of philosophical principle. Much depends on how the institutions actually operate, and what their effects actually are on students and the broader community (1992a, p.115).

Clearly, the nature of religious upbringing today needs to be redefined, and the concept of pluralism clarified. There can no longer be an easy identification of Christian development with general education. Religious education within the state school systems of modern, pluralist democracies cannot be regarded as intending to nurture Christian faith.

Christian nurture is offered by Christians to Christians in order to strengthen Christian faith and to develop Christian character. It is easily distinguished from general education, since the latter does not intend the building up of Christian faith (although it may have this effect) nor must the teachers of general education be Christian (although they may be). It is possible but not necessary to base general education on Christian faith, but it is necessary that Christian nurture should spring from and be defined by Christian faith. What is needed is to attend to the real issue that this increasing number of Christians establishing schools are raising, namely, that you cannot add 'values' to a curriculum that teaches a conflicting view of reality, and which

provides no grounds for
thinking that 'value' talk has anything to do with that reality.

The core argument of the new Christian Schools' campaign for public
funding, and by

implication public recognition, is based upon what its supporters
understand is a confused and inadequate understanding of
pluralism, as it is currently understood in
Britain's multi-faith approach to education. Certainly, the
concept of pluralism is
contentious and often ambiguous since one of the problems concerning
the use of the
term 'pluralism' is the variety of connotations it possesses. Deakin
states that:

Pluralism in education is not only a viable option it is the
only option which does justice to
all interested parties, and avoids giving too much control to any one
philosophical or
religious standpoint or societal structure (1989b, p.16).

This argument is based on the premise that the present
education system represents a
mono-cultural education system which only serves to water down the
essential ingredients
of all faiths by reducing them to their behavioural and cultural
phenomena, and avoiding
questions of ultimate commitment (Deakin, 1989b, pp. 5-7). Hence, the
supporters of
the British new Christian Schools commonly argued that a truly
multi-cultural, pluralist
society will make room for all expressions of faith, provided they are
expressed in a spirit
of mutual tolerance, rather than forcing them all together in a
confusing synthesis which
does justice to none (Lambert, 1994, p.74).

The question, therefore remains, how do pluralism and liberalism
relate? McLaughlin
highlights an important point with regard to the arguments supporting
the ideal of liberal
neutrality, where he states that:

least a lack of certainty, about
what the good life, in any substantial sense, consists in (1992c,
p.109).

This type of 'agnosticism', according to supporters of

the new Christian Schools in Britain simply serves to create, in schools, a "myth of religious neutrality" (Deakin and Jones, 1993; Clouser, 1991). Similarly, Marshall argues that while a liberal society prides itself on having an open and pluralist education system, it only serves to undercut distinctive communities and replaces them with a uniform regime of individuals and individual choices. In short, he says:

of others to liberalism, and the erection of a liberal social order.... Under the sincerely held belief in diversity through individual freedom liberals seek to recreate society in their own image (1988, p.23).

The interesting point in all of this discussion is that many of the conservative Evangelical

Christians who supported these new Christian Schools did not, as is often perceived, have a fear of a society which deliberately seeks to preserve and encourage religious and cultural pluralism, but rather were more concerned about a kind of dominant liberalism that may inadvertently marginalise religious belief and specific identities.

What this issue, in particular, highlights, is the degree to which these recently established Christian school movements in various countries have begun to mobilise opinion within their respective contexts and have collectively refined and constructed their beliefs about education (and its theological implications). While the primary focus of this paper will be upon the establishment and development of alternative Christian schools within Australia, a comparative analysis of international developments will be made by drawing upon recent detailed research conducted in Australia (Lambert, 1994b; Long, 1994), Great Britain (Lambert, 1994a, O'Keefe, 1993), and North America (Peshkin, 1986; Rose, 1988; Stronks and Blomberg, 1994; Van Brummelen, 1986, 1989).

Summary and discussion of Literature © Direct and Indirect Antecedent Analyses and Implications.

The small body of literature, still fewer authors, and the lack of research-based writing concerned with the new Christian Schools in Britain and elsewhere suggests a relatively unexamined territory. Nevertheless, a central point that is highlighted in the available literature is the desire of the supporters of these schools to re-align their thinking concerning values, morality, family, belief, faith and cultural engagement in accordance with their understanding of the Bible. O'Keeffe (1992) indicates that the "Unique Selling Point" of these schools is that they endeavour to set curriculum within a Christian framework. These points have been confirmed by this research.

British and other writers indicate that the type of Christian education offered in the British new Christian Schools and similar kinds of schools in other countries, is given internal coherence because the theoretical framework in the schools is sensitive to, and consistent with, their Christian world-view (Van Brummelen, 1988; Deakin, 1989a; Fowler, 1990; Roques, 1989). Such an education is understood to be "an alternative education developed from a completely different root of life" (Mechielsen, 1980), and the ultimate criterion by which the world-view is judged is an understanding that God is Creator of heaven and earth, and that humankind has been created in the image of God. (Macaulay and Barrs, 1978; Mechielsen, 1980; Van Brummelen, 1988; Hill,

1989b; Fowler, 1990). The educational philosophy and practice in each of the sample schools, and the world-view motives and assumptions, are similar, yet have been interpreted in significantly different ways.

What was seen to have influenced the sample schools, and indeed, the wider group of new Christian Schools in Britain in recent years is a body of literature by North American and Australian authors writing from within the Reformational tradition of Protestant Christianity. This writing has clearly influenced the educational philosophy

and aims of the sample schools. Their adoption, in differing degrees, of the theological and educational perspectives developed in this literature, provides a key to understanding the sample schools' motives, goals and aims. For example, three distinctive features found in much of this writing include the understanding that:

- 1) all of life must be viewed and lived from the perspective of Christianity, including the scholarly life;
- 2) there is no large neutral area of scholarship as every academic discipline presupposes a theoretic view of reality. Because faith and scholarship are seen to be integrated, the aim of Christian scholarship is to help students to develop a Christian world-view @ an integral and unified way of looking at the world @ which will enable them to make penetrating and informed analyses of the various cultural movements and forces encountered in modern society;
- 3) the Christian community is called to be a community in which a tradition of rational discourse is developed which leads to a true understanding of reality because it takes as a starting point and as a permanent criterion of truth the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The community is God's means of empowering people. Thus, the spiritual and intellectual health of the Christian community is understood to be reflected in the degree to which the Christian community can engage and transform culture through its Christian cultural vision.

