



Department  
for Education

# **Social Integration in Schools and Colleges: Appendices**

**Research Report**

**May 2023**

**Author: Miles Hewstone**

# Contents

Appendix A.1. Evaluating interventions	3
Appendix 1.1 Intergroup Contact	4
Appendix 1.2 Evaluations of School Linking	8
Appendix 2.1 One Globe Kids: How does it work?	11
Appendix 3.1 Evaluation of Generation Global	14
Appendix 6.1 Shared Space	17
Bibliography: Readings and websites for the interventions	20
References	25

## Appendix A.1. Evaluating interventions

When assessing impact, a key tool for evaluators is the ‘theory of change’ (Weiss, 1995) used by the organisation whose programme is being evaluated. This refers to a careful assessment of the sequence of actions that need to be taken, and the resources that need to be in place, to generate specific measurable outcomes. As the reader of this report will see, some of the approaches state explicitly their theory of change (e.g., Intervention 7), others are already based on sound academic theory, supported by extensive research (e.g., Interventions 1 and 2), while others have not (yet) made their theory of change explicit.

Given these difficulties, it is all the more important to design the most robust evaluation possible. It is not expected that readers of this report are expert methodologists or statisticians. But it may nonetheless be useful to have in mind, when reading sections of the report that outline each intervention, what the ‘gold standard’ for an evaluation study of interventions aimed at changing policy is (see Paluck et al., 2019). There are only three key points; they are straightforward and, when you think about them, it is obvious why they are crucial:

1. Participants must be randomly assigned to either the ‘intervention’ (sometimes called, ‘treatment’) or ‘control’ conditions (no treatment). This is a requirement in order to conclude that the intervention caused the measured change in one or more outcomes.
2. Outcomes must be measured at least one day after the intervention began (since one can reasonably argue that testing whether the effects of an intervention extend beyond the first day of the intervention is a minimum policy standard of efficacy, or whether the intervention works).
3. The impact of the intervention should be reported in the form of a statistic called an ‘effect size’. Conventions exist for whether an obtained effect is ‘small’, ‘medium’ or ‘large’ (Cohen, 1988), but even a designated small effect may be of practical importance if it has a cumulative effect across pupils (e.g., Funder & Ozer, 2019). Even if the effect of an intervention is small for most participating pupils, its aggregate effect will still be important for promoting social integration as long as it reaches enough pupils.

*Statistical note.* Many mean differences found in research studies are statistically significant due to the large sample size, hence intervention studies should report ‘effect sizes’. A widely-accepted convention for reporting effect sizes uses a measure called Cohen’s *d*. This statistic expresses the measured difference between treatment and control conditions in units of standard deviation (e.g., a score of .5 means that the two conditions differed by half a standard deviation). Cohen (1988) suggested the following guidelines to interpret the size of an effect: effect sizes of about  $d = .2$  denote small effects, effect sizes of about  $d = .5$ , medium sized effects, and effect sizes greater than  $d = .8$ , large effects. There are emerging new guidelines for whether effect sizes are large or small (e.g., Funder & Ozer, 2019).

## Appendix 1.1 Intergroup Contact

The contact hypothesis argues that bringing together members of different groups to engage in positive contact with each other will reduce prejudice and improve relations between the groups. Here groups can refer to any significant social groups, including groups based on race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, socioeconomic background and age. The present report is focused primarily, but not exclusively, on contact in school between members of different ethnic and racial groups.

Research has shown that direct, face-to-face contact between members of different groups – groups whose relations are often marked by prejudice, intolerance and even conflict – can reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relations (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), especially, but not only, if four ‘optimal’ conditions are met:

1. There should be equal status among the groups, or the individuals drawn from different groups, who meet in the contact situation (this should be a given in any school, where members of ethnic groups should be treated as equals).
2. The situation in which intergroup contact occurs should involve cooperation between groups or offer common goals to both groups, rather than competing with each other. Designing activities that are co-operative and offer common goals (e.g., pupils from different ethnic groups working together to design a newspaper) should drive the choice of curriculum activities at all stages of a programme promoting intergroup contact in schools (see, e.g., the Schools Linking section of this report).
3. The contact situation should be structured in such a way as to allow the development of close relationships with members of the other group (e.g., pupils from different groups should get to know each other’s first names and some personal details, moving beyond stereotypical assumptions based merely on knowing which group they belong to).
4. There should be institutional support for the intergroup contact (e.g., from teachers, who demonstrate their commitment to the project to increase and improve mixing between groups).

Turning to types of contact, five different forms of contact (one ‘direct’ and four ‘indirect’) can be identified, and exploited, in Schools Linking (see Shannahan, 2018).

### Direct face-to-face contact

Direct face-to-face contact (i.e., where pupils will actually meet and talk to each other), especially over an extended period of time, builds trust and helps children from the different groups to form some deeper relationships (at best, forming vital friendships with members of the other group, ‘cross-group friendships’). This form of contact is included in

the School Linking intervention, and the duration of Linking programmes, over a full academic year, allows pupils to develop meaningful contact.

## **Extended contact**

Linking can also exploit the potential of 'indirect' forms of contact. Extended contact refers to the impact of knowing that a friend in your own (e.g., ethnic) group has a friend from the other group (Wright et al., 1997). Surprising as it may seem, at first, this indirect form of contact is reliably associated with reduced prejudice, while controlling for any direct contact that the person may have, and its effect appears to be of the same size as direct contact (Zhou et al., 2019).

## **Vicarious contact**

Vicarious contact (Mazziotta et al., 2011) refers explicitly to observing (rather than simply knowing about) direct contact between others (e.g., classmates, friends) belonging to your own and another group. A study by Cameron et al. (2007) demonstrated the positive impact of children reading stories that depicted cross-group friendships (in this case, in which able-bodied children befriended children with disabilities), compared to stories in which the friendship depicted was with another able-bodied child. Both these forms of indirect contact can widen the impact of linking beyond the specific pupils and discrete classes involved in the linking programme, to other pupils, classes and teachers not directly involved in the linking programme.

