Christian affiliation, Christian practice, and attitudes to religious diversity: a quantitative

analysis among 13- to 15- year-old female students in the UK

Leslie J Francis *

University of Warwick

Alice Pyke

University of Warwick

Gemma Penny

University of Warwick

Author note:
*Corresponding author:
Leslie J Francis
Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit
Institute of Education
The University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539
Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638
Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

Within the context of the Young People's Attitudes to Religious Diversity Project at the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, this study examines the association between self-assigned Christian affiliation, self-reported Christian practice and attitudes toward religious diversity among a sample of 5,748 13- to 15-year-old female students attending schools in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The two hypotheses being tested are that among female students nominal Christians do not differ in their attitudes toward religious diversity from unaffiliated students, and that church attendance leads to less tolerance of other religious groups. The data partly support the first hypothesis but not the second. Churchgoing Christian female students are more interested in and more tolerant of other religious groups. The data also draw attention to the perceived importance of religious education in schools for shaping views on religion and on religious diversity among unaffiliated students, nominal Christians and practising Christians. Both the Christian churches and religious education in school seem to have an important part to play in nurturing a tolerant and inclusive religiously diverse society in the UK.

Keywords: Religious diversity, Christian affiliation, churchgoing adolescents.

Introduction

The changing cultural and religious context of the UK since the early 1950s has been well documented by a number of commentators, including Parsons (1993, 1994), Wolffe (1993), and Weller (2008). Reliable statistical data on the religious *and* ethnic composition of the UK, however, has only really become available since the beginning of the twenty-first century. Data on religious affiliation has been routinely collected in the Northern Ireland census since 1861 (Marcourt, 1995) but comparable information was not available for the rest of the UK at this time. A question about ethnicity was introduced in England and Wales for the first time in the 1991 Census (Aspinall, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c) and a question about religion was introduced for the first time in the 2001 Census (Aspinall 2000c; Weller, 2004; Sherif, 2011). The question tested for inclusion in the census for England and Wales in the July 1997 Census Test was 'Do you consider you belong to a religious group?' followed by the check list: No, Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Islam/Muslim, Jewish, Sikh, any other religion (please write in)'. Mysteriously the question printed in the Census White Paper (1999) was changed to read 'What is your religion?' but the check list remained the same (Francis, 2003). The Scottish Parliament argued strenuously for the inclusion of (the main) Christian denominations and the question was changed accordingly. The Westminster Parliament accepted the Government's proposal as it stood. The question in the Northern Ireland Census was open-ended and therefore allowed for a wide range of different affiliations.

The Census 2001 question has helped to shape the debate about religious diversity in the UK in three ways. First, the Census question has offered an operational definition of how religious diversity may be defined. The definition has to do with self-assigned religious affiliation, at least as far as this can be accessed through the question 'What is your religion?' followed by a checklist of religious identities. Self-assigned religious affiliation is regarded

as an appropriate matter for public enquiry, like ethnicity, but unlike religious belief and religious practice that are regarded as matters of a personal and private nature.

Second, the Census question has delivered clear and hard empirical evidence regarding the ways in which the inhabitants of England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland have answered the three different questions posed by the three versions of the 2001 Census for these populations. According to the respective census websites, the Census data show that in England and Wales, 72% of the population were defined as Christian, 3% as Muslim, 1% as Hindu, and under 1% as Buddhist, Jewish, or Sikh; 15% were defined as having no religious affiliation and 8% chose not to answer the optional question on religion. In Scotland, 42% were defined as Church of Scotland, 16% as Roman Catholic, and 7% as belonging to other Christian groups; less than 1% were defined as Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim or Sikh; 28% were defined as having no religious affiliation, and 5% chose not to answer the optional question on religion. In Northern Ireland, 40% were defined as Roman Catholic, 21% as Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 15% as Church of Ireland, 4% as Methodist Church in Ireland, and 6% as belonging to other Christian groups; 2% were defined as Sikh, 1% as Muslim and less than 1% as Buddhist, Hindu or Jewish; 14% were classified as having no religious affiliation or as religion not stated.