Studies of Fundamentalist Christian Schools in America indicate that the schools that were researched placed greater significance on the development of 'spirituality' than learning how to learn (Peshkin, 1986), and many of the Christian practices and beliefs are described as reactionary, and limiting rather than liberating (Rose, 1988). The

exclusivism that Peshkin and Rose found in the North American schools

created social and theological division because the schools focused on who was right and wrong, rather than on what was true or false. This tendency was not prevalent in the sample schools in this British study, although some research subjects suggested that it was evident in the educational philosophy and practice of many of the prototypical Accelerated Christian Education (ACE) schools that were established in Britain.

The nature of spiritual experience that the students' encountered in the sample schools was of a distinctively Christian kind, and was developed within the framework of consenting communities. The assertion by these schools that the Christian spiritual experience was not a negation of 'secular' areas of life and an affirmation of 'sacred' areas, but a renewal and conversion of one's whole life and outlook before God, meant that the educational process was concerned with the development of the students' full range of human faculties and the 'right' use of those faculties before, and in the service of God (see, for example, Macaulay and Barrs, 1978). Parents, governors and teachers believed that they were providing an alternative to what they perceived as the "dualistic and disembodied Christianity" that was offered in many state-maintained, independent and other church schools.

Distinctive features of the new Christian Schools in Britain.^f

It is important to recognise that while each of the new Christian Schools in Britain expounded the preeminence of the religious dimension of life, much diversity existed among the various schools associated with the new Christian Schools' movement. Noticeable differences in the physical environments, management structures, and the degree of Christian emphasis and the location of that emphasis in the schools' programs were evident. What was distinctive in the schools was the caring environment they had each created, and the strong sense of student ownership of the school and its values that

existed.

Also, the different emphases on the importance of school uniforms, school rules, and the degree to which student/teacher roles were clearly defined reflected diverse influences, including the geographical location of the school, the class aspirations of the community members, and the schooling experience of the students, parents, teachers, and governors. Another significant factor was the degree to which the personnel responsible for the

organisational and ideological leadership in the schools were able to identify and co^mordinate the basic assumptions, core values, and the various cultural elements that symbolised, directly and indirectly, the composite of values, philosophy and ideology which shaped and defined the schools' educational task.

One of the most surprising discoveries in the sample schools was that very few external features or schooling practices reflected the Charismatic foundations of the schools or the continuing religious practices of the sponsoring Charismatic churches. A non^mdenominational climate was evident in each of the schools even though the teachers clearly modelled commitment to a Christian way of life, and the vast majority were active members of Charismatic churches. Although the teachers emphasised the importance of Christian love, acceptance and forgiveness both in and out of the classrooms, very little formal religious expression was expected or demanded from the students.

Even though the specific literature about the British new Christian Schools (Rowlands, 1987; CiE, 1987; Dennett, 1988; Hughes, 1988, 1990; and Deakin 1989a), and the school documents published by the sample schools had emphasised the close relationships the schools enjoyed with their sponsoring church(es), the research found that in some instances in the sample schools, those relationships had been strained, broken, or were loosely coupled. In the sample schools' early history, the sponsoring churches had provided the initial financial security for the schools, and Church leaders had vigorously

promoted the schools to their congregants. However, a number of the governors, Principals and Head Teachers did explain that over the years their definition and understanding of 'church' had considerably broadened to incorporate "the wider body of believers that relate to the school, rather than the particular denomination or Christian institution that founded the school" (Governor of Roundwood Christian School).

Although the sample schools had experienced some difficulty defining and developing the nature of the partnership between the sponsoring church(es) and the schools, many of the three sample schools' leaders still regarded the church/school link as crucial. However, a majority of teachers and leaders at the sample schools were concerned that the sponsoring church(es) did not understand what it was that the schools were trying to achieve. Their comments reflected the concern expressed by Alan Storkey, a sociologist writing from a Christian perspective:

[A] characteristic response, especially among Nonconformists, is to concentrate on issues of private morality and to ignore the whole range of broader economic, social and political issues which equally involve questions of justice and righteousness, but which have been pushed outside Christian concern (Storkey, 1979, p. 403).

The schools' supporters commonly explained that the failure of their sponsoring church(es) leaders and many congregants to fully understand the kind of Christian education the sample schools were offering was due largely to the fact that the churches continued to emphasise Christian thinking and understanding in areas which were narrowly theological. This apparent reluctance by some Christians to think, understand, and act in the public domain has historical roots, as David Martin explains:

It is worth engaging a little on the evangelical attitude to education. Obviously literacy is essential to meditation on Scripture and for adequate daily refreshment

of the soul. [...]

Literacy is also essential to achieving or sustaining a decent, probably non-manual job, and security for one's family: particularly was this the case some fifty years or more ago. Thus education served spiritual and secular vocations alike, but it was still not specially valuable in itself. [...] Hence evangelicals persistently attempted to restrict the scope of experience to a context of religious discipline (Martin, 1967, p. 61).

A significant number of adult subjects expressed their concern that the sponsoring churches, and indeed, many non-conformist churches, appeared to be failing to encourage their members to work out and embody the Christian faith in every sphere of human activity. As a direct result of this concern, each of the schools had deliberately endeavoured to avoid the kind of dualism that they believed allows life to be divided either consciously or sub-consciously into two realms - the sacred and the secular. The dualism that the supporters of these schools understood to be operative in many long established church schools is typified by a former Housemaster and senior English Master of the Leys School, Cambridge, who detected such a division in educational practice back in 1942:

Scripture is taught, sermons are preached, prayers are said, confirmations are carried out and what is the result of all this educational effort? [...] The schoolboy seems to regard his chapel as a quaint survival, an educational enigma, a symbol of ineffectiveness or an instrument of yet further torture in the hands of an inscrutable

authority, but apparently from his behaviour when he has left he does not think that it has any relevance to life (Hughes, D., 1942, p. 19).

