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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Curriculum Advisory and Support Service (of Western Education and a Library Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact + Curriculum</td>
<td>The intervention group who received the taught curriculum and some/all of their lessons were taught through contact with another school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>The control group or did not receive the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>The intervention group who received the taught curriculum only in their regular classes in their own schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory analysis</td>
<td>A sub-group analysis which investigated pre-specified differences relating to gender, religious community background, percentage of Free School Meals in Schools and primary or post-primary attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Free School Meals – in Northern Ireland entitlement to Free School Meals is used an indicator of socio-economic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>A social group to which individuals feel they belong or to which other people see them as belonging. For example an individual may identify with being a member of the Catholic community (ingroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup bias</td>
<td>When individuals tend to see their own ingroup more positively than other groups (outgroups). For example an individual may not identify with being a member of the Catholic community (outgroup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>A social group to which individuals do not feel a sense of belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup bias</td>
<td>When individuals tend to discriminate against outgroups. While outgroup bias are considered to be correlated with ingroup bias, they are not a necessary consequence and the two concepts are conceptually distinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>A test/measure (e.g. questionnaire) administered to all participants in a study before an intervention takes place to determine baseline scores for the outcomes under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>A test/measure (e.g. questionnaire) administered to all participants in a study after an intervention takes place to determine scores for the outcomes under consideration. These are then analysed in conjunction with the pre-test scores to measure the effectiveness of an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process evaluation</td>
<td>This is usually a qualitative study which evaluates the implementation of a programme as it was planned/intended to be rolled out and delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-primary school</td>
<td>In Northern Ireland, post-primary school is compulsory for children aged...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 to 16. Children are in five year groups, Year 8 to 12.

**Primary**

In Northern Ireland, post-primary school is compulsory for children aged 4 to 11. Children are in seven year groups, Year 1 to 7.

**PRTSCE programme**

The ‘Promoting reconciliation through a shared curriculum experience’ programme

**RCT**

Randomised Controlled Trial - a specific type of scientific experiment used to test the effectiveness of an intervention. A key distinguishing feature is that after assessment of eligibility and recruitment, but before the intervention to be studied begins, participants are randomly allocated to the intervention group(s) or control group.

**Cluster RCT**

Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial – participants are randomised in groups or clusters. In the case of the PRTSCE RCT a ‘cluster’ was a school.

**WELB**

Western Education and Library Board
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Executive summary

Introduction

This report presents the findings of an independent evaluation, undertaken by the Centre for Effective Education at Queen’s University Belfast, of the ‘Promoting reconciliation through a shared curriculum experience’ programme. The programme was designed and supported staff from the Curriculum Advisory and Support Service (CASS) of the Western Education and Library Board (WELB) and the research team would like to acknowledge their funding, support and advice. The evaluation took the form of a randomised controlled trial and a qualitative process evaluation focusing on implementation. This report presents the key findings of the evaluation. The evaluation team is indebted to the children and young people, teachers, principals and schools from the WELB who participated in the study.

Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience

The ‘Promoting reconciliation through a shared curriculum experience’ programme (PRTSCE) is an educational initiative aimed at promoting community relations through specific curricular materials and activities as well as cross-community contact. It is a specifically designed programme for primary and post-primary curriculum subjects and it directly addresses community relations and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. The programme was designed to address questions raised in the literature as well as questions posed by the educational community. Firstly, this relates to the propensity of teachers to avoid controversial issues relating to sectarianism and the conflicted past in Northern Ireland, and secondly, the lack of continuity of teaching and learning resources relating to such issues in the transition from primary to post-primary education. The programme was rolled out to year 6, year 7 and year 8 children throughout the WELB area in 2011-12 and to year 9 children in 2012-13. The programme was implemented either in cross-community or single-school settings in order to investigate the impact of the curriculum and that of contact.

The PRTSCE programme involved the development of enhanced and more carefully designed curricular resources, which brought together existing and new teaching materials and activities that are closely aligned with the primary and post-primary curricula. The programme also extended teacher training through residential training and continuous support by the WELB CASS staff. The overall aims of the PRTSCE programme were to enable teachers to address controversial issues relating to sectarianism and conflict in the classroom with confidence. Furthermore the programme aimed to promote intergroup attitudes amongst pupils. Intergroup attitudes were differentiated into ingroup and outgroup attitudes. Ingroup attitudes refer to an individual’s view of their own community while outgroup attitudes refer to an individual’s view of other communities (e.g. religious, cultural).

Methodology

A rigorous two-year evaluation of the effects of the programme was completed by the Centre for Effective Education at Queen’s University Belfast. The research included a cluster randomised
controlled trial (RCT) to measure the programme effects on child outcomes and a process evaluation exploring its implementation and how it was experienced by pupils and teachers.

The clustered randomisation involved 30 primary and post-primary schools located within the WELB area. Each school was paired with another school who could potentially be their contact partner. Each pair of schools was then randomly allocated to one of three conditions: ‘curriculum and contact’ or ‘curriculum only’ or ‘control’. Pupils in participating schools were asked to complete a pre-test before the programme commenced in December 2011 to March 2012 and again at the end of the programme in May to June 2013.

In total, pre and post-tests were both obtained from 502 pupils in 27 schools. The evidence indicated that the randomisation procedure worked well. There were no significant differences on pre-test means scores between the intervention and control groups for the main outcome variables. Similarly, evidence indicated no significant impact of attrition on key outcome variables.

The study focused on five primary outcomes, which were further differentiated to allow the analysis and comparison of theoretical components and differential target groups. As such, the primary outcomes were:

1. Identity (including identity affirmation and identity exploration)
2. Inclusion of ‘other’ in self (target groups: sectarian ingroup, sectarian outgroup, other religious outgroup)
3. Social distance (target groups: sectarian ingroup and outgroup)
4. Tolerance (target groups: sectarian ingroup, sectarian outgroup, other cultural outgroup)
5. Standing up against injustice (including prosocial behaviour, aggressive behavior and ignoring behavior, self-efficacy)

Additionally, a measure of acculturation (including support for cultural maintenance and contact) was introduced at post-test.

Alongside the analysis of the main effects, a series of exploratory analyses were also undertaken to assess whether there was any evidence that the programme was having differential effects for differing subgroups of children. Specifically, the exploratory analysis considered: the child’s gender, religion, percentage of Free School Meals (FSM) in school, primary and post-primary school attendance as well as the number of lessons taught in the class and the number of lessons delivered by contact.

**Findings**

Overall, results from the cluster RCT and the process evaluation show that the PRTSCE programme increased learning about people from different religious communities in Northern Ireland and improved intergroup relations. The way the programme was designed and organized, including the extended training and support, enabled teachers to deliver lessons on controversial issues relatively confidently and pupils to enjoy and engage with the learning. Teacher training, teaching resources, methods and activities were regarded as highly successful in terms of their usefulness for teachers and their reception by pupils.
Where the PRTSCE programme was delivered in single identity settings, the enhanced and more carefully designed use of existing resources through the curriculum had a positive effect on pupils compared to what schools normally do. This was particularly evident with regards to the development of a more critical view of pupils’ own religious community (inclusion of ingroup member in self: $d=-.26$, social distance towards ingroup members: $d=-.34$, tolerance of stereotypical ingroup choices: $d=-.34$), a greater acceptance of different traditions (acculturation maintenance: $d=+.24$) and reduced tendency to respond to instances of injustice in an aggressive manner ($d=-.25$).

The addition of contact, which was considered as enjoyable and important by participants, seemed to diminish the effectiveness of the curriculum in relation to pupils’ views towards their own religious community (inclusion of ingroup member in self: $d=-.17$, social distance towards ingroup members: $d=+.03$, tolerance of stereotypical ingroup choices: $d=-.15$). This could be due to different processes being promoted by the delivery of the PRTSCE programme in single identity or shared educational settings. In particular, contact may heighten enjoyment of shared lessons but also awareness of intergroup differences. Such experiences may thus reduce the likelihood of the development of a more critical perspective of pupils’ own religious community. However, findings may also reflect the problems schools have faced in terms of organizing and planning contact and thus the fact that such practical issues tend to reduce the space available for exploring the curriculum more fully.

Contact, in itself, did not lead to negative effects of the curriculum and the findings of this study should not be used to question the importance of contact. Moreover, there was some evidence that the addition of contact to the curriculum encouraged more positive attitudes towards other religious and cultural groups (social distance towards outgroup members: $d=+.014$, tolerance of stereotypical Chinese outgroup choices: $d=+.15$).

Exploratory analyses revealed no consistent pattern of differences between gender, religion or Free School Meal percentage in school relating to the impact of the programme.

While the teaching content and methods were regarded as enjoyable, they were also clearly challenging. Pupils appeared to struggle to cognitively integrate their everyday understandings of relations between Catholics and Protestants with their new learning through the PRTSCE programme. As such, the programme appears to have successfully challenged pupils’ existing schemata relating to community relations in Northern Ireland and they still appeared to be in the process of incorporating this new learning in their existing worldviews.

**Implications and Recommendations**

1. There is a need for further research and evaluation work to be undertaken in this area to inform the future direction of policy and practice. For example, some further work is required in terms of attitudes towards specific outgroups and also in relation to encouraging more positive responses to instances of injustice.

2. The potential of reinforcing intergroup boundaries may be heightened by the introduction of contact and more attention may need to be paid to incorporating teaching that enables pupils to deconstruct notions of social categories and identities, whereby a critical understanding of ingroup differentiation and intersectionality of divergent social categories (such as gender, class and ethnicity) and how they have been impacted by the conflict in the past and present may provide useful tools for exploration.

3. Research and curriculum development work also needs to be undertaken to explore the influence of curriculum on world views. In addition, research and curriculum development should consider how children integrate their understandings of relations between Catholics
and Protestants in everyday life, their families, communities, the news and the media with their new learning through the curricular lessons.

4. The evidence from this programme would suggest that there is no requirement to differentiate programmes on the basis of gender or social deprivation (as measured by Free School Meals).

5. While findings from this study support the conclusion that shared education at the very least reduces intergroup anxiety (Hughes 2013) they also send a note of caution for teachers and others developing and delivering programmes like this through contact. There needs to be systems wide acknowledgement of the different processes involved in delivery of programmes both in the curriculum and in contact programmes in particular the careful planning of contact programmes to ensure the following:
   - Building of relationships and social interaction
   - Space within the sessions to ensure the curriculum is fully explored
   - Opportunities for pupils to explore their views and opinions on the “ingroup” and “outgroup” prior to contact.
   - Physical space which is conducive to participatory activities

6. There needs to be high quality training and support for such programmes particularly when teachers and schools are expected to undertake potentially controversial and sensitive issues.
1. Introduction

The ‘Promoting reconciliation through a shared curriculum experience’ programme (PRTSCE) is an educational initiative aiming to promote community relations through specific curricular programmes and cross-community contact. The programme was designed and supported through the Western Education and Library Board and funded by the International Fund for Ireland. It is a specifically designed programme for primary and post-primary curriculum subjects which directly address community relations and reconciliation in Northern Ireland within cross-community and single-school settings. The programme was thus designed to address questions raised in the literature and the educational community relating to firstly, the propensity of teachers to avoid controversial issues relating to sectarianism and the conflicted past in Northern Ireland, and secondly, the lack of continuity of teaching and learning resources relating to such issues in the transition from primary to post-primary education. The programme was rolled out to year 6, year 7 and year 8 children throughout the Western Education and Library Board area in 2011-12 and to year 9 children in 2012-13.

As part of the implementation process, a rigorous evaluation of the effects of the programme was completed by the Centre for Effective Education at Queen’s University Belfast, which includes a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) looking at the effects of programme on child outcomes and a process evaluation investigating implementation. This interim report will give an overview of from the 2011-12 cohort of year 6, 7 and 8 children. The curriculum for each year group included a series of 12 lesson plans with accompanying resources. The curriculum was designed and supported, through training and in-class support, by the Curriculum Advisory and Support Service (CASS) of the Western Education and Library Board (WELB). In total, 28 schools were involved in the first year of the implementation and evaluation. There were 12 primary and six post-primary intervention schools as well as five primary and four post-primary control schools. The intervention children were taught the same 12 lessons. However, four primary schools took part in cross-community contact and completed some or all of the lessons with a partner school. The remaining eight primary schools completed the lessons in school with their own class group. Likewise, four of the post-primary intervention schools took part in cross-community contact and the other two post-primary intervention schools completed their lessons in schools with their class group. The control schools did not take part in the programme during the first year of implementation but received the full training, resources and support in the second year of the programme.

In the following sections, a brief literature review provides an overview of theoretical and empirical literature that informed the development of the PRTSCE programme and the evaluation to allow for contextualisation of the programme evaluation, the identified key outcomes of the programme and the findings.

1.1 Background

Education has long been regarded as a vehicle for transforming conflicted community relations in societies emerging from violent (ethno-)political conflict and into collaborative and sustainable relationships in the future (Save the Children, 2008; UNESCO, 2011). The significant role of education for promoting peaceful relationship in such societies has been recognised for example by the
International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2001-2010), which declared education as a necessary means to instil the knowledge about other cultures, common values, positive intergroup attitudes and skills required for living together peacefully. Much of the academic literature relating to educational interventions aimed at promoting positive intergroup attitudes and reconciliation has been based on two main strategies in the formal education sector. Firstly, there has been a focus on structural initiatives, such as Integrated Education and the School Community Relations Programme in Northern Ireland, based on the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; Niens & Cairns, 2005), which suggests that bringing people from opposing groups together under optimal conditions improves intergroup attitudes. Secondly, there has been attention on curricular contents; e.g. relating to history education as a means to promote reconciliation and overcome the collective trauma of past events (Salomon, 2004; McCully, 2012), religious education to promote knowledge and understanding of the other (Jackson & Fujiwara, 2007; Nelson, 2004), and most recently citizenship education (Quaynor, 2012; Niens & Reilly 2012). The latter approach acknowledges the fact that intergroup contact is not always an option in societies, where the education system may be characterised by separate provision for different communities, where there is geographical disparity and/or other impediments to contact. Despite the growing appreciation of the role of education in promoting reconciliation and peace in educational policy and practice as well as the academic literature, there remains a disconnection between theory, research and practice (UNICEF, 2011), partly due to a lack of rigorous evaluations in the field (Paluck & Green, 2009).