Third, the Census question has stirred a rigorous academic debate concerning the meaning and social significance of replies to the Census question. This debate has largely focused on two problems raised by the category 'Christian'. The first problem concerns the coherence of ignoring the diversity between different Christian denominations. The second problem concerns the social significance of Christian nominalism.

The first problem regarding the coherence of the single category 'Christian' was raised by Francis (2003) and tested against data provided by the British Social Attitudes Survey concerning issues relevant to the notion of social capital. For example, a key question

in the British Social Attitudes Survey asked, 'Are you currently a member of any of these groups: tenants or residents association, parent-teachers, school governors, political party, parish or town council, neighbourhood council, neighbourhood watch, local conservation or environmental group, other local community or voluntary group, or voluntary groups to help the sick, elderly, children, or other vulnerable people?' A positive answer to this question was given by 32% of Christian affiliates and 21% of non-affiliates. The single Christian category, however, disguises considerable variation between 34% of Anglicans, 25% of Roman Catholics, and 33% of other Christians.

A second question designed to tap another dimension of participation in community life focused on 'volunteer work'. Overall, volunteer work was undertaken 'at least once last year' by 27% of Christians and 15% of non-affiliates. Once again, however, the differences between the denominations are as large as the difference between the Christians and the non-affiliates. Volunteer work was undertaken at least once last year by 25% of Anglicans, 27% of Roman Catholics, and 36% of other Christians.

Regarding civic engagement and social trust, Johnston and Jowell (1999, p. 186) argue that 'one of the key putative components of social capital is the extent of trust that people have in others.' Then they cite a question posed by the British Social Attitudes Survey capable of testing the general level of trust in society.

How often do you think that people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance and how often would they try to be fair?

The view that people would try to be fair was taken by 64% of the Christian affiliates and by 52% of the non-affiliates. The differences between the denominations, however, are really considerable. On this issue, the position taken by the Roman Catholics is the same as that taken by the non-affiliates. Thus, 52% of Roman Catholics and 52% of non-affiliates think

that people would try to be fair, compared with 64% of Anglicans and 77% of other Christians.

The second problem regarding the social significance of Christian nominalism was raised by Fane (1999) and discussed in the light of sociological theories of religious identification developed and tested by Bouma (1992) in Australia and by Bibby (1985, 1987) in Canada. For example, Bibby's theory of 'encasement' argues that Canadian Christians are 'encased' within the Christian tradition. In other words, the tradition has a strong influential hold over both its active and latent members from which affiliates find it extremely difficult to extricate themselves. Contrary to the claims of secularisation theorists that low levels of church attendance are indicative of the erosion of religion's social significance, Bibby argues that this trend is a manifestation of the re-packaging of religion in the context of late twentieth-century consumer-orientated society. The social significance of self-assigned religious affiliation has been tested and supported by a series of studies conducted on data provided by the Teenage Religion and Values Survey, including Francis (2001a, 2001b, 2008). The debate has been continued by studies like Voas and Bruce (2004).

The theoretical relationship between religious identity and attitude toward religious diversity has been shaped by several strands of thought. Three strands are of particular significance, one shaped within social psychology, one shaped within empirical theology, and one shaped within sociology.

The strand shaped within social psychology has its roots in debates in the 1950s concerned to explicate the connection between religion and prejudice. This debate was reflected in Gordon Allport's significant differentiation between intrinsic religious orientation and extrinsic religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967). Routinely intrinsic religious orientation was associated with lower prejudice and extrinsic religious orientation with higher prejudice. If Christian nominalism is a reflection of extrinsic or cultural religion, we might

expect nominal Christians to display less openness to religious diversity in comparison with the religiously unaffiliated. If practising Christians reflect committed and intrinsic religion, we might expect practising Christians to display greater openness to religious diversity in comparison with the religiously unaffiliated.

The strand shaped within empirical theology has its roots in the fields of enquiry known as the theology of religions. The theology of religions is concerned with the variety of ways in which religious traditions define their own identity in relation to other religious traditions. This field of enquiry has been recently reviewed by Astley, Francis, Robbins, and Selçuk (2012) in their book, *Teaching religion, teaching truth*. Traditionally, Christianity has taken an exclusive view regarding the nature of religious truth, drawing for example on texts like John 14:6. If Christian churches were today teaching the exclusivity claims of Christianity, we might expect practising Christians to display less openness to religious diversity in comparison with the religiously unaffiliated.