The religious dimension of life in the sample schools, incorporating the world-view assumptions, values, and the ways in which the people associated with the sample schools generally interacted with their surrounding culture, served to provide a relationship

between theological beliefs and assumptions, educational philosophy and practice, as well as group consciousness and collective action.

Despite the fact that the sample schools had been founded independently of each other, and had very little contact with each other, the central aims were remarkably similar and would all be described in similar religious terms. However, there was no 'blueprint' of aims that was determined prior to the establishment of the schools and adhered to during the course of their existence, and the schools' leaders understood that their aims and educational practices were still developing and being re@formulated as their schools matured and adapted to changing conditions.

The Sample Schools and their views of culture.*f*

Attempting to determine the reasons for the growth of all of the schools associated with this diverse group of new Christian Schools in Britain is beyond the scope of this paper. While some of the schools associated with the wider movement were clearly antipathetic to the principles and practice of state@maintained schools, understanding them to be "anti@Christian", "inherently evil", "humanistic", and "immoral", others were endeavouring to cooperate with the state, and to openly associate with other religious and non@religious school groups. Harro Van Brummelen (1989), has suggested that the basic reason for these different kinds of emphases in Christian Schools stems from different understandings among Christian individuals and communities concerning the nature of the interaction Christians should have with their surrounding culture.

Many of the significant differences among the wider group of schools associated with the Christian Schools' Trust can be understood to have stemmed from different world@views or understandings of the necessary relation of the Christian faith to culture. Van Brummelen interpreted his findings using a modification of the system of categorisation developed by H. Richard Niebuhr (1951) which seeks to interpret the different ways in which Christians understand and relate their faith to culture.

Niebuhr's fivefold
categorisation included the following models: Christ against

culture; Christ of culture;
Christ above culture; Christ and culture in paradox; and Christ the
transformer of culture.

These categorisations were employed in this study to
interpret its findings in
relation to the degree to which the sample schools related to modern
British culture in
general, and mainstream educational praxis specifically.

Niebuhr's Christ against culture model emphasises the opposition
between Christ and
culture. That is, whatever may be the customs of the society in which
the Christian lives,
and whatever the human achievements it conserves, Christ is seen as
opposed to them, so
that he confronts the Christian with an 'either/or' decision. Hence,
proponents
understand that they are called to "abandon the world [and to] come out
from among
them and be separate" (1951, p. 40-41).

The Christ of culture model recognises a fundamental agreement
between Christ and
culture. Here, Jesus Christ appears as the great hero of human
cultural history, and his
life and teachings are regarded as the greatest human achievement. In
him it is believed,
the aspirations of humans toward their values are brought to a point of
culmination; he
confirms what is best in the past, and guides the process of
civilisation to its proper goal.
This model suggests that it is possible for humans to work within
present culture since
through God's common grace in Christ God works in society through many
institutions
beside the church and through individuals other than Christians.

Niebuhr's remaining three models agree with each other in seeking to
maintain the great
difference between the two principles of Christ and culture, and in
understanding to hold
them together in some unity. They are distinguished from each other by
the manner in which each attempts to combine the two authorities.
Thus, the Christ above culture
model understands that Christ is the fulfilment of cultural aspirations
and the restorer of

the institutions of true society. Christ is understood to enter into life from 'above' with gifts which human aspiration has not envisioned and which human effort cannot attain unless Christ relates humankind to a supernatural society, and a new value@centre. Thus, while humankind can and should work with God@given reason in God@given reality and thus develop culture, Christ is understood to far surpass anything in that culture. In this synthetic type, "We must expend a great deal of effort to lead moral, disciplined, individual lives since that points us away from the temporal to the spiritual world" (VanBrummelen, 1989, p. 38).

The fourth model - Christ and culture in paradox -

may be called, dualist. This model refuses to accommodate the claims of Christ to those of secular society, as, in their estimation, believers of the second and third model do. People who fit this category are like the Christ against culture believers, yet they differ from them in the conviction that obedience to God requires obedience to the institutions of society and loyalty to its members as well as obedience to a Christ who sits in judgment on that society. Hence, humans are seen as being subject to two moralities, and as citizens of two worlds that are not only discontinuous with each other, but largely opposed. In the polarity and tension of Christ and culture, "life must be lived precariously and sinfully in the hope of a justification which lies beyond history" (Niebuhr, 1951, p. 43).

Finally, the Christ the transformer of culture model sees Christ as the converter of humankind and culture. What distinguishes these conversionists from dualists is their more positive and hopeful attitude toward culture. The central convictions in this model are based on 'creation', 'fall', and 'redemption'. Accordingly, the person of Jesus Christ is understood to have historically entered into a human culture that has never been without his ordering action. As a consequence of the fall (sin), human nature has become corrupted it is not bad in the sense that it ought not to exist but it has become

warped, twisted, and misdirected. The problem of redeeming culture is therefore the problem of its conversion, not its replacement. According to this model, the believer must be engaged in changing the sin@permeated structures of society through the application of the principles of the gospel to all spheres of life and human activity.

The sample schools' believed that the process of secularisation, evident in many state™maintained schools, had served to trivialise and marginalise any distinctive Christian perspectives or insights in those schools. Their communities' corporate response was to provide an alternative educational model with a distinctively Christian foundation. They believed that, according to their understanding of a Christian vision of life, an effective Christian response to secularisation cannot be achieved by "putting a Christian icing on a secular cake", that is, by adding Christian Religious Education, assemblies, or Christian clubs and societies to what they perceive to be a secular education. They believed that what was needed was a "brand new cake!" (Mechielsen, 1980, p. vi). While the base ingredients of that cake (aims) were similar in each of the sample schools, the particular flavour and design varied, as did the motivations of the makers and the purpose for which it was made.