Within Northern Ireland, the potential role of education in perpetuating community divisions or promoting reconciliation, and ultimately long-term peace, has long been acknowledged and attracted much attention in public and political discourses over the years. Many of these discourses and subsequent educational initiatives reflected the emphasis on the two main strategies for promoting reconciliation in formal education (Gallagher, 2010). As such, firstly structural initiatives featured prominently, as evidenced in Integrated Education (Niens & Cairns, 2008), the School Community Relations Programme (O’Connor et al., 2002) and most recently in Shared Education (Connolly, Purvis and O’Grady, 2013; Hansson et al., 2013, Hughes et al., 2010). Secondly, Northern Ireland experiences significant curricular changes, as seen in Education for Mutual Understanding and Cultural Heritage (1989-2007) (Smith & Robinson, 1996) and most recently Personal Development and Mutual Understanding in the primary sector and Local and Global Citizenship Education in the post-primary sector (Richardson & Gallagher, 2011).

Similar to the lack of a solid evidence base relating to peace education lamented elsewhere (Paluck, 2012) and hampered by a lack of funding for longitudinal studies, peace education initiatives in Northern Ireland have rarely been investigated systematically and rigorous evaluations of educational initiatives focussing on structural or curricular change remain rare.

In the following, we will briefly review and recent research evidence relating to the contact hypothesis and curricular initiatives, which are both relevant for the Promoting Reconciliation Programme. While there is a vast amount of literature and empirical research available in this area, in our review we will synthesise international research evidence, mainly based on recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews, as well as local research evidence from Northern Ireland.

Much of the literature relating to prejudice reduction considers prejudice as a form of intergroup bias (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Intergroup bias can be differentiated into ingroup and out group bias which can be defined as follows:
- An **ingroup** can be defined as a social group to which individuals feel they belong or to which other people see them as belonging. **Ingroup bias** then is when individuals tend to see their own ingroup more positively than other groups (outgroups).

- An **outgroup** can be defined as a social groups to which individuals do not feel a sense of belonging. **Outgroup bias** is when individuals tend to discriminate against outgroups. While outgroup bias are considered to be correlated with ingroup bias, they are not a necessary consequence and the two concepts are conceptually distinct.

- For example an individual may identify with being a member of the Catholic community (ingroup). Under certain circumstances, they may then treat members of their ‘ingroup’ (Catholic community) more favourably than others. Such ingroup bias may in turn, under certain circumstances, develop into outgroup bias (whereby the individual would discriminate against members of the ‘outgroup’, i.e. in this context the Protestant community).

### 1.2 Effectiveness of educational programmes aimed to address prejudice and promote reconciliation

The contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954) has become one of the most frequently applied theoretical frameworks to educational efforts aimed at reducing prejudice and promoting reconciliation. In its most basic form the contact hypothesis states that bringing together individuals from opposing groups reduces prejudice and conflict. Initially four conditions for effective contact were proposed, namely equal status of contact participants, no competition, common goals and institutional support (Allport, 1954).

Decades of advances in theory and research relating to the effects of contact, led to various extensions to the hypothesis (e.g. the extended contact hypothesis which proposes that knowledge about an ingroup member who has outgroup friends effectively reduces prejudice; the vicarious contact hypothesis which suggests that observing ingroup members interact with outgroup members (e.g. through media) is effective, and imagined contact whereby it is assumed that envisioning intergroup contact reduces prejudices (Dovidio et al., 2011) and proposed conditions for contact. In the 1990s, proliferation of proposed contact conditions as well as mixed research evidence and the suggestion that theoretical and applied proponents of contact failed to engage with criticisms, especially in relation to doubts about generalisibility of contact and its lack of consideration of potentially necessary structural changes, have led some to call for the contact hypothesis to be abandoned or at least to be substantially reconsidered (Connolly, 2000; Dixon et al., 2005).

Despite such criticisms, in the past ten years the contact hypothesis gained renewed popularity and recent advances in theory and statistical developments took account of some of the criticisms that had been raised. Recent meta-analyses provided clear support for the contact hypothesis. Based on statistical analyses of over 500 individual studies and over 700 independent samples, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found that contact typically reduced prejudice and generalised to the outgroup as a whole. Contact conditions were found to facilitate contact effects though they were not an essential prerequisite for effective contact. Further analyses which tested mediators of intergroup contact showed that reduced intergroup anxiety and increased perspective taking mediated the effect of contact on prejudice whereby increased knowledge about the outgroup had a weaker impact than the other two variables (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Furthermore, using an expanded database of studies, Davies et al. (2011) found outgroup friendships as a measure of contact to have a

---

1 Statistical technique that allows the combination of results from individual, similar studies (Cochrane, 2002) thereby increasing the statistical power of single studies
particularly powerful effect on prejudice reduction, particularly where these friendships are characterised by high levels of disclosure and extended time spent together.

While many of the empirical studies relating to the contact hypothesis have focused on the impact of contact and interventions on the reduction of outgroup prejudice, research evidence indicates that intergroup bias are often more pronounced in relation to positive ingroup bias than negative outgroup bias, especially for members of majority groups (e.g. in terms of ‘racial’ intergroup relations White Europeans) and homogenous group contexts (such as single-identity schools). McGlothlin & Killen’s (2010) study of seven to ten year old European and African American children in ethnically homogenous or heterogeneous school settings highlighted the necessity to clearly differentiate conceptually between ingroup and outgroup bias especially when researching children. In contrast to the body of research demonstrating an effect of contact on outgroup prejudice, McGlothlin & Killen (2010) found that contact did not reduce outgroup prejudices but positive ingroup bias only. The authors suggest that this may be a result of developmental processes whereby outgroup prejudice as a cognitive construct would only start to manifest from mid childhood. Based on the findings of a meta-analysis of over 120 studies relating to prejudice development in early and mid-childhood, Raabe & Bertelmann (2011) conclude that prejudice development can be presented as a reverse u-shaped curve whereby prejudice peaks from five to seven years and then generally gradually declines. Developmental effects were mediated by opportunities for intergroup contact; even small percentages of minority members in the classroom reduced the increase of prejudice development in mid-childhood.

In the contact of Northern Ireland today, 15 years after the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, research from the Young Life & Times Survey shows that, in comparison to ten years ago, 16-year old children have more contact with outgroup members than they did in the past and show reduction in relation to sectarian prejudices (Devine & Robinson, 2012) though segregation and sectarianism remain an issue (Nolan, 2013). With regards to the development of sectarian prejudice throughout childhood, Connolly (2009, 2011) argued that three to six years old children start to internalise ingroup norms and habits and to differentiate between ingroup and outgroup. Investigating the relationship between identity and prejudiced attitudes amongst seven to eleven year old children in Northern Ireland, Gallagher and Cairns (2011) found evidence of ingroup bias, which was positively related to outgroup bias for Protestant respondents and negatively related to outgroup bias for Catholic respondents, thus highlighting the need to differentiate between ingroup and outgroup attitudes. Research evidence from Northern Ireland indicates that education promoting contact and intergroup friendships can make a positive difference in relation to prejudice development in Northern Ireland (e.g. McGlynn et al., 2004; Stringer et al., 2012). Where contact programmes have been found to be less effective in Northern Ireland, this has been consistently attributed to their short-term and un-sustained nature and a failure to engage with controversial issues of conflict (Hughes, 2010).

However, it is much less clear what contact, as introduced through shared education, adds to intergroup attitudes and reconciliation beyond curricular initiatives that have been introduced to tackle similar issues within the context of separate schools, which are the reality in Northern Ireland as well as in many other conflicted societies.

Connolly et al. (2013) defined shared education as involving schools from divergent sectors, management types, identities and ethos with the aim of benefitting pupils’ education, the economy and social cohesion. While the potential of shared education to contribute to pupils’ development of more positive intergroup attitudes has been increasingly widely recognised (Boorooah & Knox, 2012; Connolly et al., 2013; Hughes, 2009), empirical evidence is still emerging for this relatively new initiative. An early review of inter-school collaborations (Atkinson et al., 2007) identified various
ways in which such initiatives are introduced into school in Northern Ireland and evidence of benefits for the whole school, teachers and pupils. More recently, an evaluation of the first three years of the IFI funded Shared Education Programme, revealed that cross-sector collaboration became a reality for many schools and that this provided opportunities for intergroup contact and learning between pupils (Gallagher et al., 2010). Based on the findings of a large scale pupil survey, Hughes et al. (2012) conclude that shared education impacts positively on intergroup attitudes. Based on an indepth, qualitative study, Hughes (2013) explored two shared education projects in different socio-political and demographic contexts. Findings indicate the contextually bounded nature of the programme and its impact on pupils. The ways in which the contact experience impacted on pupils in this study was found to be influenced by similarities between the norms characterising the schools and local communities, the socio-political and geographical environment pupils came from, as well as the opportunities for pupils to maintain cross-community friendships outside of the school gates and their individual perspective on the socio-political situation in Northern Ireland. Hughes (2013, p. 14) concluded that while shared education in supporting contexts may promote close intergroup friendships, at a minimum “sustained contact [through shared education] has a mitigating effect on the sense of fear and anxiety associated with the other”. While contact through shared education thus appeared to have some positive effect on pupils, it was also highlighted that teachers’ acceptance of the initiative is often based on the premise that it aims to promote educational outcomes for pupils rather than reconciliation, thereby leaving room to avoid addressing controversial issues relating to sectarian division in Northern Ireland. As such, further research evidence is required on the impact of the curriculum on pupils’ attitudes through shared education in comparison to learning contexts where curriculum delivery is not shared.

Internationally, educational initiatives based on the premises of the contact hypothesis have been queried for some of their basic premises. Dixon et al. (2012) suggest that the attempt to foster peace and harmonious intergroup relationships in historically unequal societies, may curb motivations amongst minority group members to challenge injustice and social inequality. On a different note, Bekerman & Zembylas (2011) warn that the focus on ingroup and outgroup perspectives, that the contact hypothesis and other psychological theories imply, actually reinforces community divisions and may serve to essentialise identities rather than to deconstruct their meaning in societal context. Recently, curricular initiatives in post-conflict societies have tried to address the first criticisms by drawing on literature relating to human rights and citizenship education and dialogic pedagogies, where a focus on issues relating to inequalities, injustice and democratic engagement is considered a key feature of peacebuilding education (Kester & Booth, 2010; Reardon & Snauwaert, 2011). Similar to contact programmes, the aim of such curricular initiatives for peacebuilding is to promote positive intergroup attitudes amongst pupils and the role of identity usually remains a key issue. While this could raise similar questions relating to the potential for essentialising of identities (Bekerman, 2009), the approach is based on the theoretical proposition that violent societal conflict is rooted in collective identities and narratives and that these can represent a protective factor for individuals and communities as well as a detrimental one for society as a whole (Hammack, 2010; Salomon 2006). Moreover, the discussion of controversial issues, which addresses questions relating to diversity and similarity of historically conflicted groups, through participatory teaching methods and dialogic discourses, has been proposed as central pedagogical tools (Bickmore, 2011). Based on a review of empirical literature relating to citizenship education in various post-conflict societies, Quaynor (2012) found questions as to how to deal with divergent identities and with controversial issues to be a common issue in divergent contexts. It is interesting to note that teachers’ tendency to avoid issues seen as controversial often stands in curious contrast to children and young people’s interest in local and global issues relating to conflict, their desire to gain a better understanding of the causes and consequences of it and to learn how to promote social justice effectively (Holden, 2006).
In the context of Northern Ireland, teachers’ propensity to avoid controversial issues, especially in relation to sectarianism, has also been raised as an issue in relation to Local and Global Citizenship (CCEA, 2006). Based on the findings of the evaluation of the pilot introduction of Local and Global Citizenship, Niens, O’Connor & Smith (2013) argue teachers’ understandings of citizenship and societal conflict appeared disconnected and that this in turn may limit the potential for citizenship education to promote inclusive intergroup attitudes amongst pupils. Additionally, qualitative research indicates potential differences in the implementation of Local & Global Citizenship across school sectors in Northern Ireland, which it has been suggested could serve to reinforce community divisions rather than to alleviate them (Niens & Reilly, 2012).

It could therefore be suggested that the delivery of Local & Global Citizenship through Shared Education, with a particular emphasis on controversial issues, unity and diversity, may provide a means for teachers in different sectors to learn from each other and to develop more consistent approaches. Pupils could benefit from the contact experience in which difficult issues are actually explored, which in turn could be theoretically expected to positively affect their outgroup attitudes.

In summary, while there is an increasing recognition of the role of the contact hypothesis and curricular interventions in reducing prejudiced attitudes, rigorously evaluated field programmes and interventions remain scarce (Quaynor, 2012; Paluck & Green, 2009). This is particularly the case for those interventions which are not (or not solely) based on the contact hypothesis, such as curricular initiatives, and initiatives targeted at younger children from early to mid-childhood (Aboud et al., 2012). Despite an increasing body of research evidence relating to positive effects of intergroup contact on intergroup relations and the potential for shared education in promoting positive attitudes amongst pupils, to our knowledge there has been no study in Northern Ireland comparing the introduction of an enhanced curriculum accompanied by teacher training to enable the discussion of controversial issues in shared and single-identity school settings. This is what this evaluation set out to do using a cluster randomised controlled trial to evaluate the effectiveness of the PRSCE programme in mid-childhood, ie. Year 6 to Year 8. A particular focus of this evaluation was on ingroup and outgroup attitudes as main outcome variables, whereby it was expected that the differential between ingroup and outgroup attitudes would be reduced (i.e. ingroup and outgroup bias would decrease).