The strand shaped within sociology has its roots in the religious identification theories proposed by Bouma (1992) and Bibby (1985, 1987). According this theory, the values of nominal Christians may still be encased within and reflect the values displayed by practising Christians. According to this theory, building on the psychological notion of intrinsic religious orientation, we might expect *both* nominal Christians and practising Christians to display more openness to religious diversity in comparison with the religiously unaffiliated, but to different degrees. However, building on the theological notion of the exclusivity of religious claims, we might expect *both* nominal Christians and practising Christians to display less openness to religious diversity in comparison with the religiously unaffiliated, but again to different degrees.

Research questions

Against this background, the present study examines and compares the attitudes toward religious diversity of three groups of female students: those who claim affiliation to no religious group; those who describe themselves as Christians but never attend church; and those who describe themselves as Christians and attend Church weekly. This analysis allows two specific research questions to be addressed. The first research question concerns whether practising Christian female students are more or less tolerant of religious diversity than unaffiliated young people. The second research question concerns whether nominal Christian female students differ in attitudes from unaffiliated young people. The decision to base the analysis on one sex only was taken in light of the considerable evidence regarding the importance of sex differences in attitudes toward religion (see Francis, 1997; Francis & Penny, 2013). As a consequence a clearer picture emerges by examining one sex at a time.

For the purpose of this analysis, attitudes toward religious diversity embrace five main themes: the factors that influence young people's views on religion (mother, father, television, internet and school); the level of interest shown in finding out about the six main religious groups in the UK as defined by the Census (Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, Muslims, and Sikhs); positive and negative views on religion; assessing social proximity; and celebrating religious diversity.

Method

Procedure

As part of a large multi-method project on religious diversity designed to examine the experiences and attitudes of young people living in the multi-cultural and multi-faith context of the UK, classes of 13- to 14-year-old students and classes of 14- to 15-year-old students were invited to complete a questionnaire survey. The participants were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity, and were given the choice not to participate. The level of interest shown in the project meant that very few students decided not to participate. The

sampling frame proposed for the project set out to obtain 2,000 responses from each of five

locations: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, *and* London. Slight over sampling

generated a total of 11,025 responses available for analysis. The inclusion of Northern Ireland

enhanced the participation of churchgoing students in the project.

Instrument

The *Religious Diversity and Young People* survey was designed for self-completion,

using mainly multiple-choice questions and Likert scaling on five points: agree strongly,

agree, not certain, disagree, and disagree strongly.

Analysis

The present paper selected from the 11,025 participants (5,277 males and 5,748

females) three groups of female students: religiously unaffiliated students, defined as those

who claimed no religious affiliation and no attendance (N = 1,373); practising Christians,

defined as those who described themselves as Christians and attended church weekly (N =

1,143); and nominal Christians, defined as those who described themselves as Christians and

never attended church (N = 682). The responses of these three groups were compared across

eleven themes styled: influence of mother, influence of father, influence of television,

influence of internet, influence of school, interest in religion, positive view of religion,

negative view of religion, positive proximity, negative proximity, and celebrating diversity.

Statistical significance was calculated by the chi-square contingency test for which the five-

point Likert responses were dichotomised, distinguishing between the pupils who agreed with

the item (checking agree or agree strongly) and the pupils who did not agree with the item

(checking not certain, disagree, or disagree strongly).

Results and discussion

Influencing views on religion

Tables 1 to 5 examine the female students' perceptions of what has influenced their views on religion (giving attention to mother, father, television, internet, and school) and how these influences have affected their views on each of the six main religious traditions represented in the UK (Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, Muslims, and Sikhs). Four main conclusions emerge from their data.