Summary of Favourable Characteristics of the Sample Schools^f

While the sample parents commonly emphasised their dissatisfaction and unwillingness to commit their children to the current state@maintained sector or other kinds of independent schools when a Christian alternative of this kind was available, none of the schools in their present form demonstrated sectarian or withdrawal tendencies (Christ against culture). Also, the teachers in the sample schools demonstrated a willingness to dialogue with and learn from other religious and non@religious educational organisations, although they were wary that accommodation tendencies may occur as a result of such engagement. Their common goal was to prepare students to live in the

midst of contemporary society, while a prerequisite of this goal was that the students understand the sources, roots, values, aims and ideals of the society in which they were to engage. Thus, the sample schools' different perceptions of the way in which the Christian is to interact with culture serves to explain the different emphases that were evident in the schools' philosophy and practice, even though their aims and objectives were very similar. It also provides an understanding of the degree of compatibility this kind of Evangelical Christian education has with other kinds of religious schooling, and mainstream educational theory and practice.

For the supporters of these British Christian Schools, the formative influence of religion was not to be restricted to overt religious practices and beliefs in their schools' educational program, but was to be evident through the provision of a Christian dimension that permeated and directed the entire educational program. The teachers commonly explained that their "commitment to Christ" did not necessarily mean that they were more effective teachers. However, they commonly expressed the opinion that their "commitment to Christ" and to a Christian vision of life and lifestyle had radically changed their perspective concerning the purpose of life and the needs of humanity.

The sample schools adopted an approach similar to that by Jewish mystical writer, Martin Buber, namely, the teacher must be what they want their pupils to become. In this sense, they commonly understood that they were 'disciplining' the students. While Buber emphasised the freedom of individuals, he also recognised that teachers must have a strong directive role in the educational process. He understood that educators were

responsible for selecting and arranging the world of values which they present to the students. The concept of 'inclusion' is an important one for Buber. Like the teachers in

the sample schools, Buber saw that an inclusion relationship exists between two persons who experience a common event in which at least one person actively participates. In this relationship:

One person without forfeiting anything of the felt reality of his activity, at the same time lives through the common event from the standpoint of another ... I call it experiencing the other side (Buber, 1965, p. 97 quoted in Elias, 1989).

Similarly, the teachers in the sample schools were conscious of the dialogical relationship they had with their students they tended to call this relationship "discipling". Through the example of their lifestyle they were manifesting their understanding of reality, acutely aware that they were selecting and communicating that reality to their students. The Humanities teacher from Grace School offered his understanding of the Christian teacher's task:

It is fundamentally wrong to model the Christian life to students without making it known to them that is what you are doing. They must be able to think and assess what they see and measure it against the principles and values I, as a teacher claim to be practising ... So I suppose I am trying to demonstrate the Christian life which I believe is good, fulfilling and meaningful.

This teacher, as did others, believed that it was not the school's aim to try to form and shape character solely by reference to a particular cultural pattern, or seek to fit persons into that pattern. He argued that his task was to transmit that which he thought worthwhile "the fundamental message of the gospel of Christ" and to endeavour to improve existing cultural and educational standards and activities in the process. In this way, all teachers shared a responsibility for the religious dimension of the schools, which permeated in differing degrees in each setting, the curriculum, ethos, and management practices.

Although teachers recognised that liberal educationalists may view

their educational philosophy and practices with some hostility, they commonly understood that, in their opinion, 'real' community was only possible when people have a common pattern of life that is meaningful and coherent; one based upon, and oriented by, a shared vision of life (world view). Their views concerning their school communities were

similar to those expressed by Jones who maintains that:

enshrines and mediates, learning is both haphazard and largely ineffective. [A] school will only be a 'good' school if it has an explicit world view that: undergirds and advances its educational task; and is supported by the teachers and parents (Jones, 1992, p. 10).

PART 2: THE ROOTS OF AUSTRALIAN CHRISTIAN PARENT CONTROLLED SCHOOLS

The first association for Christian Parent controlled schools in Australia was formed in Kingston and Hobart in Tasmania in 1953, a development that eventually led to the establishment of Calvin Christian School in 1962. Since then, other openings have followed and a national office Christian Parent Controlled Schools Limited has been established and represents and supports some seventy primary and secondary schools throughout Australia with approximately 20,000 students enrolled. However, it is important to recognise that this significant schooling movement did not happen fortuitously.

Contrary to common misunderstandings, the schools were never Reformed Church schools, but rather, schools that were established and governed by parents who were, in the early years, commonly members of the Reformed Church of Australia. Deenick notes that:

From 1976 to 1980 most of the new schools were still marked by a major involvement by Reformed Church members, although members of other denominations were usually also

involved. However, from 1981 onward most of the 37 new schools had little, if any, involvement by Reformed Church members other than through the [National Office of Christian Parent Controlled Schools Ltd] (1990, p. 248).

Hence, they have always been non-denominational schools, admitting children from any denomination, the crucial factor being the desire of the parents for a Biblically informed education within a distinctively Christian setting. Also, as the name suggests, there is a strong parental involvement in the schools with regard to the orientation of the schools and their respective policies and practices. One of the most distinctive features of the Christian parent-controlled schooling movement in Australia is that it allows for and encourages autonomy and diversity. What is not always clearly understood by observers, and even some parents, students and teachers in Christian parent-controlled schools, is

that this particular educational approach has common roots in a unique religious/historical tradition.