1.3 Report outline

This next chapter outlines the methodology used for the evaluation to include the Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) and process evaluation. The findings from the RCT and accompanying exploratory analysis are then presented in chapter 3, followed by the findings from the process evaluation in chapter 4. The final chapter draws together the overall tentative conclusions for the evaluation at this point.
2. Methodology

The following section gives a brief outline of the two components of the PRTSCE programme evaluation: The Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT) and the qualitative process evaluation. An overview of the outcomes, measures and analyses is presented. This chapter begins by describing the specific outcomes, as agreed with CASS of the WELB, that were tested and that provide the focus for the present evaluation.

2.1 Outcomes

For the purposes of this present evaluation, an outcome is defined as a real and discernible change in attitudes and/or intended behaviour that has occurred as a direct result of receiving the PRTSCE programme. This study focused on five primary outcomes, whereby attitudinal outcomes are differentiated into ingroup and different outgroup biases. The first primary outcome (affirmation of identity) comprised two measurement constructs (affirmation/belonging and identity exploration). The second, third and fourth primary outcomes differentiated between religious ingroup and outgroup attitudes (Catholic/Protestant) whereby the second and fourth outcome contained an additional measure for alternative outgroups (Muslim, Chinese). The fifth primary outcome (standing up against injustice) comprised five measurement constructs. The primary outcomes are considered to be the main effects of receiving the PRTSCE programme and are:

1. Identity relating to religious community background
   - Change in affirmation/belonging
   - Increased identity exploration
2. Inclusion of other in self
   - Reduced inclusion of ingroup members in self
   - Increased inclusion of religious outgroup members in self (Catholic/Protestant)
   - Increased inclusion of other outgroup members in self (Muslim)
3. Intended behaviour (social distance)
   - Increased social distance towards ingroup members
   - Decreased social distance towards outgroup members (Catholic/Protestant)
4. Tolerance/acceptance relating to others’ choices of cultural symbols
   - Decreased tolerance towards stereotypical ingroup choices
   - Increased tolerance towards stereotypical religious outgroup choices (Catholic/Protestant)
   - Increased tolerance towards stereotypical other cultural outgroup choices (Chinese)
5. Standing up against injustice comprising the following measurement constructs:
   - Increased pro-social behaviours
   - Decreased aggressive behaviours
   - Decreased ignoring behaviours
   - Improved self-efficacy

These outcomes reflect the core aims and objectives of the PRTSCE programme and were agreed in conjunction with the CASS of the WELB team.
### 2.2 Design

The clustered randomised controlled trial involved 30 primary and secondary schools located with the Western Education and Library Board in Northern Ireland. Each school was paired with another school who could potentially be their contact partner, if they were randomly allocated to the ‘Curriculum + Contact’ group. The pairs of schools were then organised into four clusters:

- **Cluster 1:** Primary schools with 2/3 classes per school. This cluster comprised three pairs of schools.
- **Cluster 2:** Post-primary schools with 2/3 classes per school. This cluster comprised three pairs of schools.
- **Cluster 3:** Primary schools with 1 class per school. This cluster comprised six pairs of schools.
- **Cluster 4:** Post-primary schools with 1 class per school. This cluster comprised three pairs of schools.

Each pair of schools, within each cluster, was then randomly allocated to one of three conditions: ‘Curriculum + Contact’ or ‘Curriculum Only’ or ‘Control’. In other words, within clusters 1, 2 and 4, one pair was assigned to each condition. Within cluster 3, two pairs were assigned to each condition. The randomization design is summarized below in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1. A summary of the randomisation design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>‘Curriculum + Contact’ condition</th>
<th>‘Curriculum Only’ condition</th>
<th>‘Control’ condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1: Primary, 2/3 classes</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2: Post-primary, 2/3 classes</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3: Primary, 1 class</td>
<td>two pairs (4 schools)</td>
<td>two pairs (4 schools)</td>
<td>two pairs (4 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4: Post-primary, 1 class</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
<td>one pair (2 schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>five pairs (10 schools)</td>
<td>five pairs (10 schools)</td>
<td>five pairs (10 schools)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall this resulted in 20 intervention schools (10 Curriculum + Contact and 10 Curriculum Only) and 10 Control schools.

### 2.3 Procedure

The intervention comprised 12 lessons, conducted between January and June 2012. The children’s pre-testing and post-testing was conducted through the use of an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed and rolled out using the Questback programme. Children were first asked to select their gender and religious background and were directed to the relevant questions. A short description of religious community was included on this page of the questionnaire. For example, girls were directed to scenarios involving girls and boys were directed to scenarios involving boys. Children were directed to questions relevant to their in-group and out-group based on the religious community they selected. All children were also asked about additional out-groups in some questions: a Muslim child, Chinese children and a child from Zambia. A short description of
the Muslim religious community was included for the relevant question. Pre-testing was undertaken for both intervention groups in December 2011 and in January 2012 for the control group. There was a lower response rate in some schools, so eight schools were revisited in an attempt to increase the pre-test response rate. Revisits were conducted in February/March 2012. Post-tests were conducted in May/June 2012.

All pre-test and post-test data collection was conducted by the research assistant and a team of carefully trained and coordinated fieldworkers.

2.4 Sample

The evaluation assessed children in 27 out of 30 potential schools. Three schools withdrew from the entire programme before or shortly after randomization. One of these schools was a Cluster 1 control school and the other two were cluster 2 ‘Curriculum Only’ schools. In addition to this the two original Cluster 1 ‘Curriculum + Contact’ schools opted for ‘Curriculum Only’. Within the 27 schools remaining, the evaluation assessed 76% (n=635) of the 840 children involved in the PRTSCE programme (see Table 2.2)

Table 2.2. Number of schools randomised and pre and post-testing completed by intervention and control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention/control group</th>
<th>Number of schools referred (% of total)</th>
<th>Schools completed Pre-test (% of total)</th>
<th>Schools completed Pre and Post-test (% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 presents the consort statement flow diagram showing how many children were in the intervention groups and the control group and details on the numbers tested and attrition. There was some attrition during the evaluation. The major reasons for this were that children were absent from school on the day of testing, left the school after referral was made, left the class after randomization, their parents did not give consent or the schools decided to include one class instead of two.
Figure 2.1: Consort statement flow diagram showing total number of questionnaires completed by children

30 schools recruited and organised into 3 clusters that were then randomised

3 schools withdrew before/shortly after randomisation

Control
5 primary schools
4 post primary schools
356 children

77 not available for pre-test (40 did not consent)

279 children pre-tested

11 not available for pre-test

228 children post-tested

Total that were pre-tested and post-tested: 217

Curriculum Only
8 primary schools
2 post primary schools
316 children

55 not available for pre-test (37 did not consent)

261 children pre-tested

10 not available for pre-test

162 children post-tested

Total that were pre-tested and post-tested: 152

Curriculum + Contact
5 primary schools
4 post primary schools
170 children

14 not available for pre-test (5 did not consent)

156 children pre-tested

5 not available for pre-test

138 children post-tested

Total that were pre-tested and post-tested: 133
2.5 Effects of Attrition

As to be expected in a two-year programme of this nature, it has to be noted that the sample showed a fair amount of attrition over time which could have introduced bias into the findings. One way to test this is to compare the mean scores of the three groups at pre-test on each of the outcome variables for whom pre-test and post-test data exists.

For each outcome variable, descriptive statistics have been generated (means, standard deviations and overall numbers for each group). Basic multilevel models were used to calculate the significance of the difference between each of the treatment groups and the control group. Table 2.3 shows basic sample statistics across groups and significance levels of difference between groups, which have been calculated in a way that takes into account the clustering of the data. As can be seen in Table 2.3, for the most part the three groups remain equivalent at pre-test. We can therefore conclude that attrition has not introduced any known biases into the study. The only notable exception is the efficacy outcome measure as can be seen.

Table 2.3: Basic sample statistics across groups and significance levels between groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Muslim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>&gt;.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Curriculum Only</td>
<td>Curriculum + Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup (Catholic/Protestant)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup (Chinese)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing up Against Injustice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial responses</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive responses</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring responses</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>Cultural maintenance</td>
<td>N/A (post-test only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact/participation</td>
<td>N/A (post-test only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to note that these analyses show that the differences that do exist between the mean scores are no more than one would expect to occur randomly due to the randomization process. Moreover, such differences are taken into account and controlled for in the main analysis below.

### 2.6 RCT measures

In the study there were five primary outcome variables investigated. Except for the variable ‘Inclusion of other in self’, each of the outcome variables is measured by a composite mean score from several items within the research questionnaire. The primary outcome variables are provided in the Table 2.4 below as well as measurement constructs (where appropriate) and a description of the measure.

#### Table 2.4. Primary Outcome variables and contributing scales and items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire scale</th>
<th>Description of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation of identity (adapted from Roberts et al, 1999)</td>
<td>Children are asked to indicate how proud they feel about their respective community and how they feel it is valued in society. Measure is made up of 12 items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs</td>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Inclusion of other in self (adapted from Cameron et al, 2006) | Children are asked to imagine they have met a child from the in-group/out-group community. |
| Constructs | In-group item* | Children are asked to indicate how close they feel to the in-group (Catholic/Protestant) child: not close to me at all, somewhat close to me, very close to me. |
| Constructs | Out-group item* | Children are asked to indicate how close they feel to the out-group (Catholic/Protestant) child: not close to me at all, somewhat close to me, very close to me. |
| Constructs | Out-group (Muslim) item* | Children are asked to indicate how close they feel to the out-group (Muslim) child: not close to me at all, somewhat close to me, very close to me. |

| Intended behaviour and social distance (adapted from Lewis & Lewis, 1987) | Children are asked to indicate if they would welcome a new pupil from the out-group or in-group to their school. Children are asked if they would go up to the child and say hello, let him/her join them at lunch time, invite him/her to call round to their house after school and share a secret with him/her. |
| Constructs | In-group scale | Items related to a respondent’s in-group. |
| Constructs | Out-group scale | Items related to a respondent’s in-group. |

| Tolerance/acceptance of difference (specifically designed for purpose of this evaluation) | Children are presented with a selection of cultural/religious items/celebrations. Children are asked to pick three that describe themselves. Children are then presented with stereotypical choices from another child and asked what they think about it and their attitudes towards the child who chose these items/celebrations. The attitude scores are calculated using a list of positive and negative attributes and children rate the out-group or in-group child against |
these attributes. The positive attributes used were friendly, good, nice, pretty and smart. The negative attributes used were dirty, mean, naughty, selfish, unfriendly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Denominational stereotype score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation of the children’s denomination stereotype is taken from the three pictures they choose to best describe themselves. Their three choices are scored and added together (-1 for a picture choice which stereotypically represents their out-group, 1 for a picture choice which stereotypically represents their in-group and 0 for a neutral picture which is neither stereotypically out-group nor in-group).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-group scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses to the list of positive and negative attitudes for the stereotypical choices from a child in their in-group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Out-group scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses to the list of positive and negative attitudes for the stereotypical choices from a child in their in-group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group unknown - stereotypical Catholic pictures</th>
<th>Group unknown - stereotypical Protestant pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses to the list of positive and negative attitudes for the stereotypical choices from a Catholic child. This scale includes children who selected ‘other’ or ‘don’t know’ for their religious community.</td>
<td>Responses to the list of positive and negative attitudes for the stereotypical choices from a Protestant child. This scale includes children who selected ‘other’ or ‘don’t know’ for their religious community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Out-group (Chinese) scale | Responses to the list of positive and negative attitudes for the stereotypical choices from a Chinese child. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing up against injustice (adapted from Palmer and Cameron, 2011)</th>
<th>Children are presented with scenarios describing situations of discrimination (e.g. name-calling) against an in-group or out-group child. Children are then asked to tick a list of options which relate to what they would do. For each of the constructs below a scenario was given for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- An in-group child (Catholic/Protestant): name calling in relation to religious background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An out-group child (Catholic/Protestant): name calling in relation to religious background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An out-group child (Catholic/Protestant) who is wearing an out-group school uniform: taking his/her schools bag and throwing it away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An out-group (Zambian) child who is black: taking his/her schools bag and throwing it away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs:</th>
<th>Pro social behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children are asked if they would tell a teacher or a member of staff or a family member about what they saw/heard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing-up behaviours</th>
<th>Children are asked if they would tell the person that they should not be nasty things about the child in the scenario because of his religious background.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive behaviours</th>
<th>Children are asked if they would start a row with the person, or call the person something nasty to do with their religious community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ignoring behaviours</th>
<th>Children are asked if they would ignore it and walk away.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self efficacy</th>
<th>Children are asked if they think they could stop the child talking like this in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Challenging social norms | Children are asked if they could make other children think about people from different religious communities more positively. This was an individual item at the end of the questionnaire and was not asked in relation to each of the scenarios outlined above. |

* These constructs are single items (questions) and not scales
Table 2.5 presents the primary outcome variables, contributing scales, notes and the final column presents the Cronbach’s alpha score for each measure. Cronbach’s alpha scores represent the reliability of the scale, which theoretically ranges from 0.0 to 1.0, with higher scores indicating higher reliability. High reliability occurs when people consistently answer the questions within each outcome measure in a similar way.