First the religious status of the students is a clear predictor of the level of awareness that they show of these influences. While 21% of religiously unaffiliated female students consider that their mother has influenced their views about religion, the proportions rise to 35% among nominal Christians and to 78% among practising Christians. While 21% of religiously unaffiliated female students consider that their father has influenced their views about religion, the proportions rise to 27% among nominal Christians and 52% among practising Christians. While 27% of religiously unaffiliated female students feel that television has influenced their views about religion, the proportions rise to 29% among nominal Christians and 34% among practising Christians. While 17% of religiously unaffiliated female students feel that the internet has influenced their views about religion, the proportion remains at 17% among nominal Christians and rises to 29% among practising Christians. While 48% of religiously unaffiliated female students feel that studying religion at school has influenced their views about religion, the proportion rises to 55% among nominal Christians and 77% among practising Christians.

Second, studying religion at school emerges as a significant factor in shaping views on religion among all three groups of students. Among the religiously unaffiliated female students 48% point to the influence of school in shaping their views on religion, compared with 21% who point to mother, 21% who point to father, 27% who point to television, and 17% who point to the internet. Among practising Christian female students, 77% point to the influence of school in shaping their views on religion, compared with 78% who point to

mother, 52% who point to father, 34% who point to television, and 29% who point to the internet.

Third, studying religion at school emerges as particularly significant in terms of shaping views on specific religious groups. The key importance of school can be illustrated by taking two specific religious groups as examples. Among the religiously unaffiliated female students, 32% feel that school has influenced their views about Muslims, compared with smaller proportions who feel that their views on Muslims have been influenced by mother (6%), father (8%), television (17%), and internet (11%). Among practising Christian female students, 54% feel that school has influenced their views on Muslims, compared with smaller proportions who feel that their views on Muslims have been influenced by mother (14%), father (13%), television (29%), and internet (16%). Among religiously unaffiliated female students, 24% feel that school has influenced their views on Sikhs, compared with smaller proportions who feel that their views on Sikhs have been influenced by mother (3%), father (4%), television (6%), and internet (5%). Among practising Christian female students, 29% feel that school has influenced their views on Sikhs, compared with smaller proportions who feel that their views on Sikhs have been influence by mother (7%), father (6%), television (9%), and internet (7%).

Fourth, the influence of studying religion at school is more pronounced in terms of some religions than others. Taking religiously unaffiliated female students as an example, the religious traditions fall into three groups. Two fifths of these students feel that school has influenced their views on Christianity (39%). Just under one third of these students feel that school has influenced their views on Muslims (32%), Buddhists (30%), Jews (30%) and Hindus (29%). One quarter of these students feel that school has influenced their views on Sikhs (24%). Among practising Christian female students, a somewhat different pattern emerges. Two thirds of these students feel that school has influenced their views on

Christians (67%). Over half feel that school has influenced their views on Jews (56%), and Muslims (54%). Lower proportions of these students feel that school has influenced their views on Hindus (42%), Buddhists (36%), and Sikhs (29%).

Showing interest in religion

Table 6 examines the female students' level of interest in finding out about different religions. Two main conclusions emerge from these data.

First, the religious status of the students is a clear predictor of the level of interest they show, not only in finding out about their own religion but in finding out about other religions as well. Thus, 33% of nominal Christian female students and 68% of practising Christians are interested in finding out about Christians, compared with 24% of religiously unaffiliated students. Similarly, 31% of nominal Christian female students and 58% of practising Christians are interested in finding out about Jews, compared with 26% of religiously unaffiliated students; 27% of nominal Christian female students and 51% of practising Christians are interested in finding out about Muslims, compared with 27% of religiously unaffiliated students.

Second, the level of interest varies from religion to religion. Among unaffiliated female students, the highest levels of interest are shown in Buddhists (32%) followed by Jews (26%), Muslims (24%), Christians (24%), Hindus (23%) and Sikhs (22%). Among practising Christian female students, the highest levels of interest are shown in Christians (68%), and Jews (58%), followed by Buddhists (53%), Muslims (51%), Hindus (48%), and Sikhs (43%).

Positive and negative views on religion

Tables 7 and 8 examine the female students' perception of both the good and the harm that is done by religious people in the world. Three main conclusions emerge from these data.