Although this movement was initiated by Dutch immigrants, it had its origins much earlier in the Netherlands, where in the second half of last century, Protestants and Roman Catholics joined forces to wage a tremendous political struggle against the 'liberals' for equality with the State school regarding the financial support for their schools. Dutch statesman Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer (1801-1876) believed that the ideals of the Enlightenment, as they had come to expression in the French Revolution (No God, No Master), and as embraced by the Dutch liberals, constituted the most serious threat ever to the place of Christianity in European culture. Van Prinsterer and others believed that the State school was failing to support Christian values and beliefs, and fought for many years for the right to establish separate Christian schools. In 1859, the new Education Act provided this 'freedom', but ruled out State subsidies, and maintained the adjective 'Christian' for government schools.

Van Prinsterer's political initiative gained real strength when Abraham Kuyper assumed leadership in 1877. Kuyper's political agenda included State aid for religious schools and parental autonomy in educational action. Eventually in 1889, the liberals lost government control and a coalition of Protestant and Roman Catholic political forces legislated the first subsidies for non-government schools. By 1917, Christian schools in the Netherlands were fully funded by the state, and by the 1950s Christian schools were present in most towns and accessible to virtually all parents who desired to have a distinctively Christian education for their children.

Thus, when the Dutch Protestants immigrated to Australia in the 1950's, they realised that Christian schools similar to those they were familiar with in Holland did not exist. Many of the new arrivals were unskilled or their qualifications were not recognised in Australia. Hence, they could not afford to send their children to high fee paying denominational schools. As parents met and discussed their predicament, preparation was made to establish schools similar to those in Holland which would be available to children from Christian families. From these grass-roots beginnings, a significant group of Christian schools has developed and continues to redefine its focus and aims in modern Australian society.

From these beginnings to now (almost forty-five years) there has been a

degree of collective shaping and directing of C.P.C.S. by key personnel in schools and in the national office. Further, the Australian Association of Christian Schools (AACS) has been formed by Christian Parent Controlled Schools and Christian Community Schools (C.C.S.) a movement of similar proportions, yet distinguishable by their governance by local churches, rather than by parents. Through AACS, these schools have substantial networks in regard to government liaison, teacher development programs,

curriculum development, publications and school leadership. In particular, they work in close association with Lutheran schools of Australia, Seventh-day Adventist Schools, other independent Christian schools and Jewish Schools through the Christian Schools Consultative Group (CSCG) which together comprise some 315 schools, 4,000 teaching staff and 63,000 students.

PART 3: Social Movement and Collective Behaviour Tradition.

Introduction

Human action cannot be reduced to social structures and impersonal social forces. From birth to death, human beings are embedded within cultural contexts that provide them with belief systems that help guide their actions and infuse them with meaning and comprehensibility. But neither are they simply detached cultural actors, given that they are also embedded within structural contexts that shape their actions and limit their options. To understand human action, therefore, attention has to centre on the intersection between culture and structure. This is especially true in the study of collective action because it focuses on a human enterprise in which culture and structure function as both constraints and promoters of social change.

What is significant for the purposes of this paper is the question: do belief systems and symbols that inspire individuals to take collective action possess autonomous mobilising potential, or are they simply the mechanical expressions of material interest, religious frustration, political opportunity, or power? Further, an exploration of the largely unresolved question of how collective beliefs are constructed by groups and how they contribute to collective action will be initiated by providing some insights into the ways in which, over time, grass-roots educational movements in Britain and Australia have had their ideological commitments and symbols increasingly shaped by movement organisers.

Finally, by relating my recent research in Christian schools in Britain to the Australian context, a more specific discussion of inservice courses provided by the National Institute for Christian Education (a professional development initiative of Christian Parent Controlled Schools in Australia) will be carried out.

Social Movement and Collective Behaviour Traditions - a brief historical overview.

Several approaches to the study of social movements and collective behaviour developed in sociology prior to the upsurge of activism in the 1960s, and there was little integration among them. Four major lines were most prominent: (1) the mass society approach (Fromm 1941; Hoffer 1951; Kornhauser 1959), which combined Le Bonian assumptions and images of massification with a horror of fascism, provided a diagnosis of the transformed nature of social movements in modern times (this approach has structural and psychological versions); (2) the political geography@sociology approach (Heberle 1951; Lipset 1950), which linked social class and social relations of production to voting behaviour, party mobilisation, and political power; (3) the Chicago school (Park and Burgess 1921; Park 1967; Fuller and Meyers 1941; Turner and Killian 1957; Lang and Lang 1961), which analysed the forms of collective behaviour and the social construction of collective action (in contrast to the political@sociology approach, which ignored the elementary forms of collective behaviour, this school played down political links and (structure); and (4) the institutionalist approach (Selznick 1952; Gusfield 1955; Messinger 1955), which drew on themes in Weber and Michels and was concerned with the routinization of charisma, organizational adaptation, and the iron law of oligarchy. Of course, these approaches were not sealed off from one another. For instance, Lipset contributed to both political geography analysis and to institutional analysis.

These earlier approaches all more or less assumed an increase in grievances as the major engine of social movements. Much recent work on social movements has

demonstrated how collective action emerges from and is shaped by preexisting patterns of social relations among adherents of social movements. In the 1970s, Social movement theory was transformed by the emergence of what has come to be known as the resource mobilisation (RM) approach (Zald and McCarthy, 1987). This change of direction in theory and research was a conscious and deliberate rebellion against the collective behaviour studies of previous decades (Morris and Herring, 1987). Two central assertions of the Resource Mobilisation framework are:

1. that social movement activities are not spontaneous and

disorganised; and

2. that social movement participants are not irrational.

Both these claims are seen as rebuttals of the classical collective behaviour model which was tainted by an unacceptable premise of participants' "irrationality" and the derogatory view of movements this implied. This new understanding has inspired researchers to look for models that would instead accord with Michael Schwartz's postulate that "social movement participants are at least as rational as those who study them" (Morris, 1984). Thus, Resource Mobilization does not centre around the question of why individuals join social movements, the rationality or irrationality of their intentions or behaviour as participants, but rather on the effectiveness with which movements, that is movement organisations, use the resources in attempting to achieve their goals.