**Table 2.5. Primary Outcome variables, contributing scales and Alpha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (original version Phinney; this version Roberts et al, 1999).</td>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>First set of 12 items. Mean score of items: 1,2,4,8,10.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of identity affirmation/belonging</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>Same set of 12 items. Mean score of items: 3,5,6,7,9,11,12</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Inclusion of others in self-measure (Cameron et al, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td></td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>Attitudes to someone from religious ingroup. 1 item (Catholic/Protestant; using images of stick people in circles).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>As above, but attitudes to outgroup (Catholic/Protestant).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>As above but attitudes to alternative outgroup (Muslim).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted social distance measure (Bogardus, 1947)</td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>Based on 4-item measure relating to scenario of imagining new ingroup child starting in school.</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>Same as above but for religious outgroup (Catholic/Protestant).</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (specifically designed for this evaluation)</td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>Pictures of cultural symbols task. 7-item scale. Mean ratings of characteristics of someone choosing stereotypical ingroup symbols.</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>As above but stereotypical outgroup symbols (Catholic/Protestant).</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>As above but alternative outgroup symbols (Chinese).</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adapted Standing up Against Injustice (adapted from Palmer & Cameron, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosocial responses across scenarios</th>
<th>prosoci2</th>
<th>Mean score for prosocial intended responses across scenarios. 12-items scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive responses</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>As above but aggressive responses. 6-item scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore responses</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>As above but ignore responses. 3-item scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-efficacy in having positive influence on others (Palmer & Cameron, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Across scenarios</th>
<th>effic2</th>
<th>Mean of responses across scenarios to question “could you stop them in the future.” 3-item scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Acculturation based on Nigbur et al. (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural maintenance</th>
<th>ac_main2</th>
<th>Post-test only measure. Mean of items 3,4,5,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact/participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>As above but mean of items 2,6,7 (item 1 excluded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alpha scores for the outcome variables refer to the reliability of the measures. The convention is that an alpha of 0.7 or higher has good reliability (Nunnally, 1978) while an alpha of > 0.6 is often considered as acceptable especially where scales are composed of small numbers of items (George & Mallery, 2003). All measures have scores over this figure and can therefore be considered as acceptable. In terms of validity the measures have good face validity (as they specifically match the intended programme outcomes) and a factor analysis of measures (not reported in this paper) suggested that all measures have good construct validity.

See Appendix 1 for a complete copy of the children’s questionnaire.

2.7 Statistical analysis

The main analysis in relation to ascertaining the impact of the two interventions (Curriculum Only or Curriculum + Contact) was undertaken using a series of multilevel linear models, with pupils (level 1) clustered within schools (level 2). For each model, the dependent variable was the outcome variable of interest at post-test and the independent variables were as follows:

- A dummy variable representing whether the pupil attended a school that delivered the Curriculum Only or not
- A dummy variable representing whether the pupil attended a school that delivered the Curriculum + Contact or not
- The following covariates: the outcome variable at pre-test; the percentage of pupils in the school eligible for free school meals; a dummy variable indicating whether the pupil attends a primary or post-primary school; a dummy variable indicating whether a child is Catholic or Protestant; a dummy variable indicating whether the pupil has any family members from the other religious tradition or not; and a dummy variable representing whether the pupil has any friends from the other religious tradition or not.

Evidence of the effectiveness of both interventions in relation to each outcome was indicated by the relevant dummy variable for each intervention in the model being statistically significant or not. As all of the covariates had been centred, then the coefficient for each of these two dummy variables represented the difference in mean scores between the control group and the particular intervention undertaken. The associated effect size (Cohen’s d) for each intervention was calculated.
by dividing the respective coefficient from the model by the standard deviation of the relevant post-test outcome variable for the sample as a whole.

These main models were then extended by adding interaction terms to assess whether the two interventions were having differential effects on particular subgroups of pupils (namely: girls and boys; Catholic and Protestant pupils; primary and post-primary pupils; and pupils from schools with differing proportions eligible for free school meals). In each case, the interaction term was calculated by multiplying the relevant contextual variable (i.e. representing gender, religion, type of school or percentage of free school meals) by the dummy variable for the particular intervention undertaken (Curriculum Only or Curriculum + Contact). Evidence that an intervention was having a differential effect was indicated by whether the interaction term was statistically significant or not. For statistically significant findings, the associated models were used to calculate the adjusted mean post-test scores for each subgroup in the control group and the group delivering either the Curriculum Only or the Curriculum + Contact. These mean scores were ‘adjusted’ in the sense that the model controlled for any pre-test differences in the groups in relation to the outcome variable concerned: gender, religion, type of school and percentage in school eligible for free school meals.

Finally, with regard to assessing whether the number of lessons delivered for those in the Curriculum Only group was associated with the effects of the intervention, each multilevel model was run again but only for the pupils in the Curriculum Only intervention group. This time, the two dummy variables representing the two interventions were removed but the other covariates were left in the model. In addition, a further independent variable was added that represented the number of lessons delivered by the school. If the coefficient for this variable was statistically significant then this indicated that there was evidence of an association between number of lessons delivered and the post-test score, controlling for the other covariates. This coefficient was then divided by the standard deviation for the outcome variable concerned for those in the Curriculum Only intervention group to calculate an effect size that represented the average change in the outcome variable at post-test for each additional lesson delivered, measured in standard deviations. The same approach was taken in relation to the number of lessons delivered through contact and the effects of the Curriculum + Contact intervention.

Full details of all of the statistical models run for the present analysis are provided in the appendices.

2.8 Process Evaluation

The following section outlines the process instruments and analysis of the process data. Additional to the RCT, a process evaluation was conducted, which involved the analysis of initial teacher questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, lesson observations and collection of teacher timesheets and teacher lesson evaluations. Four questions were also added to the end of the children’s questionnaire, for the intervention schools. The purpose of the process evaluation was:

1) To monitor the extent to which schools implement the programme as planned
2) To undertake qualitative focus groups and interviews with key stakeholders (pupils, teachers) to gauge their perspectives on and experiences of the programme
3) To identify facilitators and inhibitors to the successful delivery of the programme.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with 22 out of 23 intervention teachers – one teacher had retired. In total, 21 focus groups were conducted with groups of children across 17 of the 18 intervention schools. One school opted out of the focus group element. Lesson observations were conducted in all 12 Curriculum Only schools and for four out of the six Curriculum + Contact
schools during 2011-12. Time sheets and lesson observations were also collected from teachers. Finally, additional questions were added to the children's post-questionnaire for intervention children only in order to gain a general picture of what the children thought about the lessons.

Almost all of the process evaluation data were collected in relation to the first year of the programme (2011-12). However, teacher lesson evaluations were also collected for 2012-13 and the four questions on the children's questionnaire were included in the final post-test.

In addition, one more teacher questionnaire was issued in February 2013 because of political developments in Northern Ireland. While after the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement in 1998, Northern Ireland experienced a period of reduced political violence, the past 15 years have been punctuated intermittently by heightened community tensions. During the second year of the programme, community tensions in Northern Ireland increased substantially resulting in widespread protests throughout the country. In December 2012, Belfast City Council’s decision to reduce the number of days the Union flag would be flown at Belfast City Hall resulted in tension throughout various parts of Northern Ireland. Given that the programme focuses on reconciliation and specific aspects of the Northern Ireland situation, the research team decided to gather some information on the potential impact of recent developments on students’ perceptions and attitudes, as well as any potential impact on the teaching of the programme.

### 2.8.1 Selection of the sample

The initial teacher questionnaire was given to all intervention teachers at the initial training event. The majority of teachers completed and returned it during this event. The remaining questionnaires from intervention teachers were followed up by post and email. The initial questionnaire was sent by post and email to the control teachers. These were followed up with several reminders. In total, the initial teacher questionnaire was completed by 20 out of 23 intervention teachers and six out of 12 control teachers.

In total, 22 of the teachers involved with the delivery of the PRTSE programme throughout the first year of its roll out were interviewed. A total of 23 teachers were working to deliver the PRTSE programme across 18 schools in the Western Education and Library Board. For the most part, interviews were conducted in November/December 2012, to allow for a period of reflection and evaluation and reduce disruption in May/June given that the post-testing and focus groups with children were taking place then. One teacher interview was conducted in May because the teacher was retiring at the end of the academic year.

Focus groups were carried out with 21 groups of children across the 18 schools. All of the focus groups were conducted by the same researcher and she talked to a total of 147 children. As a starter for the focus group, children also drew pictures, in pairs, of what they remembered from the programme. The focus groups were organised in conjunction with teachers and the school/class diary. The majority were conducted after the post-testing session in an attempt to keep disruption to a minimum.

Lesson observations were conducted for one full lesson (ranging from 15 to 124 minutes) in 16 out of 18 intervention schools between March 2012 and May 2012. Lesson observations were conducted in all 12 Curriculum Only schools and for four out of the six Curriculum + Contact schools. Observations in the Curriculum + Contact schools took place during a contact lesson. The remaining two Curriculum + Contact schools were in partnership but re-scheduling (by the schools) and scheduling clashes meant it wasn’t possible to get to one of the contact lessons. It was decided that
observations of lessons in as many schools as possible should take place to give as accurate a picture as possible of delivery in all schools.

Time sheets were returned from 14 out of the 23 teachers involved in the 2011-12 roll out of the programme. Teacher evaluation sheets were returned from 13 teachers for the 2011-12 roll out, five of whom did not return a full set of 12 lesson evaluations (one teacher returned one, one teacher returned two, one teacher returned three, one teacher returned six and one teacher returned seven). Nine intervention teachers returned evaluation sheets for the 2012-13 roll out, four of whom did not return a full set of 12 evaluations (one teacher returned one, two teachers returned four and one teacher returned six).

The additional post-questionnaire items were added for all children involved in the intervention in the Curriculum Only and the Curriculum + Contact schools in 2011-12 and 2012-13.

2.8.2 Pupil focus groups and additional post-test items on the children’s questionnaire.

The focus of this part of the evaluation was to gather in-depth data from the children to complement the RCT and the statistical analysis of the effectiveness of the programmes, and will be used to assist in the interpretation of the results from the RCT.

The children’s focus groups began with a short drawing/writing exercise as a ‘conversation starter’. Children were asked, in pairs, to draw or write three things they remembered from the lessons – these could be things they liked, didn’t like or things that they learned. Children were then asked to explain their drawing/writing in pairs. The children were then asked some semi-structured questions in relation to what they/the other children in their class liked/didn’t like about the lessons, what they learned, if they think they/the other children in their class now think differently about children from different religions, if they think other children in Northern Ireland should take part in this programme, what their friends/family thought about the lessons. Children were also asked if they imagine they were a Year 6/7 or Year 8 teacher (according to the group they were in) and if there is anything they would change/add/take away from the lessons. Children in the Curriculum + Contact schools were also asked what they thought about the lessons with the other school – what they enjoyed/didn’t enjoy, how they got on with the children, if they learned anything new from them and whether or not other schools in Northern Ireland should meet up to lesson like these. Finally, the children were asked if they had ever taken part in anything like or lessons like this before. Children in the Curriculum Only schools were asked about the potential of taking part in this programme with children from the other religious community (i.e. through contact). A complete copy of the children’s focus group schedule is given in Appendix 2.

The focus groups were digitally recorded (with the interviewees’ consent) and were fully transcribed. Transcripts were analysed following a thorough process of reading, categorising, testing and refining, which was repeated by the researcher until all emerging themes were compared against all the participants’ responses. The same process has previously been labelled as ‘recursive comparative analysis’ (Cooper & McIntyre, 1993) and thematic/content analysis (Kvale, 1996)². The themes were collated and listed in order of the most frequently mentioned aspects. The focus groups with the children were conducted by the same researcher.

Intervention children were asked four additional questions on the post-test questionnaire at the end of 2011-12 and 2012-13. They were asked how much they learnt, this year, about people from different religious communities in Northern Ireland. This was a closed question with three possible

---

² For more information on this analysis approach see the studies by Leitch et al. (2006), Miller et al. (2009), Odena (2001, 2007, 2009) and Odena & Welch (2007, 2009).
responses: nothing at all, a little bit or a lot. Children were then asked what they thought about these lessons (open question). The next question asked the children how important they thought these lessons were. There were three possible responses: not important at all, a little important or very important. Finally, the children were asked to imagine they were teacher and how would they teach about different religious communities. This was an open question. A screen shot of the additional questions included on the children’ post-test is given in Appendix 3.

### 2.8.3 Teacher Interviews

The focus of this part of the evaluation was to gather in-depth data from the teachers to complement the RCT and the statistical analysis of the effectiveness of the programmes, and will be used to assist in the interpretation of the results from the RCT.

The teacher interviews focused on what the teachers thought about the programme, how they felt at the start/end, aspects they felt went well/not so well, if there’s anything they feel should be changed, how useful they found the training events and meetings, how they found the support from CASS team of the WELB and how they could support them in the future. Teachers were also asked if they thought the children in their class enjoyed the programme, if they have benefited from it, if they think the children’s perceptions have changed as a result of being involved in the programme and whether or not there was any feedback from parents and how this was dealt with. Teachers who took part in the contact element were also asked about the benefits and challenges of the contact, if the children enjoyed this element of the programme and now they interacted with children from the other school. A complete copy of the teacher’s interview schedule is given in Appendix 4.

The teacher interviews were also digitally recorded (with the interviewees’ consent) and were fully transcribed. Transcripts were analysed following the same thorough process as the children’s focus groups. The teacher interviews were conducted by the same researcher.