First, there is greater support for the view that religion is a force for good rather than a force for harm. For example, among religiously unaffiliated female students, 35% feel that a

lot of good is done in the world by Christians, compared with 12% who feel that a lot of harm is done in the world by Christians. Similarly, among religiously unaffiliated female students, 21% take the view that a lot of good is done in the world by Jews, compared with 12% who take the view that a lot of harm is done in the world by Jews. The exception to this pattern concerns attitudes toward Muslims. Among religiously unaffiliated female students, 26% take the view that a lot of harm is done in the world by Muslims, compared with 19% who take the view that a lot of good is done in the world by Muslims.

Second, the religious status of the student is a clear predictor of differences in assessing the positive impact of religion, but less so in predicting differences in assessing the negative impact of religion. For example, while 35% of religiously unaffiliated female students feel that a lot of good is done in the world by Christians, the proportions rise to 46% among nominal Christians and 77% among practising Christians. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the proportions of these three groups who feel that a lot of harm is done in the world by Christians.

Third, the level of negativity shown toward religious groups varies from religion to religion. Overall, there is over twice the level of negativity felt toward Muslims as toward other groups. For example, among the religiously unaffiliated female students, 26% feel that Muslims do a lot of harm in the world, compared with lower figures for Christians (12%), Jews (12%), Sikhs (10%), Hindus (9%), and Buddhists (7%). Among practising Christian female students, 32% felt that Muslims do a lot of harm in the world, compared with lower figures for Jews (12%), Christians (12%), Hindus (11%), Sikhs (11%), and Buddhists (9%).

Assessing social proximity

Tables 9 and 10 examine the female students' perceptions of their personal proximity to people of different religions. Positive proximity is assessed by examining the extent to which the students have friends who belong to different religions. Negative proximity is

assessed by examine the extent to which the students would not like to live next door to people who belong to different religions. Three main conclusions emerge from these data.

First, the religious status of the students is not a strong predictor of their perceptions of positive proximity. Religiously unaffiliated female students are less likely to count Christians among their friends (70% compared with 93% of practising Christians), while practising Christian female students are more likely to have Sikhs among their friends (21% compared with 13% of religiously unaffiliated students). However, the differences are negligible between religiously unaffiliated students and practising Christians in terms of the others religious groups.

 Second, some religions are more visible than others in terms of the students' personal experiences. For example, among the religiously unaffiliated female students, 33% count Muslims among their friends, but the proportions fall steadily to 21% for Jews, 17% for Hindus, 11% for Buddhists, and 7% for Sikhs.

Third, in terms of negative proximity, a higher level of negativity is expressed toward Muslims than toward other religious groups. Among religiously unaffiliated female students, 15% say that they would not like to live next door to Muslims, compared with smaller proportions who say that they would not like to live next door to Jews (11%), Sikhs (10%), Hindus (9%), Buddhists (8%), or Christians (6%). A similar pattern exists among practising Christian female students, of whom 12 % say that they would not like to live next door to Muslims, compared with smaller proportions who say that they would not like to live next door to Hindus (8%), Buddhists (7%), Jews (7%), Sikhs (7%) and Christians (4%).

Celebrating religious diversity

Table 11 examines the female students' perceptions of celebrating religious diversity, giving attention to the rich and varied range of distinctive religious dress that may sometimes

appear controversial in contemporary society. Three main conclusions emerge from these data.

First, it is clear that, overall, more students are in favour of allowing religiously significant dress to be worn in school than the number of students who are not in favour of this, but the majority is by no means clear cut across all the issues included in the survey. Among the religiously unaffiliated female students, the figures fall to 51% or 50% who agree that Muslims should be allowed to wear the Niquab or the Burka in school, or who agree that Sikhs should be allowed to wear the Kirpan in school.

Second, the religious status of the student is a clear predictor of the level of acceptance shown. Although there are generally only small differences between the levels of acceptance among religiously unaffiliated female students and nominal Christians, practising Christians show greater respect for the rights of other religious groups. Thus, 75% of practising Christians agree that Muslims should be allowed to wear the headscarf in school, compared with 59% of religiously unaffiliated students, and 53% of nominal Christians; 60% of practising Christians agree that Muslims should be allowed to wear the Burka in school, compared with 50% of religiously unaffiliated students, and 48% of nominal Christians.