Although social movements participants are no more or less irrational than anyone else, achieving a measured and rational response is an accomplishment. This is not well understood by defining all behaviour as rational. Certainly, in relation to the development and growth of the alternative Christian schooling movement in Australia and elsewhere, the provision of inservice teacher education is one obvious instance in

which a movement organisation Christian Parent Controlled Schools Ltd has attempted to anticipate and re@direct noncalculated and self@defeating responses and reactions by movement participants (particularly teachers and parents) to social and political change.

On the one hand, some types of behaviour may be meta@rational, in the sense of Weber's "value@rationality" as contrasted with merely instrumental rationality.

These behaviours reflect considerations of ends or values rather than means. Socio@economic models (e.g. Etzioni, 1988; Hirschman, 1986) define motivations for such behaviour as moral commitmentsf that is, as sources of value other than being better off, no matter how "better off" is defined. These moral commitments are explicitly distinguished from pleasure, both theoretically and experientially. Hirschman (1986) notes that such values act as "meta@preferences" that is, means of consciously reflecting on and deliberately changing one's preferences; they involve the choice of ends rather than means of achieving a specified end. As Etzioni notes, such moral commitments are often "explicitly based on the denial of pleasure in the name of the principle(s) involved" (1988,p.45).

Moral behaviour as such distinctively expresses the affirmation of a value rather than its accomplishment or consumption. Hirschman labels "striving" and suggests that this is what we experience as giving our lives purpose and meaning (1986, p.149@55). Indeed, many social movements are committed to such moral principles and attempt to realise them in the process of collective mobilisation itself as much as in the stated outcome of such endeavours. However, in all this, it is important to understand that individual preferences are not a single set of stable values attached to "objective" outcomes but rather the result of contextual frames by which the outcomes are interpreted (Snow and Bensford, 1988). Thus, a social movement, particularly a grass@roots movement such as that evident in the growth and development of alternative Christian

schools in this and other countries in recent years, must not be understood as monolithic in any sense, but rather a collection of diverse values, beliefs and motivations being constantly evaluated and reformed in accordance with certain basic biblical principles.

Shaping a Collective Identity in the new Christian Schools.

Collective identity, which has increasingly developed in the Christian school movements in Australia and Britain in recent years, concerns the mesh between the individual and cultural systems. More specifically, the question is how individuals' sense of who they are becomes engaged with a definition shared by co-participants in some effort at social change that is, with who "we" are. More specifically, the question is how individuals help develop and maintain loyalty and commitment to collective actors that is, to groups or organisations who act as carriers of social movements. The prime research question, then, is not who the actors are or what motivates them, or what wider historical or structural meaning a particular movement may have, but rather why some movements are more successful than others. Success here is defined as a function of how clearly organisational goals are defined and how effectively its available resources @ people, material, and ideas @ are put to use both in mobilising support and in seeing to it that the established institutions take seriously the aims expressed by the movement.

Melucci (1989) suggests that the construction of a collective identity is the most central task of "new" social movements. This is a negotiated process in which the "we" involved in collective action is elaborated and given meaning. He

emphasises the reflexivity of these new movements that is, their tendency to ask themselves explicit questions about "who we are". Primarily, this is the result of fact that when people bind their fate to the fate of the group, they personally feel threatened when the group is

threatened. Thus, as Melucci observes, "the process of constructing, maintaining, and altering a collective identity provides the basis for actors to shape their expectations and calculate the costs and benefits of their action" (1989, p.34). This certainly appears to be the case for many parents, teachers, and organisational leaders in the new Christian school movements.

Social Movements as Knowledge Producers.

The collective articulation of movement identity can be likened to a process of social learning in which movement organisations act as structuring forces, opening a space in which creative interaction between individuals can take place. Eyerman and Jamison (1991) argue that at a certain point in time, the interaction takes on a further dimension, as different organisations together carve out an actual societal space, transforming what began as interpersonal interests into interorganisational concerns, that is, from individual into wider social terms.

It is precisely in the creation, articulation, formulation of new thoughts and ideas and new knowledge that a social movement defines itself in society. Thus, it can be argued that cognitive praxis is the core activity of a social movement, which means seeing knowledge creation as a collective process. As I shall seek to demonstrate, the cognitive praxis of many social movements lies between the disparate types of knowledge. That is, social movements create new types of knowledge as well as recombine or connect previously separate types of knowledge with each other. This is particularly true of in the case of the new or alternative Christian school movement in Australia.

All activists in social movements are, in some sense, "movement intellectuals," because through their activism they contribute to the formation of the movement's collective identity, to making the movement what it is. We have seen in the example of the

Christian schools in Australia, that the "movement intellectuals" have been, by and large, parents. However, increasingly, it is possible to distinguish between movement intellectuals, as those who carry out their tasks within a social movement, and established

intellectuals, who are formed within established social institutional contexts. Christian Parent Controlled Schools in Australia, through their national office, and in more recent times, through the National Institute for Christian Education, sought to transform the practice of teachers in Christian schools through research partnership and inservice teacher education courses. The important question then is, why have they done this?

Collective Action Frames © the dynamics of the relation between practice and beliefs.

Sidney Tarrow (1992) points out that, when people come together in collective action it takes a very special kind of culture choice to do so. He says:

Rather than entire segments of a society reacting automatically to their social situations or choosing one culture over another, enterprising individuals and groups draw upon existing mentalities and cultures to create action-oriented frames of meaning (p. 186)

Few schools would now question the assumption that collective action must be undergirded by shared understandings. Indeed, ideology serves as an economising device with which leaders signal a movement's goals to their adversaries, make a complex universe comprehensible to ordinary people, communicate messages among leaders, supporters and outsiders, and provide movements with the solidarity that enables them to maintain themselves and expand their influence in the face of repression, cooptation, or indifference (Apter et al. 1960). But instead of focusing on the content of the formal ideologies of movement organisations, many scholars now focus on collective identities

and frames of meaning that link members of social movements and movement networks to one another.