### 2.8.4 Observational data

An observation schedule was drawn up and agreed by CASS of the WELB. The observation schedule included sections on the timing of the lesson (activity/task by activity/task), planning, teaching and learning, interaction between the children (both in Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact lessons), assessment and whether or not the learning intentions were met. There were also sections on the interaction between teachers, when the lesson observed was a contact lesson and a section to comment on whether or not the learning intentions were met during the lesson. There was also space for further notes/observations. In this section, the researcher mainly commented on what the children were saying and/or presenting during the lesson and any other pieces of information given by the teacher about the programme during the visit. For example, there was often time to briefly chat before/after the lesson observation. The observation framework is presented in Appendix 5. All observations were conducted by the same researcher.

The observational data were analysed in a similar way to the interview and focus group data with a thorough process of reading, categorising, testing and refining, which was repeated by the researcher until all emerging themes were compared against all the observations and participants’ responses in the interviews and focus groups.

### 2.8.5 Initial teacher questionnaire, teacher evaluations, time sheets and additional teacher questionnaire
The initial teacher questionnaire was completed by 20 out of 23 intervention teachers and six out of 12 control teachers. The questionnaire was completed either at the initial training days or by post, within the first term (between September and December 2012). The questionnaire asked teachers for some background information to include their age, gender, the year groups and subjects (for post-primary only) they teach as well as information on previous experience and training programmes in the area of community relations. The questionnaire also asked teachers how confident they feel teaching community relationships and citizenship, why they have attended the initial training session, their personal expectations for the training and how they see the training fitting into their teaching. Teachers were also asked about their expectations in relation to their school’s participation in the programme and there was space to write down anything else they would like to add. A copy of the initial teacher questionnaire is given in Appendix 6.

The teacher evaluation sheets were drawn up and agreed by CASS of the WELB. The teacher evaluations included sections on learning intentions and the activities specified for the lesson. Teachers were asked to comment on whether or not each learning intention and activity was completed. There were also questions on how confident the teacher felt in delivering the lesson, how they felt the lesson went overall, how much the pupils seemed to enjoy the lesson, if there were any barriers to teaching the lesson, if there were any additional/unforeseen outcomes for the lesson (positive or negative), how useful the activities were, how much the pupils participated in the activities, if the resources were useful, how controversial they found the lesson and if there was anything else they would like to add. If the lesson was a contact lesson, teachers were also asked to comment on how much the pupils from both schools interacted with each other. A copy of the teacher evaluation is given in Appendix 7.

During the initial visits to schools to conduct the lesson observations, a large number of teachers commented on time pressures – that it was difficult to complete everything in some lesson plans within the slot allocated to one lesson in their school. As a result of this, a timesheet was drawn up and sent to every teacher in order to collect data on this issue. The time sheet was a table with columns for the date, lesson number, time taken to complete the lesson and a column for additional comments. A copy of the time sheet is given in Appendix 8.

The additional teacher questionnaire asked teachers to rate the overall impact of the ‘recent developments’ (December 2012 to January 2013) in Northern Ireland on the perceptions and attitudes towards people of the other religious community for the general students body in their school as well as for the students in their class who have/would take part in the programme. For both items, the teachers were asked to rate the impact on students’ perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community on the following scale: ‘A very positive impact’, ‘A slightly positive impact’, ‘No impact (neither positive nor negative)’, ‘A slightly negative impact’ or ‘A very negative impact’. Teachers were also asked if they had changed/will change how they have taught/will teach the programme, as a result of the ‘recent developments’ in Northern Ireland and, if yes, if they would add more content or remove content. Teachers were also given the opportunity to comment further on each of these responses. A copy of the additional teacher questionnaire, issued in February 2013, is given in Appendix 9.

2.9 Ethics

A statement of ethics was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education at Queen’s University Belfast, ensuring that the study complied with the ethical standards set out by the American Education Research Association and the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2004). It covers issues relating to consent, privacy, confidentiality and data storage, the
wellbeing and safety of participants and the intellectual property rights of participants as well as the wider ethical issues relating to research with children.

All interviewees were given anonymity assurances and it was explained in the preamble of their interviews that no names of individuals will be identified in the final report.

An additional statement of ethics was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education at Queen’s University Belfast in February 2013 to cover the same issues. This additional statement related to the additional teacher questionnaire on the impact of ‘recent developments’ (December 2012 to February 2013) in Northern Ireland in relation to Belfast City Council’s decision to reduce the number of days the Union flag will be flown at Belfast City Hall.

2.10 Challenges and limitations

Generally, the research team and CASS of the WELB communicated the research process well within the schools and ‘buy-in’ into the evaluation was high from the start and increased as processes became established. The main challenge was attrition in terms of the withdrawal of one school from Cluster 1 (primary 2/3 classes) and the withdrawal of two classes of children from Cluster 2 (post-primary 2/3 classes) after randomisation. These two classes came from two of the partner Curriculum + Contact schools. The teachers decided it was more manageable to complete the programme with one class from each of their schools, instead of two. In an attempt to retain the data from the Cluster 2 classes, it was decided that the children in these withdrawn classes would still complete the questionnaire as a ‘control group. This worked well at pre-test but one of the classes was withdrawn from post-test by the school.

Attrition was also a challenge in relation to absent children on the day of pre-testing and non-return of consent forms. There was also an issue with the internet ‘dropping out’ in certain schools resulting in the non-completion of questionnaires. In an attempt to address these issues the research team followed up on consent forms with individual schools and children. Moreover, fieldworkers re-visited schools with particularly low attendance at pre-test or where there had been issues with the online completion of the questionnaire due to internet problems.

Developments in relation to Belfast City Council’s decision to reduce the number of days the Union flag will be flown at Belfast City Hall resulted in tension throughout various parts of Northern Ireland. Given that the PRTSCE programme focuses on reconciliation and specific aspects of the Northern Ireland situation, the research team were concerned that this may have impacted on children’s perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community. However, this challenge was overcome by successfully seeking ethical clearance (the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education at Queen’s University Belfast) to issue a further questionnaire to the intervention teachers to gather some information on the potential impact of these developments on students’ perceptions and attitudes, as well as any potential impact on the teaching of the PRTSCE programme. These data were then used as part of the exploratory analysis (see section 3.2 for further details).

The engagement of schools, teachers and children in relation to interviews, focus groups and observations of lessons was excellent and resulted in an almost complete data set for these three data collection methods. However, non-return of lesson evaluations and time sheets from a number of schools has resulted in limited data through use of these methods. Therefore, any findings presented and conclusions drawn in relation to lessons evaluations and time sheets (see section 4.3) should be viewed with caution.
3. Findings

This section provides an overview of the evaluation findings relating to the cluster RCT by firstly a presentation of the main analysis of programme effects on the key outcome variables identified. Secondly, this is followed by a description of exploratory sub-group analysis which investigated pre-specified differences relating to gender, religious community background, percentage of Free School Meals in Schools and primary or post-primary attendance.

3.1 Main analysis

Data analysis were conducted using a series of multilevel models with pupils (level 1) clustered within schools (level 2). In each case, the post-test score was the dependent variable. Alongside the independent variables representing whether a pupil was in the Curriculum Only group or Curriculum + Contact Group, the following covariates were added to control for any differences between groups at pre-test:

- Measure of area deprivation (% pupils in each school eligible for FSM)
- Type of school (whether a school is primary or post-primary)
- Child’s religious/community background (Catholic or Protestant)
- Whether there are any individuals from the other community within the family
- Whether the child has any friends from the other community at pretest

The inclusion of the children’s pre-test scores in the model means that the analysis controls for any differences at pre-test between the children in the Curriculum Only, the Curriculum + Contact and the Control group.

Table 3.1 below highlights the main primary effects reporting: the mean gain score; the effect size difference between the Control and Curriculum Only group as well as the Control and the Curriculum + Contact group on each of the primary outcomes and whether the differences are statistically significant (i.e. $p< 0.05$). Statistically significant effects are indicated in bold.
Table 3.1: Summary of Main Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>+.17</td>
<td>+.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>+.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>Difference between two groups is significant (p=.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>+.14</td>
<td>Difference between two groups is approaching significance (p=.078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>+.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>+.15</td>
<td>Difference between two groups is significant (p=.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice:</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice:</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice:</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>+.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>+.24</td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>+.04</td>
<td>+.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Controlling for pre-test score. Effect sizes presented in comparison to the control group.

In interpreting these findings, it needs to be acknowledged that the study design was not sufficiently powered to identify small effects. Thus, for the outcome variables identity exploration and identity affirmation, for example, we see consistent positive effects across both groups but they are small in terms of effect sizes and, given our overall sample sizes, they were not statistically significant. It therefore needs to be remembered that where findings are not significant this does not necessarily mean that the programme was not having an effect but that the effects were not large enough to be reported confidently.

In some ways, it is advantageous not having a very large sample as this could make everything statistically significant. In the case of these analyses, the sample size available plays a discriminating role in that it only provides evidence of programme impact where effects are fairly large (typically from the above, for those with effect sizes of at least one quarter of a standard deviation, i.e. $d=.25$ or above). This, in turn, helps us identify where the notable (and thus practically significant) effects are. With these points in mind, we can note a few things.
3.1.1 Effects of Curriculum Only

As can be seen from Table 3.1, in terms of attitudinal and behaviour-related outcomes, nearly all the effects of the programme are associated with the Curriculum Only group. These are all fairly sizeable effects (typically between $d$.25 and .34) for an intervention of this type over two years. Most of these effects concern reduction in ingroup bias rather than outgroup bias. In particular, the effects of the curriculum can be seen in relation to:

- Reduced inclusion of other in self ($d = -.26$).
- Increased social distance towards ingroup members ($d = -.34$).
- More negative ratings of characteristics of those choosing stereotypical religious ingroup symbols ($d = -.34$).
- Reduction in aggressive responses to instances of injustice ($d = -.25$).
- Increased positive attitude towards migrants in terms of maintenance of their own cultural tradition and identity ($d = +.24$).
- More negative rating of characteristics of those choosing stereotypically Chinese cultural symbols ($d = -.26$).

It is interesting to note here that strength of group identification is not significantly affected by the programme and that ingroup assessments remain more positive than outgroup evaluations on all measures. The key outcome for the Curriculum Only group therefore can be interpreted as reduced ingroup bias whereby children become more critical in the assessment of the ingroup as a result of the curriculum.

As a result of the programme, pupils in the Curriculum Only group also seem to be disposed to responding to instances of injustice less negatively (i.e. less likely to choose aggressive responses). Relatedly, results relating to acculturation show pupils becoming more positive towards other traditions.

A strange result relates to the rating of characteristics of those choosing stereotypically Chinese cultural symbols, which has become more negative for the Curriculum Only group in comparison to the Control group. This result stands out in particular as it contradicts the findings that pupils have become more positive towards migrants maintaining their own cultural traditions. We currently do not have an explanation for this and it could easily be a quirk from this specific study as there is always a chance for false positives to emerge in findings of this nature. However, the finding could be explored in future studies to see if it is replicated.

The programme clearly seems to have reduced ingroup bias in the Curriculum Only group, which, it could be theoretically proposed, may in turn affect a reduction of outgroup bias in the long-term. Further research would be required to investigate the sustainability and long terms effects of the programme, an issue which has been considered as one of the main challenges for peace education (Salomon, 2012).

However, outgroup bias appear to be largely unaffected in the Curriculum Only group, particularly with regard to attitudinal change relating to the other religious community. Additionally, while there is a positive effect in terms of reducing aggressive responses to instances of injustice, there was no increase in prosocial responses. This might point to the need for greater emphasis on exploring how to respond appropriately to such instances and modelling these out in practice.
3.1.2 Effects of Contact

The size of the effects for the Curriculum Only group tended to diminish for the Curriculum + Contact group to the point that they were no longer statistically significant. With regard to a reduction of ingroup bias, adding contact reduced effects to a level that they can no longer be reported confidently. A key finding therefore was that the addition of contact tended to reduce the effectiveness of the curriculum in relation to reduction of ingroup bias.

For the Curriculum + Contact group, the only significant impact of the programme was evident in relation to acculturation whereby pupils showed more positive towards other traditions in comparison to the control group. This result mirrored the significant effect relating to the same variable for the Curriculum Only group.

It is worth noting that there are two outcomes where the effects of Curriculum + Contact are in the opposite direction to the Curriculum Only group. Moreover, and not surprisingly, these are two of just three outcomes where the differences in post-test mean scores between the two treatment groups are also statistically significant. These are noted in the table above. Interestingly, both reverse effects relate to attitudes to outgroups (“Social distance Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant” and “Tolerance Outgroup: Chinese”) where the effects are in a positive direction in both cases for the Curriculum + Contact group compared to the Curriculum Only group. This seems to hint at the potentially positive effects of contact. However these results need to be interpreted carefully. Firstly, the difference in mean post-test scores between the Curriculum + Contact group and the Control group in both cases is not statistically significant and it thus cannot be concluded that Curriculum + Contact leads to more positive outgroup attitudes. Secondly, however, the difference in mean scores between the Curriculum Only and the Curriculum + Contact groups is statistically significant. We can therefore argue that contact tended to lessen the potentially negative effects that doing the curriculum on its own might have on outgroup attitudes.

3.2 Exploratory analysis

A number of pre-specified exploratory subgroup analyses were undertaken to see whether PRSC worked differently for:

- Boys and girls
- Catholics and Protestants
- % of Free School Meals (FSM) in school
- Primary and post-primary school attendance

In addition to this, analyses were conducted to explore whether the number of PRTSCE sessions that were delivered in the Curriculum Only and the Curriculum + Contact group (i.e. a higher dose of the programme) was related to better outcomes. A similar analysis was conducted to test whether the number of PRTSCE session that were delivered through contact between schools for the Curriculum + Contact group (i.e. a higher dose of contact). Tables presenting the data from the pre-specified exploratory subgroup analyses are presented in full in Appendix 10.