## **Imagined contact**

According to Crisp and Turner (2009), prejudice-reducing benefits arise from merely imagining a positive interaction with an outgroup member. Notwithstanding a large body of research claiming such an effect, Paluck et al. (2021) are sceptical, voicing concerns about the validity of this approach, and failures to replicate the large effect size of one of the classic imagined contact studies (Husnu & Crisp 2010). If there is a role for this form of contact, it may well be most effectively used in the pre-contact phase, where children are prepared in their separate schools for the future encounters with members of the other group (e.g., Vezzali et al., 2015).

## **Online contact**

Given modern technology and online learning (the use of which has accelerated through the COVID-19 crisis), contact can occur, or be created, online. Such 'online' or 'virtual' contact involves computer-mediated communication that enables contact among individuals who would otherwise not have the opportunity to meet, easily, in person. Whilst virtual contact has advantages and can improve intergroup relations (e.g., Amichai-Hamburger & McKenna, 2006; White et al., 2014) its effects do tend to be

smaller than those of direct or extended contact (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015). It does, however, have the potential to enrich the practice and experience of Schools Linking still further, and overcome the constraints that, for financial and logistical reasons, direct contact takes places only a limited number of times in a single school year.

## **Potential adverse effects of contact**

Contact may not, inevitably, be positive, and there is currently mixed evidence as to whether the adverse effects of negative contact are stronger than the beneficial effects of positive contact (e.g., Hayward et al., 2017).

In fact, contact itself is not enough, as Allport (1954) noted. What matters is that contact, when it occurs, should be positive and of high quality (Love & Hewstone, in press). Merely bringing together school children from different backgrounds is not enough to generate meaningful interactions across group lines, challenge stereotypes and change attitudes that have probably formed over several years. Children may self-segregate or re-segregate (Al Ramiah et al., 2015), especially in any free time (e.g., school breaks and lunch time), and the tendency to form friends with similar children strengthens as young people move through adolescence. Thus interventions are required to structure and guide contact in order to realise its potential. On this basis, the Green Paper on Integration supported “meaningful social mixing in schools as an important driver for integration” and endorsed the belief “that providing children and young people with opportunities to have meaningful interactions with those from different backgrounds helps foster more positive attitudes, builds understanding of different communities and cultures, and breaks down barriers to greater integration.”

Over sixty years of research has accrued evidence that contact is effective in reducing prejudice and promoting better relations between groups. Allport’s (1954) four conditions are optimal in the sense of ‘facilitating’, while not being strictly necessary (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). A meta-analysis of over 500 studies confirmed a significant negative relationship between contact and prejudice ( $r = -.22$ ,  $p < .0001$ ) – the more contact, the less prejudice – a relationship that was reliably stronger when contact was structured to meet Allport’s (1954) optimal contact conditions (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Contact is most effective when it involves friendships with outgroup members, leading to the addition of cross-group friendship as a fifth condition (Pettigrew, 1998; see also meta-analyses focused on friendship contact, by Davies et al., 2011; see also Zhou et al., 2019). The overall effect of contact on prejudice would be designated ‘small’ (according to Cohen, 1998) or ‘medium’ (according to Funder & Ozer, 2019); it should also benefit from a multiplier effect when contact is promoted on a wide scale across both pupils and school settings.

A note of caution should, however, be sounded. A meta-analysis of all the studies available has confirmed that contact-based interventions were effective at reducing ethnic prejudice in real-world studies conducted outside the lab (Lemmer & Wagner,

2015). The most recent meta-analysis, however (Paluck et al., 2019) focused specifically on the policy-relevance of intergroup contact and considered only the most rigorously conducted studies. Specifically, Paluck et al. only included a study if it: (1) randomly assigned some participants to a contact intervention, allowing for unbiased causal inference about the effects of intergroup contact; and (2) measured outcomes at least one day after the contact intervention began (since they reasonably argue that testing whether intervention effects extend beyond the first day of the intervention is a minimum policy standard of efficacy). Using these criteria, they found only 27 experiments to include in their review, almost all of which evaluated small-scale interventions. The vast majority (24/27) revealed reliable effects, with a large average effect size (contact reduced measured prejudice by 0.39 standard deviations). As such, this last review confirms Pettigew and Tropp's (2006) broad conclusion that contact does typically reduce prejudice, but suggests that it may be premature to claim evidence for the effectiveness of large-scale contact-based interventions.

## Appendix 1.2 Evaluations of School Linking

There have been four separate evaluations of Schools Linking (Raw, 2006, 2009; Kerr et al., 2011; Shannahan, 2018). Two (Raw, 2006, 2009) are more descriptive, but do include some reporting of results (e.g., the percentage of children who form a new friend from a different cultural group); a third (Shannahan, 2018) is a more general review of the evidence on Schools Linking. Only one evaluation (Kerr et al., 2011) is robust, and only its main findings are summarized below.

### Kerr et al.'s (2011) evaluation

The third, and only robust, evaluation is the report conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), commissioned by the Department for Education (DFE). Kerr et al. (2011)'s evaluation had three key objectives: (1) to collect data on the types of school linking activities taking place in Local Authorities (LAs), and to evaluate the processes (at LA- and school-levels) involved in administering and supporting the school linking; (2) to measure the impact and outcomes of school linking at different levels (i.e., on pupils, schools, staff, and local communities); and (3) to consider the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of school linking beyond the pilot phase.

### Design of the evaluation study

The evaluation was based on a robust two-stage, quasi-experimental research design. The evaluation included longitudinal analysis of pre- and post- questionnaires (i.e., completed before and after the intervention), eight case studies where in-depth interviews were conducted with teachers and members of the school's senior management, and several focus groups conducted with selected pupils involved in the linking activities. During the first 'pre-phase', NFER collected baseline evidence from pupils and schools in order to measure pupils' prior attitudes towards, and experiences of, cohesion and integration, as well as schools' policies towards cohesion and their plans for school linking. This baseline data was then used in the second 'post-phase', to measure the types of changes that had taken place and the impact of school linking.

### Methodology

Quantitative and qualitative evidence was collected in each phase. However, due to concerns about the ability of younger children to answer questions about sensitive issues, only qualitative data was collected in primary schools, but both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from secondary school pupils. The quantitative data was drawn from the two-wave survey of pupils' knowledge, attitudes, experiences, and behaviours before and after participating in school linking activities. To attribute any observed changes to linking, the evaluation made two types of comparisons: (1) comparisons were made within-schools between pupils who did versus did not participate in the linking activities; (2) comparisons were made between-schools, comparing the



linked schools to a matched comparison group ('control group') of schools not participating in linking.