However, since ideologies link movement leaders to others in their society, it must follow that the content of their messages is relational "that it builds action-oriented purposive messages out of the materials they find in their societies" (Tarrow, 1992, p. 187). David Snow provides a starting point for linking movement ideologies both to societal mentalities "long term, unfocused, and passive popular beliefs about existing society that are not oriented toward action in the public arena" and to political culture (Snow et al. 1986).

Snow and his collaborators argue that there is a special category of cognitive

understandings "frames" that relate to collective action (see Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford, 1988; 1992). They argue that social movement organisers act as the "carriers and transmitters" of these meanings and, among other things, are "actively engaged in the production of [new] meaning for participants, antagonists and observers" (Snow and Benford, 1988, p. 198).

By adopting Goffman's (1974) term framing, which they define as "schemata of interpretation" (Snow et al. 1986), to conceptualise how ideological meanings are proposed by movement organisers to would-be supporters, they argue that frame alignment is a necessary condition for movement participation, whatever its nature or intensity (Snow et al. 1986, p. 464).

Frame alignment can occur in four ways: "frame bridging", "frame amplification", "frame expansion", and "frame transformation" (p. 467). Snow and his collaborators see these as different strategies of linking a movement's message to its prospective supporters. I am proposing that these few strategies which may be mutually exclusive "serve to reflect the

different associations that different kinds of Christian schools maintain with the wider educational milieu, or more broadly, culture (Lambert, 1994; Niebuhr, 1951; Van Brummelen, 1989). And more importantly, they demonstrate how movement organisers can both support and challenge individual's beliefs and understandings and focus attention on their existing values and predispositions.

In the example of Christian Parent Controlled Schools, Australia, the establishment of the National Institute for Christian Education can be understood as an initiative of movement organisers designed to promote heightened collective identity, amongst C.P.C.S. schools and a greater sense of collective action that has been informed and distinctively shaped by ideological imperatives.

The four frame alignment strategies developed by Snow and his collaborators can be summarised in the following way:

Frame bridging: This is the least ambitious form of framing. It "refers to the linkage of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem" (1986, p. 467).

Frame amplification: This refers to "the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame bearing on a particular issue (1986, p. 469).

Frame extension: By this process, a movement attempts to "enlarge its adherent pool by portraying its objectives or activities as attending to or being congruent with the values or interests of potential adherents" (1986, p. 472).

Frame transformation: When a movement wishes to put forward a radically new set of ideas, it must engage in frame transformation, which implies that "new values may have to be planted and nurtured, old meanings or understandings jettisoned, and erroneous beliefs or 'misframings' reframed" (1986, p. 473).

In all but the most transformational framing efforts, organisers

attempt to relate their goals and programs directly to the existing values and predispositions of their target public. They are thus in a certain sense both consumers of existing cultural meanings and producers of new meanings. Collective action is, then, "the stage in which new meanings are produced, as well as a text full of old meanings" (Tarrow, 1992, p. 189).

CONCLUSIONf

The kind of movement framing that might be expected to emerge from the development of inservice teacher education courses developed by the National Institute for Christian Education is a kind that aims to detach teachers, parents, and students from any form of habitual passivity that may result from their being a part of a consenting community. Further, in line with the "Christ the transformer of Culture" model that is the preferred Christ/culture relationship in Christian Parent Controlled Schools in Australia, the development of inservice courses with a teacher as researcher focus, aims to encourage frame transformation from the bottom up, that is, by seeking to affect some kind of cognitive/ideational alignment within school communities.

As a grass roots movement that is gradually developing more central organising structures and national and international linkages, the Christian schooling movement always runs the risk of losing sight of its foundational goals. With this in mind, the transformation of the practice of teaching through research partnership is one attempt to transform quiescence into collective action and, in the process, improve the quality of teaching practice and student outcomes.

END NOTESf

1. The group of schools that fell into this category are commonly referred to as

"Christian Schools", "new Christian Schools" or "new independent

Christian schools". For the purposes of my research, they were referred to as the "new Christian Schools" so as to avoid confusing them with other kinds of Christian schools that exist and have done so for quite some time in Britain.Δ@#ÀΔ

2. For a full account of the Christian Schools' Campaign's argument for Public funding for faith@based schooling, see Deakin (1989b).

3. Donald Howard (1979) is the founder and chief 'theoretician' of Accelerated Christian Education (ACE) curriculum. In essence, this curriculum is based on creation science beliefs, and it is centred around a system of programmed learning booklets called PACEs. The ACE belief system is extremely conservative in regard to political, religious and ethical issues, and has been vigorously criticised in America and Australia. For more detail. see, for example, Rose (1988); and Prideaux & Speck (1989, 1993).

BIBLIOGRAPHYf

CiE, 1987. Report on the New Independent Christian Schools.f
Cambridge: Christiansin Education.

Clouser, R.A. 1991. The Myth of Religious Neutrality. Notre Dame, Indiana: UniversityPress.

Deakin, R. 1989a. New Christian Schools. Bristol: Regius.

Deakin, R. 1989b. A Case for Public Funding. Bristol:Regius.

Deakin, R. and Jones, A. 1993. Towards Effective Christian Politics. Bristol: Deakin and Jones.

Deenick, T. 1991. "Church and School". In A Church En Route: 40 Years of Reformed Churches of Australia. Geelong: Reformed Church Publishing.

Dennett, S. 1988. A Case for Christian Education. Bradford: Harvestime Services Ltd.

Etzioni, A. 1988. The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics. New York: FreePress.

Fowler, S. 1990. Christian Schooling: Education for Freedom.
Potchefstroom:Potchefstroom University.

Fromm, E. 1941. Escape from Freedom. New York:Rinehart.

Fuller, R.C., and Meyers, R.R. 1941. "The
Natural History of a Social Problem."
American Sociological Review 6, No. 2 pp. 320-29

Gusfield, J.R. 1955. "Social Structure and Moral Reform: A Study of
the Women's Christian Temperance Union." American Journal of Sociology 61;

pp. 221-32.