Third, the acceptance of distinctive religious dress varies from religious group to religious group. Among religiously unaffiliated female students, nominal Christians and practising Christians, there is a lower level of acceptance for the Muslim Niquab and Burka and for the Sikh Kirpan than for the other items listed in the survey.

Conclusion

This study set out to address two main research questions. The first research question concerns whether practising Christian female students are more or less tolerant of religious diversity than unaffiliated students. The data make it clear that practising Christian female students are more tolerant. This is especially clear in respect of their level of support for

members of other religious groups being permitted to wear religiously significant dress in school, and in respect of their level of endorsement of the view that a lot of good is done in the world by various religious groups. This more positive view of religious diversity is supported by a greater level of expressed interest in other religious groups and by a greater appreciation of the influence on their views exerted by their parents, by television and internet, and by school. The finding that churchgoing female students are both more interested in and more tolerant of religious diversity, supports the view that church teaching and Christian practice are nurturing the development of the UK as a multi-cultural and multi-faith society. In other words, it is the female students who are growing up outside the influence of the churches who are more likely to hold less positive attitudes toward living in a religiously diverse society. There is from these data no evidence to support the view that the majority of Christian churches are promoting a theology of religions inimical to life in a religiously diverse society.

The second research question concerns whether the category of nominal Christians carries any significance distinct from being religiously unaffiliated. The data make it clear that the attitudinal profile of nominal Christian female students is in some respect distinct from that of religiously unaffiliated students and that the overall difference is in the direction of the attitudinal profile of practising Christians. This is especially clear in respect of the level of interest shown in religion. On the other hand, nominal Christian female students are no more tolerant than unaffiliated students of permitting religious dress in schools, and no more convinced about the good done in the world by religious traditions other than Christians. These findings that nominal Christian female students occupy a distinctive position different both from religiously unaffiliated students and from practising Christians in their attitudes toward religious diversity questions the usefulness of assessing religiosity solely in terms of

self-assigned religious affiliation and affirms the importance of assessing religious practice as well.

A third conclusion also emerges from these research data, concerning the central role of school in influencing female students' views about religion and religious diversity. Among all three groups (religiously unaffiliated female students, nominal Christians and practising Christian), studying religion at school was regarded as having been more influential in this respect than their fathers, the internet, or television. The finding that studying religion in school is perceived by students as so formative in shaping their attitudes toward religion and religious diversity may be seen as an important warning to a current generation of politicians in England who (either intentionally or unintentionally) are eroding the status and significance of religious education in schools. On the female students' own account, the religious education offered in schools is among the most powerful factors in equipping young people for life in the religiously diverse environment of the UK.

Although the Young People's Attitudes to Religious Diversity Project contained equal proportions of male and female students, the present analyses were conducted among one sex only in light of the considerable evidence regarding the importance of sex differences in attitudes toward religion (Francis, 1997; Francis & Penny, 2013). Similar analyses could now be conducted among male students.

Note

Young People's Attitudes to Religious Diversity Project (AHRC Reference: AH/G014035/1) is a large scale mixed methods research project investigating the attitudes of 13- to 16-year-old students across the United Kingdom. Young people from a variety of socio-economic, cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds from different parts of England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland, with the addition of London as a special case, are taking part in the study. Professor Robert Jackson is principal investigator and Professor

Leslie J Francis is co-investigator. Together they lead a team of qualitative and quantitative researchers based in the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit, within the Institute of Education at the University of Warwick. The project is part of the AHRC/ESRC Religion and Society Programme, and ran from 2009-12.

Appendix

Statistical tables

References

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*, 432-443.

Aspinall, P. (2000a). The challenges of measuring the ethno-cultural diversity of Britain in the new millennium. *Policy and Politics, 28,* 109-118.

Aspinall P. (2000b). The new 2001 census question set on cultural characteristics: Is it useful for the monitoring of the health status of people from ethnic groups in Britain? *Ethnicity and Health,* 5, 33-40.