3.2.1 Gender, Religion, FSM and Primary/Post-Primary School

In relation to most outcome measures there was no consistent pattern of evidence to suggest a mediating effect of any of the variables tested. Generally, there were a few significant effects for
each outcome variable. However, given the number of tests undertaken, some significant results can be expected to emerge randomly.

Significant gender differences were only found in relation to two variables. Findings indicated levels of tolerance towards stereotypical outgroup choices (Catholic/Protestant) being positively affected for boys, but negatively for girls in the Curriculum Only group (p=.008). For attitudes relating to migrants maintaining their traditions (acculturation maintenance) in the Curriculum + Contact group, a stronger influence of the programme was found for girls than boys (p=.035).

Significant differences in terms of pupils’ religious community background were also found for two variables only. In relation to tolerance towards stereotypical ingroup choices, Curriculum + Contact reduced ingroup bias significantly more for Catholic than Protestant pupils (p=.039). The opposite mediating effect was found for acculturation maintenance, where Curriculum + Contact impacted more positively on Catholic than Protestant pupils’ attitudes (p=.013).

In relation to primary/post-primary school attendance, findings indicated a differential effect of the Curriculum + Contact condition for only one variable, namely pupils’ sense of efficacy in challenging other people’s negative outgroup behaviour (p=.032). Curriculum + Contact increased primary pupils’ sense of self-efficacy while it decreased for post-primary pupils.

A few differential impacts were found relating to FSM though no clear pattern was discernible. In relation to inclusion of outgroup members in conceptions of self, Curriculum + Contact impacted positively on pupils in school with high levels of FSM but negatively for those in low FSM schools (p=.025). Social distance towards ingroup members was affected positively in low FSM but negatively in high FSM schools (p=.010).

For the Curriculum Only group, results revealed pupils’ reported social distance towards outgroup members was positively affected in high FSM schools but negatively in low FSM schools (p=.050). Finally, FSM was a significant mediator in both groups for reported aggressive behaviours whereby aggressive behaviour decreased for pupils in low FSM and increased for pupils in high FSM schools (p=.006/p=.008).

The main issue with the findings of the exploratory analysis is that multiple models have been analysed and therefore multiple tests were conducted. As such, one or two findings are likely to be significant just by random.

In order to claim that there is a notable difference in the effectiveness of the programme for potentially mediating variables, a consistent pattern of significant findings should be evident across the outcome variables. In this case, as can be seen, no consistent patterns emerged. Overall, it can therefore be concluded that there was no consistent evidence that the programme had a differential effect in relation to gender, religious community background, primary/post-primary school attendance or level of FSM in schools.

The only caveat with the above conclusion is that the analyses break the sample size up into fairly small subsamples. There may thus be some differences in effects relating to the mediating variables tested but the sample may have been too small to show statistical significance.

While the trial was large enough for the main analysis it was not sufficiently powered for additional exploratory analyses that are based on sub-samples.
3.2.2 Number of lessons taught and Number of lessons taught through contact

In relation to the number of curriculum lessons taught, no significant differential effects were found except for the variable inclusion of religious outgroup members in self (p=.049) whereby increasing exposure to lessons was indicated to results in more positive attitudes.

Overall, as almost all of the findings are not significant for these analyses, there is no consistent evidence that the variation in number of lessons taught had a significant influence on outcomes. However, it should be borne in mind that these findings are based on small samples (about 140-150 in each group). There thus might be an effect but it may be too small and/or our sample was too small for it to be statistically significant. Moreover, fidelity in relation to programme delivery was high, with 86% of the sample (n=418) reporting to have taught the maximum number of lessons. While this speaks for programme implementation it reduces the potential for interpreting findings of differential analysis between groups.

A different pattern is emerging for the number of lessons taught through contact, where consistent effects were found for about half of the primary outcome variables. Increased exposure to contact through shared lessons significantly impacted on a greater sense of belonging to pupils' religious communities (p=.030), reduced social distance relating to the ingroup (p=.016), increased tolerance towards the ingroup (p=.090) and the alternative outgroup (Chinese) (p=.034) and more positive acculturation attitudes relating to maintenance of other cultural traditions (p=.015). Interestingly, more contact was also found to significantly affect increased levels of aggressive behaviours in response to instances of injustice (p=.038) and a reduced sense of self-efficacy (p=.022).

Overall the number of contact lessons appears to have a possible influence on outgroup attitudes while also strengthening ingroup attitudes. However, it needs to be noted that findings are essentially based on a sample of four pairs of schools. It therefore cannot be separated out whether these effects are actually down to the number of lessons delivered or some other characteristics that may differ between the schools and also impact upon the lessons that were delivered. For example, it could be that more motivated (or skilled) teachers in these schools are also more likely to deliver more lessons. If this is the case, then the effects will be associated with higher number of contact lessons delivered but this association is spurious because the real reason for the higher effects would have been done to the more motivated (or skilled) nature of the programme delivery. Findings should therefore be viewed with caution as causality of effects cannot be clearly attributed to the number of contact lessons.

3.3 Conclusions from the analyses of the cluster RCT

In summary, the analyses provided some clear evidence of the effects of the PRTSCE programme on pupils’ reported attitudes through the questionnaire surveys as well as some indications of potential impact.

Firstly, the programme as taught in the Curriculum Only group positively impacted on ingroup bias in that it appeared to make pupils more critical about their own respective communities. Outgroup bias however remained largely unaffected except for attitudes towards immigrants maintaining their own cultural traditions.

Secondly, the programme as taught in the Curriculum + Contact group did not result in a distinct pattern of effects on pupils’ attitudes. In fact, the addition of contact appeared to reduce the positive programme impact on ingroup bias. Where potentially negative effects on outgroup attitudes were found that for the Curriculum Only group, these appeared to be reduced by contact.
Thirdly, there was no clear pattern of effects for other variables, which may mediate the programme impact, such as gender, religious community background or primary or post-primary schooling.

Fourthly, there was no clear pattern of effects relating to the number of lessons taught through the programme. However, there was some indication that increasing numbers of contact lessons may have a positive impact on pupils' attitudes.
4. Process Evaluation

Additionally to the Cluster RCT, a qualitative evaluation was conducted to monitor the extent to which schools implemented the programme as planned. Qualitative focus groups and interviews were carried out with key stakeholders (pupils, teachers and principals) to gauge their perspectives on and experiences of the programme and to identify facilitators and inhibitors to the successful delivery of the programme. In addition to this, teacher questionnaire were collected at the start of the implementation process, lesson observations were conducted in almost all of the intervention schools and timesheets and teacher lesson evaluations were also collected. Four questions were also added to the end of the children’s questionnaire, for the intervention schools. In addition, one more teacher questionnaire was issued because of developments in Northern Ireland in relation to Belfast City Council’s decision to reduce the number of days the Union flag will be flown at Belfast City Hall.

The findings from the additional post-test items on the children questionnaire and the findings from the children’s focus groups are presented in section 4.1. The findings from the teacher interviews are presented in section 4.2. The findings from the lesson observations are outlined in section 4.3 and, finally, section 4.3 presents the findings from the initial teacher questionnaire and teacher lessons evaluations are given in section 4.4. The findings are presented with illustrative quotes in an attempt to keep the sections brief. It is important to note that the interview and focus group data presented represent the views and perceptions of those who were interviewed and have not been extrapolated beyond that in order to prevent assumptions being made from the data.

4.1 Findings from the children’s additional post-test items the children’s focus groups

With regard to the additional items on the children’s post-test, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted to test for post-test differences in pupils’ responses relating to five variables tapping into general views on intergroup relations in Northern Ireland and perceptions of learning about religious communities in school. There were no significant differences in perceived stability and nature of intergroup relations in the past or future between Control, Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact intervention groups .

In comparison to the Control group, Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact groups however indicated significantly more learning in school about religious communities in Northern Ireland (p=.000) and saw it as significantly more important (p=.002).

Questions adopted from Young Life & Times Survey (YLT): a) Would you say relations between Catholics and Protestants are better than they were 5 years ago, worse or about the same now? (p=.833) b) In 5 years time, do you think relations between Protestants and Catholics will be better than they are now, worse or about the same? (p=.915) c) Do you think religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland? (p=.462)
Focus groups were carried out with 21 groups of children across the 18 schools. All of the focus groups were conducted by the same researcher and she talked to a total of 147 children. As a starter for the focus group, children also drew pictures, in pairs, of what they remembered from the programme. Children were then asked to explain their drawing/writing in pairs. The children were then asked some semi-structured questions in relation to the programme. A summary of the questions asked is given in section 2.8.2. However, it is important to note that children in the Curriculum + Contact group were also asked what they thought about the lessons with the other school and children in the Curriculum Only group were asked about the potential of taking part in this programme with children from the other religious community (i.e. through contact). A complete copy of the children’s focus group schedule is given in Appendix 2.

In order from the most frequently to least frequently occurring aspects the children in the focus groups talked about: the programme content and approaches (section 4.4.1), learning through the programme (section 4.4.2), their opinions, feelings and experiences of contact/potential contact (section 4.4.3), their views of the outgroup and ingroup (section 4.4.4) and outside experiences and influences, that is out of school (section 4.4.5). The children also talked at length about the future of this programme and the recommendations they have for it (section 4.4.6).

## 4.1.1 The programme content and approaches

Children in both the Curriculum + Contact and the Curriculum Only focus groups talked at length about the programme content and approaches. This was mainly focused around the details of specific activities and tasks. There were twice as many positive comments as opposed to negative comments. The positive comments focused on the active learning elements of the programme and the most prevalent of these were in relation to acting, talking, playing games, the stories, making/drawing things:

I liked the lessons, like I thought they were quite good, and my favourite thing was this human bingo thing or the dot on the head...they were good craic, like we had a good time when we were doing them.  
(Curriculum Only school)

The drawing, like, involving drama, and conversation was good.  
(Curriculum + Contact school)

I liked it because you got to meet new friends, you got to take part in all acting and stuff.  
(Curriculum + Contact school)

I put down I liked the games and the friends, the people bingo, that’s the, that’s the acting the thing to do, I liked most.  
(Curriculum + Contact school)

Some children in the Curriculum + Contact group and Curriculum Only group were negative about specific activities: lack of understanding of the relevance and what to do for the de Bono’s hats activity, the scenarios cards, writing in the journal and lack of understanding of the Ordinary Citizen story.

Child 1: The only thing I didn’t like was de Bono’s hats there was a blue hat but there wasn’t a name for it.
Child 2: It took a long trying to figure out what does it mean and why.
Child 3: Made me think he was sick, or cold.  
(Curriculum Only school)
Children in the Curriculum + Contact group tended to focus more on group level issues around reaching agreement. Children in one Curriculum + Contact school talked about the emotional impact of the scenarios cards and said that children should not be asked questions like that. However, interestingly, there were more discussions in relation to emotional responses to some of the activities in the Curriculum Only groups:

Child 1: The thing I would change (in the programme) is the thing where it says if you would, if they, the Catholics had killed your family, cause people might actually take that quite serious, like I don’t, someone might cry….just a bit, cause like, I have to be honest I nearly broke down especially when it says, uh, if they killed like your brother, if they hurted your brother, if they got your brother, if they killed someone of your family member, like your mum or dad, like I wouldn’t really want anyone to really think about that.

Child 2: Or you could go over protective and like a boy who is just a friend, but he was Catholic and you never played with him cause, cause you couldn’t get that someone would hurt your family, just couldn’t get it out of your head.

(Curriculum Only school)

Nevertheless, children in the Curriculum + Contact group were more likely to talk generally about their enjoyment of the programme in general:

Child 1: Enjoyable and exciting.
Child 2: Fun, yeah.
Child 3: Really good and just enjoyable.
Child 4: Good craic and we had good laughs.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

4.1.2 Learning through the programme

Children in both groups talked about learning through the programme. Although the frequency of these comments were similar for both groups, there seemed to be differences in the content. Children in the Curriculum + Contact groups tended to focus on how much they learned about the outgroup, in particular, in relation to cultural norms and activities as well as about how similar they are to the outgroup:

Child 1: We told them what Sunday school was and then they told us what Communion was.
Child 2: Because (..) I learnt about mass (..) is it mass?...and they go there on a Sunday and some people go on a Saturday night.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

The Girls Brigade and the Boys Brigade…it’s like um, Protestant ones do, I think it’s only for Protestants, but um the, the like the girls, it’s just like they do activities and they get badges and things. And then trophies and stuff. They do Sunday school.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Like, (we’re) all the same but just different religions.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

We’ve some of these here wee phrases (on their drawing) ‘we’re practically the same, the only thing different is our name’ and ‘we are like each other, like sister and brother’.

(Curriculum + Contact school)
Children in the Curriculum Only group talked more about learning about how to behave if/when they are potentially in contact with the outgroup and what they should or shouldn’t do:

Um, that you have to be careful in the way that you say things about other people’s communities and (...) the way you celebrate your culture which is- You’re meant to celebrate your own culture but you have to do it in a respectful way.

(Curriculum Only school)

makes you aware of like (...) what not to do and what, like, people would maybe do to you.

(Curriculum Only school)

if we ever like mix with them it would help if you knew something about them.