School response rates were high at the post-intervention phase (over 80% in intervention and control schools), but considerably lower at the pre-intervention/baseline phase (especially in the comparison/control sample, only 22.5%, compared with 47% in the intervention sample). The final sample comprised 3,092 pupils who responded to both the pre- and post-surveys (1536 from linked schools; 2366 from comparison schools). Of the pupils participating in programmes, 455 reported that they had been directly involved in linking activities, but levels of involvement were still low (245 were involved in linking once or less, and 210 in linking two or more times). This appears to be a weak 'dose' of the intervention.

## Results

The sophisticated analyses conducted by Kerr et al. (2011) did not reveal any impact of the programme on pupils' knowledge and understanding: pupils participating in school linking activities were not more likely, at post-test, to say that they 'know lots about different cultures and people with different backgrounds.' At the post-intervention stage, however, a substantial proportion of pupils from programme schools who had taken part directly in school linking activities reported that, since taking part in the activities, they: 'Were more interested in finding out about others', or 'Had their beliefs or assumptions about other communities and cultures challenged'. Kerr et al. acknowledge that these results do not constitute evidence that pupils developed their knowledge and understanding as a result of the Linking programme. They note, however, that the results may suggest that the school linking set in motion processes that would, with more time, result in such gains in the longer term.

The statistical analyses also showed that the Linking programme seemed to have no impact on a number of outcomes, namely pupils' enjoyment of diverse people and cultures, their openness to different opinions, their openness to immigrants, their trust of others, and their perceived level of discrimination in Britain today. The linking programme did, however, appear to have influenced some aspects of learners' attitudes and dispositions, particularly their respect for others and their rights. Also, involvement in linking activities on two or more occasions was associated with pupils being more inclined, at the post-intervention stage, to feel respect for the rights of others.

Based on pupils' self-reports, the Linking programme was associated with gains in pupils' self-confidence and self-efficacy (a feeling that one can do something) in relation to interpersonal situations which involve others from different backgrounds, including intercultural communication. For instance, the post-intervention survey of pupils showed that, of those pupils who took part directly in school linking activities: most felt 'more confident about meeting people from different schools and different communities' since taking part in school linking (52 per cent). A sizeable proportion also thought that, through school linking activities, they had learned how to meet new people and how to get along

with them (44 per cent), and that they could cope in strange and new situations (43 per cent). According to the statistical analysis, other things being equal, pupils directly involved in School Linking activities (compared with pupils in a Linking programme school, but not involved in school linking, or with pupils in comparison schools), were more likely at the post-intervention stage to report often meeting and mixing with people who come from another racial or ethnic group.

## **Potential negative impacts**

It is important in evaluating any intervention to acknowledge openly whether there were any unintended negative effects, and Kerr et al. (2011) note that there appears to have been a reinforcement of negative attitudes and fears in some cases. The post-intervention survey revealed, for example, that 11 per cent of pupils who had taken part in school linking reported feeling more negatively towards other communities since taking part in linking activities. Some (18 per cent) also responded that through school linking activities they had learned that they find meeting people from different backgrounds difficult.

## **Summary**

To summarize, Kerr et al. (2011) concluded that School Linking can have a positive impact on many aspects of pupils' skills, attitudes, perceptions and behaviours, particularly their respect for others, their self-confidence and their self-efficacy. Linking can also broaden the social groups with whom pupils interact. However, the evidence for the programme's impact on pupils' knowledge and understanding is mixed.

Overall, Kerr et al. (2011) concluded: (1) that the programme is more likely to have an impact if there is sustained involvement (two or more visits) of pupils involved in the programme, which is now implemented in the programme design, and (2) that to have impact beyond those pupils directly involved in linking activities there would likely need to be a deliberate and sustained dissemination effort within the school, which has now also been structured into the programme. Although the programme is primarily designed to have an impact on the pupils involved, Kerr et al. found evidence that teachers were generally enthusiastic about and willing to run the programme with their class, and that they, as well as local authority staff, also benefit from involvement in the intervention.

## Appendix 2.1 One Globe Kids: How does it work?

One Globe Kids has drawn on extensive psychological research on contact theory (Allport, 1954) in the design of its programme (for more detail, see also Appendix 1.1). Contact theory argues that bringing together members of different groups to engage in positive face-to-face contact with each other will reduce prejudice and improve relations between the groups. Here, groups can refer to any significant social groups, including groups based on race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, socioeconomic background and age.

Research (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) has shown that such contact, especially over an extended period of time, builds trust and helps children from the different groups to form some deeper relationships (at best, forming vital cross-group friendships). This contact can reduce prejudice and improve relations between groups whose relations are often marked by prejudice, intolerance and even conflict.

One Globe Kids differs from School Linking in that it does not use face-to-face contact. Rather, it builds on more recent research that has demonstrated the value of: (1) cross-group friendships; and (2) more 'indirect' forms of contact.

### Cross-group friends

Friendship between members of different groups ('cross-group friends') is a unique form of contact. One Globe Kids emphasizes that friendship involves a different level of interaction than we have with acquaintances, and sometimes even family. Friendship is linked to powerful positive emotions (e.g., empathy) and behaviours (e.g., helping), and builds trust (based on reciprocal sharing of intimate thoughts and feelings). One Globe Kids builds on one of the core findings of research on intergroup contact, namely that cross-group friendships constitute the most effective form of contact for reducing prejudice and improving intergroup relations (Davies et al., 2011; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Among the benefits of cross-group friendships, One Globe Kids emphasizes three in particular. Children with cross-group friends:

1. Have higher levels of social competence (Eisenberg, Vaughan, & Hofer, 2009; Lease & Blake 2005), self-esteem, well-being and resilience (Bagci et al., 2014; Fletcher, Rollings, & Nickerson, 2004);
2. Tend to be better at perspective-taking, which makes them better able to understand how children around them feel, and more likely to think race-based discrimination is wrong (Killen et al., 2007, Tropp & Prenovost, 2008); and
3. Even show higher leadership potential and are more popular (Kawabata & Crick, 2008; Lease & Blake, 2005).