Aspinall, P. (2000c). Should a question on 'religion' be asked in the 2001 British census? A public policy case in favour. *Social Policy and Administration, 34*, 584-600.

Astley, J., Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Selçuk, M. (2012). *Teaching religion, teaching truth.* Oxford: Peter Lang.

Bibby, R. W. (1985). Religious encasement in Canada: An argument for Protestant and Catholic entrenchment. *Social Compass, 32*, 287-303.

Bibby, R. W. (1987). *Fragmented Gods: The poverty and potential of religion in Canada*. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.

Bouma, G. D. (1992). *Religion: Meaning, transcendence and community in Australia.* Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Census White Paper. (1999). *The 2001 Census of Population*. London: The Stationery Office, Ltd.

Fane, R. S. (1999). Is self-assigned religious affiliation socially significant? In L. J. Francis (Ed.), *Sociology, theology and the curriculum* (pp. 113-124). London: Cassell.

Francis, L.J. (1997). The psychology of gender differences in religion: A review of empirical research. *Religion, 27*, 81-96.

Francis, L. J. (2001a). Religion and values: A quantitative perspective. In L. J. Francis, J. Astley, & M. Robbins (Eds.). *The Fourth R for the third millennium: Education in religion and values for the global future* (pp. 47-78). Dublin: Lindisfarne Books.

Francis, L. J. (2001b). The social significance of religious affiliation among adolescents in England and Wales. In H.-G. Ziebertz (Ed.), *Religious individualisation and Christian religious semantics* (pp. 115-138). Münster: Lit Verlag.

Francis, L. J. (2003). Religion and social capital: The flaw in the 2001 census in England and Wales. In P. Avis (Ed.), *Public faith: The state of religious belief and practice in Britain*, pp 45-64. London: SPCK.

Francis, L. J. (2008). Self-assigned religious affiliation: A study among adolescents in England and Wales. In B. Spalek & A. Imtoual (Eds.), *Religion, spirituality and the social sciences: Challenging marginalisation* (pp. 149-161). Bristol: Policy Press.

Francis, L. J., & Penny, G. (2013). Gender differences in religion. In V. Saroglou (Ed.). *Religion, personality and social behaviour* (pp. 191-209). New York: Psychology Press.

Johnston, M., & Jowell, R. (2001). How robust is British civil society? In A. Park, J. Curtice, K. Thomson, L. Jarvis, C. Bromley, & N. Stratford (Eds.), *British Social Attitudes: The 18th report* (pp. 175-197). London: Sage.

Macourt, M. P. A. (1995). Using census data: Religion as a key variable in studies of Northern Ireland. *Environment and Planning, 27,* 593-614.

Parsons, G. (Ed.) (1993). *The growth of religious diversity: Britain from 1945: Volume 1 Traditions.* London: Routledge.

Parson, G. (Ed.) (1994). *The growth of religious diversity: Britain from 1945: Volume 2 Issues.* London: Routledge.

Sherif, J. (2011). A census chronicle: Reflections on the campaign for a religious question in

the 2001 census for England and Wales. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 32,* 1-18.

Voas, D., & Bruce, S. (2004). The 2001 Census and Christian identification in Britain.

Journal of Contemporary Religion, 19, 23-28.

Weller, P. (2004). Identity, politics, and the future(s) of religion in the UK: The case of the

religious question in the 2001 decennial census. *Journal of Contemporary Religion,*

19, 3-21.

Weller, P. (2008). *Religious diversity in the UK.* London: Continuum.