(Curriculum Only school)

Both groups talked a little about learning about sectarianism. This was more frequently mentioned than other terminology and there tended to be confusion over what this meant, in both groups. There were also several comments, in both groups, related to the realisation (as a result of the programme) that there are “Catholics” and “Protestants” and that they do or did not get on:

Interviewer: What’s sectarianism?
Child 1: Aw.
Interviewer: Can you remember what is it?
Child 1: Nah, not really.
Child 2: Aw, it was about when...is it not when you judge someone before you know them?
Child 3: That’s prejudice.
Child 2: Oh yeah. (laughs)
Child 4: Is sectarianism not like racism?
Child 2: You’re checking your book. (laughs)

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Child 1: Didn’t know what sec- Sec- What do you call it?
Child 2: Sectarian.
Child 1: What sectarian attacks was.
Child 2: Before we started talking about that.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Well I, I learnt that Catholics and Protestants don’t really get on that well.

(Curriculum Only school)

I was a Protestant and it was a word, but I didn’t really, that it was that serious, kind of that way, that people were getting killed and bombed because of it.

(Curriculum Only school)

4.1.3 Opinions and feelings about contact or possible contact

Children in the Curriculum + Contact group were asked specifically about how the shared lessons went. Children in the Curriculum Only group were asked about the potential of doing the lessons from the programme with a school from the ‘other’ religion. Overwhelming, the Curriculum + Contact group talked in much more depth and more frequently about the benefits of contact, particularly in relation to meeting new people, getting to know each other, talking, making friends,
spending time together and that doing the programme through contact is better than not doing it through contact:

We wrote down friends and then we like drew a picture of Catholic and a Protestant joined together, and then we like we wrote around it (…) ‘we’re the same in so many ways’, ‘we were happy when we were doing it’, ‘it’s mean to be mean’, ‘stop being hateful and just be grateful’.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

We got to meet new friends and you got to know them and play about.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Meeting new people. Finding out different things about different people, what they like.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Meeting up (is better)...you get to talk to someone from a different religious background, is a better experience.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Children in the Curriculum Only group did make a few comments (approximately 1 out of 6 of the positive comments in relation to contact) and these were mainly about finding out what the outgroup thinks or does. Although the frequency of negative comments in relation to contact was equal for both, the Curriculum + Contact group and the Curriculum Only group, the negative comments from the Curriculum + Contact group came from two schools (not paired). In one school this focused on incidents outside of class, particularly during a break time football match which apparently took place the previous day and involved Catholic pupils playing against Protestant pupils. Children in this school made nine separate references to religious issues relating to football, both in relation to this match during the programme and in relation to Celtic and Rangers – this incident thus had a strong impact on their view of the outgroup as they reviewed it the following day in the focus group. However, had the focus group not taken place the next day but sometime after the football match which evidently had steered up emotions for the pupils, their views would be likely to be less over-shadowed by the single incident. In the other school the negative comments focused on feeling awkward to share views in front of the outgroup and that they talked more about sensitive things back in their own class (without the other group being present):

Child 1: He just kept going ‘aw Celtic, first team to win the championship’.
Child 2: Aw yeah.
Child 1: He just kept going like, boasting about Celtic to us.
Child 3: Because we weren’t offending them and they were offending us.
Interviewer: How did that make you feel?
Child 4: Upset.
Child 5: Scared.
Child 1: It felt- You want me to tell the truth like, I just wanted to...give him a slap.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Aye, like you wouldn’t want to say anything too bad about, about eh...like their religion in front of them so you wouldn’t, like you wouldn’t want to say anything that annoyed them in any sort of way. Then like you wouldn’t feel as comfortable saying like if they were there but you might feel comfortable if they weren’t there.

(Curriculum + Contact school)
The negative comments in relation to contact from the Curriculum Only group were related to potential problems and appeared much more aggressive in nature and referenced potential behaviours generally. In other words, they tended not to mention the ingroup or outgroup specifically:

Child 1: Well in some cases it’s good (doing lessons together), in some cases it’s bad cause if there was people from different religions in our school, like you, like, maybe like the ones who’d come, I don’t know-
Child 2: (laughs) Hurt someone.
Child 1: Yeah, if someone said something they could get offended by it, if they said something.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: It could be, it might start a row or something.
Child 2: They could end up disagreeing with you.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: It might cause a few problems because you don’t really say- You wouldn’t be able to say- Like, in case somebody was biased...and didn’t really know it...they might start arguments.
Child 2: Like you mightn’t want to say what you actually felt because you mightn’t want to harm the other religion.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: It would be good (shared lessons), like at the start I would be afraid though, you know? Like there would be a lot of...because there’d be a lot of tension. Like towards the end it would be better...but to the start it would be very hard to...like settle the tension.
Child 2: ‘Cause like you wouldn’t want to say something wrong.
Child 1: Exactly.
Child 2: Like that would be on both ends, you wouldn’t want to say something wrong and maybe they wouldn’t want to say something wrong.
Child 1: Yeah.
Child 3: Because like if you go in and say ‘Ireland’...like some of them would go ‘which Ireland?’ and like, there’s only one Ireland...and they’d go ‘Northern Ireland’.

(Curriculum Only school)

The Curriculum + Contact group and Curriculum Only group also talked about a fear of ‘offending’ – both groups talked about this in equal measure but the Curriculum + Contact group tended to talk about not wanting to offend the outgroup specifically and the Curriculum Only group talked about it in relation to the potential of and being prepared to prevent the possibility of saying something offensive:

(important to learn this stuff) so you wouldn’t say anything that would annoy them.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Child 1: We got to understand what would offend other people.
Child 2: Like we learnt what to do that we don’t notice.
Child 1: Like what we do that would offend people, by saying stuff that...that we would usually say Miss that we never thought would be bad, but now we would be careful with what we say.

(Curriculum Only school)
Because it’s not really that important because you mightn’t run into any of them, but if you did then you want to know a bit about them so you know not to offend them with some things...because like, eh, just because you think that, that (...) orange is a bad colour, doesn’t mean like other people doesn’t think that.

(Curriculum Only school)

Pupils in the Curriculum + Contact group were also asked about future contact with children in their partner school, beyond the programme. Out of the eight Curriculum + Contact schools involved in the focus groups, four said they have been in contact virtually (three on Facebook, one on x-box and one ‘online’) and the children in one school said they “will now talk outside school” at other shared activities they already attend. It is also interesting to note the predominance of virtual contact as the main method of future contact between the children who were involved in the Curriculum + Contact programme.

4.1.4 Views of outgroup and ingroup

The frequency of positive comments related to the outgroup was similar for children in the Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only group. However, the content of what they said appeared to differ. Children in the Curriculum + Contact group talked more about how the ingroup and outgroup are all the same and no different from each other and in almost every group they claimed that their opinion of the ‘other’ had changed for the better:

Yeah, and they probably thought that we didn’t really like them. But now that we can be together, we all kind of like each other.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

‘Cause then you’d have more respect for them and all now when you learn about them and all.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Child 1: sometimes they have the same hobbies as us.
Child 2: I don’t mind them, they’re just the same as us, they aren’t any different.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Children in the Curriculum Only group also talked about how similar the ingroup and outgroup are and that there are no differences. However, it is interesting to note that, in four out of the nine Curriculum Only schools, the children talked about their ingroup and ingroup behaviours more critically:

But there’s a massive person to blame for this...he’s a Celtic player. Once they were playing Rangers and he was kissing the Celtic badge once they scored and then after the match he took the Ireland flag and started wagging it like mad. Even if, even if we run about the town with the Ireland flag on our back, none of the Protestants would say anything to us-

(Curriculum Only school, Grant maintained)

Child 1: Eh, everybody- They just don’t like coming to Northern Ireland. I don’t know why
Interviewer: Anyone else know why?
Child 2: Republicanism.

(Curriculum Only school, Grant maintained)
sometimes it’s like (..) their fault that they get the hard time and all, because if you’re going round going ‘aw Catholics are the best, Catholics are the best’ you’re obviously going to get hit or something like.

(Curriculum Only school, Grant maintained)

It can be argued that as a result of their learning through the programme, they are simply more critical of the behaviours of the ingroup. However, children in the Curriculum Only group expressed much more negative attitudes about the outgroup. Children in six out of the Curriculum Only schools talked about the outgroup in a negative way. Children in only one of the Curriculum + Contact groups talked about the outgroup in a negative way and this was minimal. Children in the Curriculum Only group talked about a range of issues, including: parades, names, the importance of our religion (pride, learn about it in separate schools), potential for aggressive behaviour from outgroup:

Child 1: Life goes on, and like you sort of- Protestants have their day and we have our day, and like (..) we have our day and they should just leave it and-
Child 2: Stay in the house.
Child 1: Wait for their day.

(Curriculum Only school)

(Important to learn about programme content) to get warned maybe...like be careful if you’re walking in to somewhere that’s all...Protestant and you wear your Gaelic shirt or something. Miss because...Miss people could...like...punch- Hurt people and threaten them, say bad stuff, like ‘aw, if you don’t...stop calling the Protestants names and all I’m going to kill you’ and all that stuff.

(Curriculum Only school)

Be glad of your religion though...and just be proud of what religion you are in.

(Curriculum Only school)

4.1.5 Outside experience and influences

Overall, there was a higher frequency of negative than positive comments in relation to outside experience and influences and the vast majority of these comments came from the curriculum only group (i.e. six out of the nine Curriculum Only schools involved in the focus groups). Only one Curriculum + Contact school talked negatively about outside experience and influences and this was the same school where pupils reported the football incident at break time (see section 4.4.3).

The Curriculum Only group talked about negative outside experiences and influences in relation to negative influences of parents/family (five schools), witnessing actual incidents related to religion outside of school (four schools), incidents that happened on other contact programmes (four schools), negative experiences/opinions of politicians (three schools) and incidents they had heard of through the media (two schools):

**Influence of parents:**

My mummy thought (the programme was) brain wash!

(Curriculum Only school)

Just me (laughs) I think like we have a better understanding, but there’s still some though. Probably like in our background as well there’s probably some, like your parents and everything, they probably don’t like it so they just agree.

(Curriculum Only school)
Witnessing of incidents:
Aye, and like, one time...I was like on with these here boys on my Xbox like, right? And then there was like a couple of boys singing like the Rangers song and all, but I didn’t speak at all. Then this other boy, he started being cheeky to them all and started singing the Celtic song and all so...I just left.

(Curriculum Only school)

And another boy, I know a boy, funny enough, he fighted a boy from like Coleraine or something, and then he won the fight and then he got piles of Coleraine boys and then one night they all came up behind him and jumped him. Now that boy is in hospital at the minute now.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: Em, two of the people down in my park, they said they, like nothing was done by the Protestants and they said ‘aye are you coming up to fight the Protestants? I’m wild bored’ or something like that there...
Child 2: They did get into a fight over it and then...
Child 1: That’s how they got into a fight because they were wearing poppies...The cars in the car park up there and they’ve got like a poppy sticker in the window and everyone like spits on it.

(Curriculum Only school)

Incidents during other contact programmes:
Cause like there was this one time and we were dancing, and like people were being a bit mean to me.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: There was a whole load of boys from our school and a different school that was with us, and they were in the bathroom and they came out, and some boy from England said there was something happening in the bathrooms, and no one knew who it was, but it had something to do with some of the ones that came with us and the other ones in the English school.
Child 2: They were being mean and stuff.
Child 1: Calling them bad names...Just to do with where they were from and assuming they were Protestants.
Child 3: Miss they were probably saying like... Miss I was up Miss with my friend to the toilet Miss...Miss they were calling each other ‘Prods’ and ‘mixed’ and all that there Miss.

(Curriculum Only school)

Incidents heard about through the media/films:
Em, I was listening to a radio station and, um, some people- He said that, this girl was saying that we march on the 12th July because the Pope said so, and then there was this other boy and he goes ‘so we all march on the 12th July just because the Pope said so’ and he kept on saying that over and over again (..)

(Curriculum Only school)

I also watched this DVD too (at home) about Catholics and Protestants...it was, it was about like there was these, a wee Protestant went over to a Catholic side and the Catholics then
were like very violent and got knives and threatened the wee boy to go over his side, to go over to his side again and not to come back.

(Curriculum Only school)

I went into the cinema and I seen this big poster up in the cinema, and it says ‘Kill the Irish Man’ and it was an English film...So I thought that was, that would have set it off a bit. Like it should have said like...‘Kill the...Spanish Man’ or something like that, but ‘Kill the Irish Man’.

(Curriculum Only school)

As such pupils in the Curriculum Only group appeared to draw more on outside influences to explain their views and attitudes which may be due to a lack of an alternative reference point. In contrast, pupils in the Curriculum + Contact groups appeared to draw on their experiences of shared learning through the lessons when explaining how they felt about the outgroup.

Given that the PRTSCE programme has been partly designed for implementation in the Local & Global Citizenship Curriculum, it is interesting to note that some children appeared to consider politicians and news as well as their potential influence on children and young people critically in the light of their learning about sectarianism through the PRTSCE programme.

Negative opinions of politicians:
Child 1: it’s like the people in parliament buildings, they’re making, they’re fighting and people are at home going like this here, well our representatives, are fighting with Protestants so we should just fight along with them.
Child 2: So, so if the Protestants and the Catholics retired, and people are telling a different story and then, they reason with each other. They could reason. They’re not showing a good example.
Child 3: Sinn Fein says that they’re not coming to see her, not taking part in the thing and all the other parties are presenting her with a present for the Diamond Jubilee [I agrees] so they’re saying we’re not doing it cause she’s Protestant and we’re Catholic.
I: So how does that make you feel, what do you think of that?
Child 2: Bit upset. But upset, annoyed.
Child 3: People should get on, even if you are of a different background doesn’t mean you’re different, everyone’s just the same.
Child 2: You’re made of the same things, you act the same. The Queen’s the Queen.
Child 4: Like he was saying in Stormont, they would encourage wee children to fight, but it weren’t really a fight, it’s more a words that they’d use not like their hands, so it wouldn’t have that sort of effect, it would just be shouting over like all that’s better, that’s not better.
Child 1: Like if everyone can now can be an example for people being born now they could all stop and it mightn’t happen.