The One Globe Kids intervention seeks to exploit the power of cross-group friendship on a large scale, and in areas where opportunities to form such friendships are unavailable. It does this by building on reliable evidence that cross-group friendships need not involve face-to-face contact between the pupils involved in the intervention; such contact is a challenge always posed when communities are segregated due to a variety of structural and social boundaries (e.g., rural-urban divides, residential or school segregation) including self-imposed segregation (declining to engage with diverse groups, or even avoiding them). These challenges can be overcome by fulfilling the potential of different forms of indirect contact.

## **Indirect contact**

There are four forms of indirect contact that can be seen at work in One Globe Kids:

### **1. Extended contact**

This form of indirect contact refers to the impact of knowing that a friend in your own (e.g., ethnic) group has a friend from the other group (Wright et al., 1997). Surprising as it may seem, at first, this indirect form of contact is reliably associated with reduced prejudice even while controlling for any direct contact that the person may have (Vezzali et al., 2014), and its effect appears to be of the same size as that of direct contact (for a meta-analysis, Zhou et al., 2019).

### **2. Vicarious contact**

The second form of indirect contact, vicarious contact (Mazziotta et al., 2011) refers explicitly to observing (rather than simply knowing about) direct contact between others (e.g., classmates, friends) belonging to your own and another group. This 'observation' can take place when one actually sees a member of one's own group in contact with a member of another group, or when one observes this in a video, or on TV or film, or even when reading about cross-group friendships (e.g., Cameron et al., 2006, 2007; Cameron & Abbott, 2017). Both extended and vicarious contact can widen the impact of linking, beyond the specific pupils and discrete classes involved in the linking programme, to other pupils, classes and teachers not directly involved in the linking programme.

### **3. Imagined contact**

According to Crisp and Turner (2009), this third kind of indirect contact delivers prejudice-reducing benefits from merely imagining a positive interaction with an outgroup member. Notwithstanding a large body of research claiming such an effect, Paluck et al. (2021) are sceptical, voicing concerns about the validity of this approach, the research practices of some studies, and failures to replicate the large effect size of one of the classic imagined

contact studies (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). If there is a role for this form of contact, it may well be most effectively used in the pre-contact phase, where children are prepared in their separate schools for future encounters with members of the other group (e.g., Vezzali et al., 2015).

#### **4. Online contact**

A fourth kind of indirect contact, online contact exploits technology (the use of which has accelerated through the COVID-19 crisis) to connect members of different groups, from different places, online. Such 'virtual contact' involves computer-mediated communication that enables contact among individuals who would otherwise not have the opportunity to meet, easily, in person. Whilst virtual contact has advantages and can improve intergroup relations (e.g., Amichai-Hamburger & McKenna, 2006; White et al., 2014) its effects do tend to be smaller than those of direct or extended contact (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015).

## Appendix 3.1 Evaluation of Generation Global

Doney and Wegerif (2016) have provided the only, but a robust, evaluation of Generation Global. They conducted a study to measure the extent to which the Face to Faith (F2F) programme (which, at the time of their evaluation was a project of the Tony Blair Faith Foundation) had a positive impact upon participating pupils. The work of the Tony Blair Faith Foundation is now carried out by the Tony Blair Institute for Global Change. The Face to Faith programme continues under its new name 'Generation Global. Specifically, Doney and Wegerif asked, 'Did the programme succeed in helping pupils to be more open-minded in their attitudes to others (both globally and locally)?'

As the researchers explain, this is not an easy programme to evaluate. There is no clear beginning or end point, often resulting in the programme being almost continuous; moreover, a different combination of activities seems to occur in a varying order in each school. They also note that the teaching materials are very flexible, and that the delivery of the programme relied very much on individual teachers who delivered the materials in a non-uniform manner. Pupils' experience of the programme, then, depended upon a range of factors: the combination of preparatory lessons; the preparation of other schools whose pupils were subsequently engaged in dialogue; and the quality of relationship with partner schools. The researchers argued that the meaning of the programme experience was unique to each school (and potentially to each class).

### Research methodology & design

The methodology for this evaluation programme combined a quantitative evaluation of the impact of the programme that was intended to be as rigorous as possible, with a qualitative attempt to understand the more subjective processes by which individuals developed and changed their attitudes over time towards others who are different from them.

The study used a repeated measures, semi-longitudinal research tool. Baseline data was gathered from participating pupils and a control group in each school, as well as their teachers, at the start of their programme experience, and after each subsequent experience of dialogue with pupils from schools abroad (whether videoconference or online). This design was chosen in preference to a 'pre-/post-test' design in order to better identify key points in the process of change.

### Sample and control groups

In total, 5,157 individuals from 89 schools responded (a response rate of 44%). All participating schools were asked to provide control groups of a roughly similar size and age group to the group of pupils participating in the research programme.

## Measures

A range of innovative approaches were used, including the development of a new tool, the 'Measure of Dialogical Open Mindedness' (MDOM). This is an original instrument developed for the evaluation of this programme. It, and the measure of 'Knowledge and Experience of Difference' (KED), were assessed by means of a questionnaire, completed on multiple occasions. Both MDOM and KED were found to be reliable tools.

In addition to this quantitative data, two 'vignette' questions were included, and a teacher questionnaire was developed (for further details, see the original report).

## Analysis

Data analysis included: quantitative analyses, linguistic analysis of pupils' written pre- and post-dialogue reflections, observation of videoconference recordings, and in-depth case studies that included interviews with identified pupils and teachers.

The researchers dealt with a key aspect of the structure of the data, namely that responses from individual pupils are 'nested' within schools, which are then nested within countries. Hence, they used multi-level modelling (MLM), and results of the analyses that used MLM should be the main focus of any conclusions drawn from the quantitative analyses.

## Results

Being part of the programme had a modest but statistically significant positive impact on pupils' open-mindedness and their knowledge and experience of difference (e.g. their attitudes towards others who are different). The effect sizes, the 'difference in the differences' between baseline and post-test measures for the programme and control group, were designated large for MDOM (3), and small for KED (0.2). Analysis of the control groups, however, demonstrated a clear decline in open-mindedness in pupils that did not participate in the programme. The cause of this unexpected result was unknown.