Herberle, R. 1951. Social Movements: An Introduction to
Political Sociology. New York.: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hill, B.V. 1989b. "Spiritual Development" in the Education Reform
Act: A source of acrimony, apathy or accord? in British Journal
of Educational Studies, Vol. xxxvii, No.2, May.

Hirschman, A.O. 1986. Rival Views of Market Society and Other
Essays. New York: Viking.

Hoffer, E. 1951. The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of
Mass Movements. New York: Mentor.

Howard, D. 1979. Your church can have a Christian school
Lewisville, TX: Accelerated Christian Education.

Hughes, F. 1988. "A Critical analysis of the concept of Christian
Education with
particular reference to educational issues after 1957" (Unpublished PhD
thesis, Nottingham University).

Hughes, F. 1990. "Christian Education in Recently Established
Christian Schools" in Spectrum (Vol. 22:2, Summer, 1990).

Jones, A. 1992. Christian Education: A vision and a hope.
Bristol: Jones, Policy paper.

Kornhauser, W. 1959. The Politics of Mass Society. Glencoe,
Ill.: Free Press.

Lambert, I.P.M. 1994b. Articulating Educational Vision in
Christian Schools. Sydney: CPCS.

Laura, R.S. and Leahy, M. 1989. "Religious Upbringing and
Rational Autonomy." Journal of Philosophy of Education, 23, 2,

pp. 253@266.

Long, R. 1994. A Study of Themelic Schools in Australia
Doctoral Thesis in progress:University Western Sydney.

Macaulay, R. and Barrs, J. 1978. Being Human: The Nature of
Spiritual Experience. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press.

McLaughlin, T.H. 1984. "Parental rights and the religious upbringing of
children." Journal of Philosophy of Education. 18, 1, pp.75@83.

McLaughlin, T.H. 1985. "Religion, upbringing and liberal values." \sqrt
Journal of Philosophy of Education. 19, 1, pp.119@27.

McLaughlin, T.H. 1992."The ethics of Separate Schools." In M. Leicester
and M.Taylor eds. Ethics, Ethnicity and Education. London: Kogan Page.

McLaughlin, T.H. 1992c. "Fairness, Controversiality and the Common
School." Spectrum. Vol24:2 pp.103@118.

Lang, K. and Lang, G. 1961. Collective Dynamics. New York.:Crowell.

Lipset, S.M. 1950. Agrarian Socialism. Berkeley, Cal.:
University of California Press.

Marshall, P. 1988. "Liberalism, Pluralism, and Christianity: A
Reconceptualisation." A version of thesis pare was first read a
the conference on Faith and History. GreenvilleIll. Oct. 20@22, 1988.

Melucci, A. 1989. Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and
Individual Needs in Contemporary Society. Philadelphia: Temple
University Press.

Messinger, S.L. 1955. "Organizational Transformation: A Case Study of
a Declining Social Movement". American Sociological Review, 26,
pp. 3@10.f

Morris, A.D. 1984. The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement.f
New York: Free Press.

Morris, A.D., and Herring, C. 1987. "Theory and Research in Social
Movements: A Critical Review." In Samuel Long, ed., Annual Review of
Political Science. Vol.2 Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Newbigin, L. 1990. 'Religion, science and truth in the school
curriculum', in L. Francis and A. Thatcher (eds), Christian
Perspectives for Education, Leominster: Gracewing.

O'Keeffe, B. 1992. "A Look at the Christian Schools' Movement." In

Brenda Watson *Priorities in Religious Education: A Model for the 1990s and Beyond*. London: Falmer Press.

Park, R.E. and Burgess, E.W. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Park, R.E. 1967. *On Social Control and Collective Behaviour*, ed. Ralph H. Turner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peshkin, A. 1986. *God's Choice: The Total World of a Fundamentalist Christian School*. Chicago: University Press.

Prideaux, D. & Speck, C. 1989. *Accelerated Christian Education in South Australia: A curriculum review of primary social studies, secondary science and junior primary language arts*.f Magill: South Australian College of Advanced Education.

Prideaux, D. & Speck, C. 1993. "Fundamentalist Education and Creation Science", in *Australian Journal of Education*,f Vol.37, No.3, pp. 279-295.

Niebuhr, H.R. 1951. *Christ and Culture*. N.Y.: Harper and Row.

Roques, M. 1989. *Curriculum Unmasked*. London: Monarch.

Rose, S.D. 1988. *Keeping the out of the Hands of Satan: Evangelical schooling in America*. N.Y. :Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Selznick, P. 1952. *The Organizational Weapon*. New York.: McGraw-Hill.

Shortt, J. 1992. "Christian nurture, Indoctrination and Liberal Education: a response to Elmer Theissen." *Spectrum*, vol.24,2.

Snow, D.A., and Benford, R.D. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilisation." In Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney

Tarrow, eds. *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research across Cultures*. International Social Movement Research,

vol. 1. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Stronks, G.G. and Blomberg, D. 1994. *A Vision with a Task: Christian Schooling for Responsive Discipleship*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books.

Thiessen, E.J. 1987. "Two concepts of two phases of liberal education?" *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 21, 2. pp.223-34.

Thiessen, E.J. 1991. "Christian nurture, Indoctrination and Liberal Education." *Spectrum*, vol.23, no.2 pp.105-124.

Thiessen, E.J. 1994. *Teaching for Commitment*.

Turner, R.H. and Killian, L.M. 1957. *Collective Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice-Hall.

Van Brummelen, H. 1986. *Telling the next generation: educational development in North American Calvinist Christian schools*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Van Brummelen, H. 1988. *Walking with God in the Classroom*. Ontario: Welch.

Van Brummelen, H. 1989. *Curriculum implementation in three Christian Schools*. Michigan: Calvin College.

Walker, A. 1988. *Restoring the Kingdom*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Wright, N. 1991. "Restoration and the 'House Church' movement." *Themelios*, 16, no.2, pp. 4-8.