Wolffe, J. (Ed.) (1993). *The growth of religious diversity: Britain from 1945: A reader.*

London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Table 1

Influence of mother

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
My mother has influenced my views about					
religion	21	35	78	822.8	.001
Christians	14	28	62	639.6	.001
Buddhists	5	5	10	25.0	.001
Hindus	4	4	9	24.7	.001
Jews	5	6	15	80.3	.001
Muslims	6	7	14	60.4	.001
Sikhs	3	4	7	22.8	.001

Table 2

Influence of father

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
My father has influenced my views about					
religion	21	27	63	156.8	.001
Christians	13	23	52	475.5	.001
Buddhists	5	5	8	10.3	.05
Hindus	4	5	8	14.4	.001
Jews	5	6	14	65.2	.001
Muslims	8	8	13	22.0	.001
Sikhs	4	4	6	9.3	.01

Table 3

Influence of television

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
Television has influenced my views about					
religion	27	29	43	72.1	.001
Christians	19	22	34	81.4	.001
Buddhists	9	10	14	17.1	.001
Hindus	8	12	15	28.8	.001
Jews	15	16	25	47.6	.001
Muslims	17	19	29	57.5	.001
Sikhs	6	8	9	7.5	.05

Table 4

Influence of internet

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	*p* <
The internet has influenced my views about					
religion	17	17	29	67.8	.001
Christians	11	15	23	61.9	.001
Buddhists	6	7	9	6.2	.05
Hindus	6	7	9	5.8	NS
Jews	9	10	15	27.8	.001
Muslims	11	10	16	21.3	.001
Sikhs	5	6	7	4.3	NS

Table 5

Influence of school

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
Studying religion at school has influenced my views about					
religion	48	55	77	220.1	.001
Christians	39	48	67	192.0	.001
Buddhists	30	28	36	16.0	.001
Hindus	29	31	42	43.8	.001
Jews	30	38	56	171.3	.001
Muslims	32	36	54	131.3	.001
Sikhs	24	23	29	13.3	.001

Table 6

Interest in religion

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
I am interested in finding out about					
Christians	24	33	68	525.6	.001
Buddhists	32	33	53	136.2	.001
Hindus	23	27	48	189.4	.001
Jews	26	31	58	297.6	.001
Muslims	24	27	51	232.0	.001
Sikhs	22	26	43	139.2	.001

Table 7

Positive view of religion

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
A lot of good is done in the world by					
Christians	35	46	77	457.8	.001
Buddhists	29	26	39	39.8	.001
Hindus	22	22	35	60.2	.001
Jews	21	24	40	117.0	.001
Muslims	19	19	32	66.7	.001
Sikhs	19	18	29	45.6	.001

Table 8

Negative view of religion

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	*p* <
A lot of harm is done in the world by					
Christians	12	11	12	0.8	NS
Buddhists	7	8	9	3.6	NS
Hindus	9	12	11	3.6	NS
Jews	12	14	12	2.7	NS
Muslims	26	34	32	19.7	.001
Sikhs	10	12	11	2.0	NS

Table 9

Positive proximity

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	*p* <
I have friends who are					
Christians	70	82	93	214.8	.001
Buddhists	11	10	11	0.2	NS
Hindus	17	16	20	5.3	NS
Jews	21	18	19	2.2	NS
Muslims	33	30	36	7.2	.05
Sikhs	7	9	15	44.2	.001

Table 10

Negative proximity

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	*p* <
I would not like to live next door to					
Christians	6	5	4	3.2	NS
Buddhists	8	9	7	4.2	NS
Hindus	9	10	8	3.6	NS
Jews	11	13	7	18.5	.001
Muslims	15	19	12	13.7	.01
Sikhs	10	12	7	12.6	.01

Table 11

Celebrating diversity

	none %	nominal %	active %	χ^2	$p <$
Christians should be allowed to wear crosses in school	58	56	80	167.7	.001
Hindus should be allowed to wear the Bindi in school	57	52	68	55.7	.001
Jews should be allowed to wear the Kippah/Yamulke in school	55	50	67	60.7	.001
Jews should be allowed to wear the star of David in school	58	55	74	89.7	.001
Muslims should be allowed to wear the headscarf in school	59	53	75	105.1	.001
Muslims should be allowed to wear the Niquab in school	51	46	60	32.7	.001
Muslims should be allowed to wear the Burka in school	50	46	60	43.1	.001
Sikhs should be allowed to wear the Kirpan in school	50	48	60	36.1	.001
Sikhs should be allowed to wear the Kara in school	54	49	66	60.0	.001
Sikhs should be allowed to wear the Turban in school	57	52	71	82.0	.001