## Limitations

The authors of the study are transparent about the challenges of conducting an evaluation of the programme, and some of the main limitations:

1. Nearly all the schools taking part in the programme and the research were self-selecting, rather than randomly allocated. Because schools had chosen to take part in the programme, they may already have had a tendency to open mindedness and global connection, while valuing diversity. This limitation is, however, partially mitigated by the fact that control groups were from the same schools. Thus, any difference between

intervention and control groups in the same school cannot be explained by a tendency within the school as a whole for its pupils to be more open-minded.

2. The data were non-normally distributed and therefore had to be treated as non-parametric (a less powerful approach than the originally intended parametric analyses would have been).

3. The researchers had planned to treat, and analyse, the data as a longitudinal data set, allowing an analysis of changes in attitude for an individual over a sequence of dialogue (videoconferencing) events, by comparing baseline scores with scores after each event. However, it was not possible to construct a longitudinal data set as originally envisaged, because very few pupils completed the baseline assessment and multiple post-videoconference questionnaires.

4. Many schools returned data for either control or programme pupils, so the in-school difference for them could not be estimated directly. Of 89 schools, only 42 had observations from both the programme and control groups.



## Appendix 6.1 Shared Space: Using contact theory in the teaching of religious education

In collaboration with the National Association of Teachers of Religious Education (NATRE), the Shared Space intervention aims to show how ‘contact theory’ (Allport, 1954; see also Interventions 1 and 2 in this report) could be applied usefully to RE lessons in primary and secondary classrooms.

According to Shared Space, the value of the RE classroom lies in it being a place that can allow painful or challenging ideas to be explored, but one in which, Champain (2015) argues, religious people should be explored as individuals, so pupils do not think that ‘all Christians are the same’ or ‘all Muslims think the same’. Thus, RE lessons should:

1. Avoid generalising about religion and belief;
2. Acknowledge that religious faith is part of a person’s identity; and
3. Consider religious peoples’ cultural and geographical origins as well as their beliefs.

Shared Space emphasises that when people are brought together across cultural and religious divides we need to better understand how they ‘use the space’. For example, it is well established that pupils and pupils from different ethnic and religious groups tend to ‘keep to their own’, occupying different parts of the classroom or choosing separate seating arrangements at break and lunch (e.g., McKeown et al. 2017, from a primary school, and Al Ramiah et al., 2015, from a sixth-form college). In this way they avoid those they ‘don’t like’, who are often simply those they don’t know. It is not enough simply to occupy the same public spaces; this approach asks the pertinent question, ‘Is Shared Space shared?’. Answering, ‘It is often not’, Shared Space offers a novel approach to mixing up the unmixed classroom.

Shared Space argues that we can facilitate and enhance interaction between young people to hold balanced and informed conversations about religion and belief by considering how we group pupils, and how we arrange our classrooms. This is illustrated with two cases where research studies offer useful insights for classroom teachers. By raising awareness and changing classroom seating plans, there is potential to improve relations between pupils who belong to different groups.

In the first example (Van den Berg et al., 2012), it is pointed out that placing pupils who do not like each other together can have positive outcomes through encouraging meaningful intergroup contact. This study began by having all the children in a class rate their classmates’ likeability. Then, for several weeks, pupils were placed closer to those they did not like. After this intervention period pupils reported feeling more friendly towards those they had previously rated in negative terms. The study neatly shows that having the opportunity for interpersonal contact can improve interpersonal relations. In

the second example (Van den Berg & Cillessen, 2015), a different study found that pupils who were randomly paired by the teacher became more friendly to one another after working together for some time. Taken together, these findings seem to point to teachers' ability to improve interpersonal relations through careful use of seating plans.

Practically, Champain (2015) argues that teachers need to encourage the following 'rules' to allow exploration of difficult and challenging ideas: respect, active listening, dialogue not debate, avoidance of generalisations, using 'oops-ouch' in discussions (e.g., when one needs to back up, seeing that one said something insensitive, or to be open in stating that one was offended).

In their survey of RE teachers across England, Shared Space found that teachers tended to use three distinct and pedagogical steps related to contact theory to promote community relations in their classrooms: 'encounter', 'conversation', and 'interaction' (Williams et al., 2019). Below, all three terms are explained, with examples for primary and secondary schools teaching RE (see Resources, Teachers toolkit, below, for the toolkit from which examples are drawn):

1. Encounter, including encountering both beliefs and practices, enables pupils to engage with different outlooks and worldviews. This can be done within the classroom environment, in the absence of pupils from another community (e.g., visiting a place of worship).

*Primary school example:* Visiting a place of worship (e.g., a mosque)

- **Encountering beliefs:** explore the roots of belief (e.g., Muhammad's revelation in Cave Hira).
- **Encountering practices:** Explore the history and context of religious communities through festivals (e.g., compare pictures of the Hindu festival of Holi, or Sikh processions in India and Britain).

*Secondary school example:* Enabling a deep engagement with practice and belief

- **Encountering worldviews:** Explore the origins of a religion or worldview to understand its roots (e.g., pupils might understand a religion or worldview as a solution to a particular set of political, social and spiritual concerns, such as tracing the roots of Islam to turmoil in the seventh century as tribal life changed).
- **Encountering beliefs:** Explore a diverse range of practices as a way to learn about both core belief and variations of belief (e.g., compare Protestant iconoclasm to the use of the senses in Catholic worship).

2. Conversation involves developing discussion and listening skills.

*Primary school example:* For younger children, write simple questions on black paper, and ask them to paint their palm and create a handprint. They can either write or explain their answer. The different-coloured hands show children that there are many different views. Apply resources from KS1 Citizenship, Community, and Respecting Differences.

Apply these approaches to learning in RE, as when encountering different views in the classroom.

*Secondary school example:* Help pupils to find out the roots of present conflict to understand today's world in more depth (e.g., teach the roots of the Sunni–Shi'a division in KS3, so that by KS4 pupils can discuss Islamic perspectives with increased knowledge).

3. Interaction (as when members of two different groups engage in meaningful contact) involves exploration of multiple views or areas of disagreement. This does not have to be in the school classroom itself and can make use of linking networks (see Intervention 1).

*Primary school example:* Create an opportunity for pupils of different faiths or beliefs to meet (e.g., Shi'a and Sunni pupils from the al-Sadiq and al-Zahra school in West London, a Shi'a Muslim faith girls school, and Mulberry School for Girls, a secular maintained school where the majority of families come from Sunni Muslim backgrounds with a Bangladeshi cultural heritage). The pupils met in controlled conditions, first engaging in 'warm-up' conversations, then exploring similarities between their traditions and discussing difficult differences. Carefully planned sessions deepened communication and forged trust. The pupils came to see the person beyond the labels.

*Secondary school example:* Not all contact is positive or easy. Even though addressing some controversial issues may be difficult, it should not be avoided if pupils are to make sense of them. Use techniques, including changes to the seating plan, to allow openness and trust to develop in the classroom. Ensure, if possible, that all pupils feel able to ask questions and volunteer answers, and feel safe from personal comments. Allow time and space for discussion of difficult and complicated topics, and accept that confusion and disagreement might well occur, and that you may have to help the class manage their emotions.

# Bibliography: Readings and websites for the interventions

## 1. Schools Linking

### Readings

Akhtar, Y., Henry, M., & Longson, S. (2017). The schools linking programme. "If you could do one thing . . .". 10 local actions to promote social integration. London, UK: British Academy Essays Collection. [The best brief overview of this approach. Available online at:

[https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/documents/292/British\\_Academy\\_IYCDOT\\_Essays.pdf](https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/documents/292/British_Academy_IYCDOT_Essays.pdf)

Kerr, D. et al. (2011) Evaluation of the schools linking network: Final report, Research report DFE-RR090. London, UK: National Foundation for Educational research. Available online at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/182402/DFE-RR090.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/182402/DFE-RR090.pdf)

### Websites

<https://thelinkingnetwork.org.uk> [The excellent website of The Linking Network.]

<http://thelinkingnetwork.org.uk/resource/0-schools-linking-process/>)

[A short video on the 'Resources' page of the Schools Linking Network's web site outlines the key aspects of the Schools Linking process. The stages include teacher training, preparation in class, exchange of information, meeting in a neutral venue, reflection, reciprocal class visits and celebration.]

<https://thelinkingnetwork.org.uk/resources-2/primary-schools-linking-2020-21/> [Virtual primary schools Linking]

<https://thelinkingnetwork.org.uk/resources-2/shuttle-dialogue-linking-for-secondary-schools-2020-2021/> [Shuttle dialogue digital Linking for secondary schools]

## 2. One Globe Kids

### Readings

Cameron, L. & Swift, H. (2017). One Globe Kids in action: Evaluating an online platform for changing social attitudes in young children. Equality and Human Rights Commission. Available online at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/one-globe-kids-action-evaluating-anti-prejudice-projects>

Zuiderveld, S. (2020). Friends around the world: One Globe Kids. Childhood Education, 96, 6-13. Available online at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/HJDG64JGPCUHJ28Z68FN/full?target=10.1080/00094056.2020.1707528>

### Website

<https://oneglobekids.org/>

## 3. Generation Global

### Websites

<https://generation.global>

<https://institute.global/advisory/generation-global>

## 4. Amplify

### Websites

<https://faithbeliefforum.org/programme/school-workshops/encountering-faiths-beliefs/>

<https://faithbeliefforum.org/programme/amplify/>

## 5. Deliberative Classroom

### Readings

Andersson, K. (2015). Deliberative teaching: Effects on students' democratic virtues. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 59, 604-622.

ACT (2017). The deliberative classroom: Religious freedom. (Topic briefing and lesson plans). Available online at: <https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/resource/deliberative-classroom-religious-freedom>.

ACT (2018). The deliberative classroom: General guidance. London: The Association for Citizenship Teaching, Middlesex University and the English Speaking Union. Report for the Department for Education. Available online at:

<https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/resource/deliberative-classroom-general-guidance-teachers>

ACT (2020). Evidence on the impacts of classroom deliberation. London: Association for Citizenship Education.

DFE (2015) The prevent duty. Departmental advice for schools and childcare providers. London: Department for Education.

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E., and Lopes, J. (2010). Citizenship education in England 2001-2010. The eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS). Research Report DFE- RR059, London: Department for Education.

Schuitema, J., Veugelers, W., Rijlaarsdam, G. & ten Dam, G. (2009). Two instructional designs for dialogic citizenship education: An effect study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 439-461.

Weinberg, J. (2020). Politics in schools: 'What exists' and 'what works'? Project Report for the UK Democracy Fund (Ref. 190903). Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust. London: United Kingdom.

## Websites

<https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/resource/deliberative-classroom-general-guidance-teachers>

<https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/deliberative-classroom-topical-debating-resources-and-teacher-guidance>

## 6. Shared Space

### Readings

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Al Ramiah, A., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Floe, C. (2015). Why are all the White (Asian) kids sitting together in the cafeteria? Resegregation and the role of intergroup attributions and norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54, 100–124.

Champaign, P. (2018). Facing the strange. In M. Castelli & M. Charter (Eds.), *We need to talk about religious education: Manifestos for the future of RE* (pp. 155-168). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers).

Christopher, K., Jackson-Royal, R., Orchard, J., McKeown Jones, S., Williams, A., &

Wright, K. (2018). RE and good community relations: What can RE learn from social psychology? A Toolkit for Teachers of RE. Published on the NATRE website.

<https://www.natre.org.uk/uploads/Additional%20Documents/The%20Shared%20Space%20Folder/teachers%20toolkit%20final%20April%202018.pdf>

Christopher, K., Orchard, J., & Williams, A. (2018). Promoting good community relations: What can RE learn from social psychology? RE Today.

<https://www.natre.org.uk/uploads/Free%20Resources/Promoting%20good%20community%20relations%20-%20Christopher%20et%20al%202018.pdf>

McKeown, S., Orchard, J., Williams, A., & Christopher, K. (May 9, 2018a). Using the contact hypothesis in RE. SecEd Magazine. <http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/best-practice/using-contact-hypothesis-in-re/>

McKeown, S., Orchard, J., Williams, A., Wright, K., Christopher, K. & Jackson-Royal, R. (2018a). Encounter, conversation and interaction: Improving community relations through religious education (February 2018). University of Bristol Policy Briefing 56.

<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/policybristol/policy-briefings/improving-community-relations-through-religious-ed/>

McKeown, S. Williams, A. & Orchard, J. (May 24, 2018c). Five ways to celebrate diversity in the classroom. TES. <https://www.tes.com/news/five-ways-celebrate-diversity-classroom>

McKeown, S., Williams, A., & Pauker, K. (2017). Stories that move them: Changing children's behaviour toward diverse peers. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 381-387.

Orchard, J. (2015). Does religious education promote good community relations?. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 36, 40-53.

Van den Berg, V. and Cillessen, A. (2015). Peer status and classroom seating arrangements: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 130, 19-34.

Van den Berg, V., Segers, E. & Cillessen, A. (2012). Changing peer perceptions and victimization through classroom arrangements: A field experiment. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 40, 403-412.

Williams, A., McKeown, S., Orchard, J. & Wright, K. (2019). Promoting positive community relations: What can RE learn from social psychology and the Shared Space project? *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 40, 215-227.

## Websites

<https://www.natre.org.uk/about-natre/projects/the-shared-space-project/>

<https://www.westhillendowment.org/natre-shared-space/Home>

## 7. Rights Respecting Schools

### Readings

Bonnell, J. Copestake, P., & Kerr, D. (2010). Teaching approaches that help to build resilience to extremism among young people. Research Report DFE-RR119. London: Department for Education.

Covell, K., Howe, R. B., & McNeil, J. (2010). Implementing children's human rights education in schools. *Improving Schools*, 13, 117-132.

Dunhill, A. (2016). Does teaching children about human rights, encourage them to practice, protect and promote the rights of others? *Education 3-13*, 46, 1-11.

Howe, R. & Covell, K. (2011). Countering disadvantage, promoting health: The value of children's human rights Education. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 45, 59-85.

### Websites

<https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/>

<https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/the-rrsa/what-is-a-rights-respecting-school>

[https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/05/Impact-Report-2017\\_final.pdf](https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/05/Impact-Report-2017_final.pdf)

[https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/06/Summary-Impact-Report-2018\\_Final.pdf](https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/06/Summary-Impact-Report-2018_Final.pdf)



## References

- ACT (2017). The deliberative classroom: Religious freedom. (Topic briefing and lesson plans). Available online at: <https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/resource/deliberative-classroom-religious-freedom>.
- ACT (2018). The deliberative classroom: General guidance. London: The Association for Citizenship Teaching, Middlesex University and the English Speaking Union. Report for the Department for Education. Available online at: <https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/resource/deliberative-classroom-general-guidance-teachers>.
- ACT (2020). Evidence on the impacts of classroom deliberation. London: Association for Citizenship Education.
- Akhtar, Y., Henry, M., & Longson, S. (2017). The schools linking programme. "If you could do one thing . . .". 10 local actions to promote social integration. London, UK: British Academy Essays Collection.
- Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving, and preventing intergroup conflict: Evidence, limitations, and potential. *American Psychologist*, 68, 527–542.
- Al Ramiah, A., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Floe, C. (2015). Why are all the White (Asian) kids sitting together in the cafeteria? Resegregation and the role of intergroup attributions and norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54, 100–124.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amichai-Hamburger, Y., & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2006). The contact hypothesis reconsidered: Interacting via the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 825-843.
- Andersson, K. (2015). Deliberative Teaching: Effects on students' democratic virtues. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 604-622.
- Bagci, S.B., Rutland, A., Kumashiro, M., Smith, K.P., & Blumberg, H., (2014). Are minority status children's cross-ethnic friendships beneficial in a multiethnic context? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 32, 107–115.
- Bonnell, J. Copestake, P., & Kerr, D. (2010). Teaching approaches that help to build resilience to extremism among young people. Research Report DFE-RR119. London: Department for Education.

- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 255-343). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Cameron, L. & Abbott, N. (2017). Intergroup contact in action: Using intergroup contact interventions to change children's out-group orientation. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale, & C. Spears Brown (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of group processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 455-72). Wiley Blackwell Publishing.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes towards refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development*, 77, 1208-19.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Brown, R. (2007). Promoting children's positive intergroup attitudes towards stigmatized groups: Extended contact and multiple classification skills training. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 454-466.
- Cameron, L. & Swift, H. (2017). One Globe Kids in action: Evaluating an online platform for changing social attitudes in young children. Equality and Human Rights Commission. Available online at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/one-globe-kids-action-evaluating-anti-prejudice-projects>
- Champain, P. (2018). Facing the strange. In M. Castelli & M. Charter (Eds.), *We need to talk about religious education: Manifestos for the future of RE* (pp. 155-168). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers).
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, 64, 231-240.
- Christopher, K., Jackson-Royal, R., Orchard, J., McKeown Jones, S., Williams, A., & Wright, K. (2018). RE and good community relations: What can RE learn from social psychology? A Toolkit for Teachers of RE. Available online at: <https://www.natre.org.uk/uploads/Additional%20Documents/The%20Shared%20Space%20Folder/teachers%20toolkit%20final%20April%202018.pdf>
- Covell, K., Howe, R. B., & McNeil, J. (2010). Implementing children's human rights education in schools. *Improving Schools*, 13, 117-132.
- Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15, 332-35.

Department for Education (2015) *The prevent duty*. Departmental advice for schools and childcare providers. London: Department for Education.

Doney, J. & Wegerif, R. (2016). *Measuring open-mindedness: An evaluation of the impact of our school dialogue programme on students' open-mindedness and attitude to others*. London: Tony Blair Institute for Global Change.

Dunhill, A. (2016). Does teaching children about human rights, encourage them to practice, protect and promote the rights of others? *Education 3-13*, 46, 1-11.

Eisenberg, N., Vaughan, J., & Hofer, C. (2009). Temperament, self-regulation, and peer social competence. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 473–489). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Fletcher, A. C., Rollins, A., & Nickerson, P. (2004). The extension of school-based inter- and intraracial children's friendships: Influences on psychosocial well-being. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74, 272–285.

Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2, 156–168.

Hayward, L. E., Tropp, L. R., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Toward a comprehensive understanding of intergroup contact: Descriptions and mediators of positive and negative contact among majority and minority groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43, 347-364.

Hewstone, M. (2009). Living apart, living together? The role of intergroup contact in social integration. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 162, 243-300.

Howe, R. & Covell, K. (2011). Countering disadvantage, promoting health: The value of children's human rights education. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 45, 59-85.

Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagined intergroup contact: A new technique for encouraging greater inter-ethnic contact in Cyprus. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 16, 97–108.

Jerome, L., Liddle, A., & Young, H. (2020). *The Deliberative Classroom and the development of secondary students' conceptual understanding of democracy*. London: Middlesex University.

Kawabata, Y., & Crick, N. R. (2011). The significance of cross-racial/ethnic friendships: Associations with peer victimization, peer support, sociometric status, and classroom diversity. *Developmental Psychology*, 47, 1763-1775.

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E., and Lopes, J. (2010). Citizenship education in England 2001-2010. The eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS). Research Report DFE- RR059, London: Department for Education.

Kerr D., Keating A., Poet H., Spielhofer T., Lopes J., & Mundy E. (2011). Evaluation of the schools linking network: Final report. Research report DFE-RR090. London, UK: National Foundation for Educational research. Available online at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/182402/DFE-RR090.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/182402/DFE-RR090.pdf)

Killen, M., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2007). The social developmental benefits of heterogeneous school environments. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools* (pp. 57–73). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Lease, A. M., & Blake, J. J. (2005). A comparison of majority-race children with and without a minority-race friend. *Social Development*, 14, 20–41.

Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 152-168.

Love, A., & Hewstone, M. (in press). Intergroup contact and prejudice reduction: Three guiding principles. In P. van Lang, E. T. Higgins, and A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Manzoni, C. & Rolfe, H. (2019). Promoting ethnic and religious integration in schools: A review of evidence. London, UK: National Institute of Economic and Social Research.

Mazziotta, A. Mummendey, A. & Wright, S. C. (2011). Vicarious intergroup contact effects: Applying social-cognitive theory to intergroup contact research. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14, 255–274.

McKeown, S., Orchard, J., Williams, A., & Christopher, K. (May 9, 2018a). Using the contact hypothesis in RE. *SecEd Magazine*. Published online: <http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/best-practice/using-contact-hypothesis-in-re/>

McKeown, S., Orchard, J., Williams, A., Wright, K., Christopher, K. & Jackson-Royal, R. (2018b). Encounter, conversation and interaction: Improving community relations through religious education (February 2018). University of Bristol Policy Briefing 56. <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/policybristol/policy-briefings/improving-community-relations-through-religious-ed/>

McKeown, S. Williams, A. & Orchard, J. (May 24, 2018c). Five ways to celebrate diversity in the classroom. TES. <https://www.tes.com/news/five-ways-celebrate-diversity-classroom>

McKeown, S., Williams, A., & Pauker, K. (2017). Stories that move them: Changing children's behaviour toward diverse peers. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 381-387.

MHCLG (2019). Integrated Communities Action Plan. GOV.UK. Ministry of Housing, Local Government and Communities.

Orchard, J. (2015). Does religious education promote good community relations? *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 36, 40-53.

Oskamp, S. (2000). *Reducing prejudice and discrimination*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Paluck, E. L., Green, S. A., & Green, D. P. (2019). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 3, 129–158.

Paluck, E. L., Porat, R., Clark, C. S., & Green, D. P. (2021). Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 533–560.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.

Raw, A. (2006). *Schools Linking Project, 2005-06: Full final evaluation report*. Bradford, UK: Arts & Regeneration.

Raw, A. (2009). *Schools Linking Network: Final evaluation report, 2008-09*. Bradford, UK: Arts & Regeneration.

Schuitema, J., Veugelers, W., Rijlaarsdam, G. & ten Dam, G. (2009). Two instructional designs for dialogic citizenship education: An effect study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 439-461.

Shannahan, C. (2018). *Schools linking and social cohesion: An evaluation of The Linking Network's Schools Linking National Programme*. Coventry, UK: Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations, Coventry University.

Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. W. (2001). *Improving intergroup relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting interethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 236–248). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Van den Berg, V. and Cillessen, A. (2015). Peer status and classroom seating arrangements: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 130, 19-34.

Van den Berg, V., Segers, E. & Cillessen, A. (2012). Changing peer perceptions and victimization through classroom arrangements: A field experiment. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 40, 403-412.

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Visintin, E. P. (2015). 'And the best essay is...': Extended contact and cross-group friendships at school. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54, 601–615.

Vezzali, L., Hewstone, M., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Wölfer, R. (2014). Improving intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25, 314-389.

Weinberg, J. (2020). Politics in schools: 'What exists' and 'what works'? Project Report for the UK Democracy Fund (Ref. 190903). Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust. London: United Kingdom.

Weiss, C.H (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In J. Connell, J. Kubisch, A. L. Schorr, & C. Weiss (Eds.), *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods and contexts* (pp. 65-92). New York: Aspen Institute.

White, F. A., Abu-Rayya, H. M., & Weitzel, C. (2014). Achieving twelve-months of intergroup bias reduction: The dual identity-electronic contact (DIEC) experiment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 158-163.

Williams, A., McKeown, S., Orchard, J. & Wright, K. (2019). Promoting positive community relations: What can RE learn from social psychology and the Shared Space project? *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 40, 215-227.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.

Zhou, S., Page-Gould, E., Aron, A., Moyer, A., & Hewstone, M. (2019). The extended contact hypothesis: A meta-analysis on 20 years of research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 23, 132–160.

Zuiderveld, S. (2020). Friends around the world: One Globe Kids. *Childhood Education*, 96, 6-13. Available online at:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/HJDG64JGPCUHJ28Z68FN/full?target=10.1080/00094056.2020.1707528>



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2023

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3).

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](https://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/publications](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Reference: RR1343

ISBN: 978-1-83870-476-6



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)