(Curriculum Only school)

News
P 6: And they’re watching like the news and if they see, like all the, like you know bombs and all the fires and all that stuff that is happening to the police then they might start to riot, like the teenagers the thirteen year olds might start to do it.
I: Start to behave like that.
P 6: To, to kind of show off.

(Curriculum +Contact school)

The positive comments in relation to outside experience and influences were mainly related to the positive support of parents for the programme and that the children already know outgroup people
in their friendship groups and families – the frequency and content of comments in relation to positive outside influences and experiences were similar for both the Curriculum + Contact groups and Curriculum Only children.

4.1.6 Future recommendations for the programme

Children in the Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only schools talked in equal measure about expanding the programme. Both groups talked about making it available to more schools or all schools and the Curriculum + Contact group, perhaps as a result of their experiences of contact during the programme, talked about having more shared lessons and more time with their partner school. Children in both groups also talked about expanding the programme to younger children:

There’s no point only some people learning them and others (not)...all going to do this here (the programme)...well like it would make everyone more aware and maybe it would make a little bit more peace.

(Curriculum Only school)

Child 1: the visits were kind of short...I wish they were longer-
Child 2:: So we could spend more time with them.
Child 1: Like the whole day, yeah, like lunchtime and stuff.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Child 1: Meet up with them more...so we could stay in touch. Do more stuff instead of just sitting inside a classroom, take them out to like a park or something, altogether.
Child 2: Do activities with them.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

It’s better to do it from a young age anyway...because, it’s like partly because when you’re young...you’re younger and you look for what you think, and it’s not going to go away when you’re older you know. Like that’s what I would think. Like that’s my opinion.

(Curriculum Only school)

Children in three of the Curriculum + Contact schools and four of the Curriculum Only schools talked about expanding the programme to incorporate contact but with conditions. For example, they suggested that contact be introduced on a trial basis, only some lessons shared, in a neutral place and having time to get to know each other before doing the lessons:

Child 1: You’d be best picking schools to do it that listen, where maybe everybody did the lessons and then again with the questionnaire they did the thing then...when they had all the lessons done.
Child 2: Maybe there could be like, not a visual place but like, sort of a special, not a special place.
Child 3: Like a place.
Child 2: A place to go to learn about it kinda.
Child 1: Aye like a building you go to-
Child 2: Like for children.
Interviewer: All together?
Several children: Yes.
I: And why would you need a different building?
Child 2: Not a different building but in a school, like a special room kind of.
Child 4: Everyone in together.
Interviewer: Why would you, why?
Child 2: Just, for like other schools to meet up.
Interviewer: Oh, OK, why can you not just go their school.
Child 2: Cause we maybe not want to go to their school.
Interviewer: OK, good girl, very good suggestion.
Child 2: They like know everywhere about it. They know like.
Child 4: Just in case like-
Child 2: In case they trap you somewhere or something...they can do whatever they want. Yeah.
(Curriculum Only school)

Yeah, and if they (..) if they, if it worked with one or two schools then you could try it with maybe another school, and then if you kept doing that for maybe (..) a wee while then they all might start joining sort of.
(Curriculum Only school)

Get to know them a wee bit better, then you feel a wee bit more comfortable with them...before you make... before you do that (the programme), get to know them better before you do that so then you know that you can say things.
(Curriculum + Contact school)

Children in both the Curriculum + Contact schools and Curriculum Only schools also talked in equal measure about changing the programme content — the most frequently mentioned activity here was removing de Bono’s hats or making it easier and removing the scenarios cards due to the emotional content. The children also talked about changing the teaching approaches in the programme. These comments mainly came from the Curriculum + Contact schools and were related to including more active learning approaches and tasks and ‘going outside’.

With reference to the future impact of the programme, the majority of comments were positive and three quarters of them came from the Curriculum + Contact schools. The most predominate themes in relation to the future impact of the programme were related to reducing violence and helping people to live together in the future/be friends in the future and these came from Curriculum + Contact children:

Child 1: Well (..) bringing (..) communities together.
Child 2: Together, yeah.
Child 1: And sharing.
Child 2: Shared community.
Child 1: It helps...so that there will be less fighting...because we’ll get used to each other.
Child 2: Like our mummies and daddies grew up in the Troubles and (..) we don’t want to.
Child 1: Well it’ll (..) help because when we (..) like (..) we’re growing up and we’re going to start like (..) like (..)when we’re growing up to be around Catholics then (..) other people will and (..)
Child 2: Then we can (..)We can be together.
Child 1: It will get better then.
(Curriculum + Contact school)

Child 1: See the project is (..) I thought it was based on like to stop the violence and all (..) that like Protestants and Catholics are involved-
Child 2: Trying to understand what they can do.
(Curriculum + Contact school)
Child 1: Cause like you talk about stuff, but at the same time make friends and everything...stop fighting and understand each other.
Child 2: It’s also cause it’s good to just good to show what your religion means and understand what theirs does as well.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Like before, say like they didn’t know anything about them but if there was people they heard about and then... and then if they were going to grow up and if they started fighting or anything, and then if they did the programme then it would stop them like... like sort of like...going away at other people and like fighting and sort of... the way Catholics and Protestants fight.

(Curriculum + Contact school)

Children in both the Curriculum + Contact group and Curriculum Only group also talked a little about the importance of knowing about religions for your future life. The negative comments in relation to the future impact of the programme were less frequent (one for every four positive comments) and came from one or two individual children – there was no overall pattern to these comments.

4.2 Findings from the teacher interviews

Between November/December 2012 4 a total of 23 semi-structured interviews were conducted with both, Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact teachers. A series of questions were designed to evaluate the PRTSC programme (see interview schedule in Appendix 4). The responses from these questions have been categorised into the four most frequently cited aspects of the programme and are present below in the following order:

(a) Support for teachers: in terms of training, ongoing support, professional development and the provision of resources.
(b) The programme’s content and approaches: in terms of implementation, general views, most successful elements of the programme, least successful elements of the programme, and the addressing issues such as sectarianism.
(c) Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only programme implementation: i.e. benefits of the Curriculum + Contact programme, issues with the Curriculum + Contact programme, and the Curriculum Only programme.
(d) Impacts of the programme, proposed changes and suggestions: i.e. changed attitudes amongst children, preparation for post-primary and beyond, parental feedback, the need for such programmes in Northern Ireland, proposed changes to programme, and what else should be done to address sectarianism?

4.2.1 Support for teachers: training, on-going support, professional development and the provision of resources

The overwhelming view of the teachers who attended the two days residential training was that the exercise was invaluable and ‘alleviated everybody’s fears’. In particular, the teachers felt that they were guided through the programme; were shown ‘really good techniques’ in terms of ‘how to handle the teaching of the controversial issues’; and had the opportunity to suggest changes. In terms of on-going support, the interviews attest that the Link Officers were ‘supportive’, ‘calming’, ‘incredibly helpful’ and that the teacher’s feedback was consistently ‘linked-in’ to the updating of resources. Similarly, in relation to the teacher’s own professional development, the consensus was
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that the programme has increased their confidence in terms of using a variety of active learning strategies and addressing controversial issues. Typical comments include:

After going to [the residential training venue] I would feel confident teaching this content. That was two of the best days of a course I was ever on . . . The setting, the situation, the leaders were fantastic . . . made you feel at ease.

They went through everything, every lesson and if there were things we felt we weren’t comfortable with, they changed them. We changed them together. We had input, people saying “we don’t feel comfortable”, “right, let’s change it”.

I was a bit scared about teaching the controversial sensitive issues. But, you went home knowing what was in the 12 lessons, what you had to do . . . and you had a feel for it. I came home thinking I can’t wait to start this.

Venue and food were lovely there and nice accommodation . . . it does matter if you have to be away for two days.

On-going support was fantastic; she would have phoned me several times and visited.

Link Officer rang a few times, was also available via email and she came out to the school, she was so interested in listening to the children she was very helpful “I’m only a phone call away”.

I never felt isolated, never felt on my own. I would say on-going support and monitoring support was 100% just knowing that somebody is on the end of a line.

Resources were constantly updated, “I’ve updated this because you said that wouldn’t work, here’s the updated version”.

I feel that taking part in this project has taught me how to deal with sectarian issues and use the active learning strategies.

Lessons taught me to explain those delicate issues to the children. When you’re being trained as a teacher, those subjects are not broached upon, so you’re coming into this sort of blind.

Several teachers also pointed out that the ‘paired teaching’ element of the programme gave them the opportunity to ‘learn from somebody else’s experience’. The predominant view was that these partnerships ‘worked very well’ both in terms of the relationship between the teachers and the delivery of the lesson. However, one teacher highlighted the importance of equal ‘levels of enthusiasm’; another of the difficulties in terms of contrasting approaches.

You always worry when you meet another teacher from another school, maybe it won’t click or whatever, but it worked very well. It made the lessons more productive and collaborative.

That was one thing about the contact programme, you need to have both teachers really enthused, if not you’re fighting a losing battle.

There were times throughout the programme when the other teacher occasionally stepped further than what I felt was appropriate. Afterwards I thought to myself, God, that’s a bit over the top . . . had my own children asked that I would have veered away from it completely.
In relation to the resources provided by the CASS of the WELB, the teachers agreed that ‘having each lesson set out for you was a massive help’ and that the structured way the resources were assembled ensured that participating schools were ‘singing off the same hymn sheet’. One teacher, however, commented that the ‘very rigid’ nature of the programme was, potentially, restrictive; another raised concerns over the ‘insufficient provision’ of children’s books.

The lessons were so explanatory and so set out step-by-step . . . they had everything organised. It had all been put onto pen drives; it just had to be collected from the teacher’s centre. It made the delivery of the lessons . . . so much easier.

Teachers may have a very different style to me . . . the fact we had to stick to the same resources very rigorously could have been restricting.

How do you expect us to do this with a class of 28 and we’ve six books (12th July novel)?

4.2.2 The Programme’s content and approaches

Although time pressures have been a recurring issue throughout the programme, the general view of the teachers was that the programme was very well structured and that the active learning strategies employed have been particularly valuable. The most successful elements of the programme were the activities which ‘so engaged’ the children and the least successful elements related to, for example, the repetitious nature of some lessons. There were also many concerns raised in relation to addressing issues such as sectarianism.

Implementation

Although several teachers reported that they were able to get two or three lessons ‘done in one full afternoon’ and found that ‘the timing wasn’t really an issue’, many others claimed that time pressures were ‘a nightmare’ and ‘the biggest variable’ in the programme. Several teachers thought the programme was too ‘long’, that six or seven weeks was ‘probably sufficient’, and that they often had to ‘cherry pick’ because there was an ‘awful lot of content’.

I did have to shorten it a little bit. The big problem was, because I had 34, I really couldn’t attempt it in the (year 6) class. I had to be timetabled for the hall and was only really able to do the bare bones.

Some of the (year 8) lessons actually ran over. There was maybe too much packed into one lesson; you could have rattled through it you know, but, the children don’t get the same out of it when you go through it too quickly.

Obviously P7 is a big year and it’s quite busy as well so I am quite concerned about time. That’s the biggest factor for me am I going to have to sacrifice huge amount of other lessons - numeracy and literacy are two of the most important things.

General views on the programme

The consensus from the teachers was that the programme was ‘excellently prepared’ and encouraged pupils to develop their ‘thinking skills’. The most valuable aspects were identified as: firstly, the active learning strategies employed and the way such methods engaged the children. Indeed, one teacher commented that such strategies are ‘things you aspire to in your teaching’, but don’t ‘get the opportunity to use as often as you would like’; secondly, the way in which the programme was linked to the school curriculum; and thirdly, the level of difficulty of the content which was seen as both age and capacity appropriate. However, several teachers questioned if the programme placed too much emphasis on the two main denominations.
The (year 6) lessons were very thorough and well thought out. One of the main things that I liked about the lessons was the fact that they used thinking skills.

The (year 6) children really engaged very well with the stuff, people bingo the different carousel, the different strategies for getting their views across, ‘cause they are so fed up with pen and paper’.

I’m very happy with it . . . It’s one of the best programmes I have certainly encountered. The (year 7) lessons were structured and the activities were structured; it was geared very much towards their age.

They (year 8) didn’t even think they were learning, they just thought they were having fun. They were having fun so as far as they were concerned that couldn’t possibly be learning can it?

I think that this project basically is brilliant but I think that it shouldn’t so focussed on the two religions because there are so many other aspects.

**Most successful elements of the programme**

In line with the responses from the teacher evaluations, the interviews highlight that the children particularly enjoyed: the circle times which allowed children to express things that were meaningful to them; the stories and dramatisations; ‘getting up and moving around’ in their ‘mixed ability groups’, which gave ‘every child an opportunity to participate’; and the activities which enabled them to examine their own identity and deal with issues they encounter every day such as bullying. Several teachers also commented on the ‘cross-curricular’ value of the learning strategies, particularly in terms of supporting literacy development.

The 12th of July book was great. The book goes at a nice speed and teaches them about their own identity.

The ‘Velveteen Rabbit’ was excellent; nice new shiny things aren’t always the most loved things . . . this was a nice way of putting across that message.

They absolutely loved researching online the history of their own surname; every single one of them was hooked on that; it didn’t cross their mind that it might be religious based.

The ‘I’m special’ poem was great; ‘no-one’s like me, I’m unique’ . . . I have used that in school anti-bullying initiative.

Those types of active learning are cross-curricular; I could use it for all different types of subjects. We probably will adopt these strategies again in literacy as well.

**Least successful elements of the programme**

There were a number of areas identified where the programme was less successful. Several teachers thought that: many children ‘were confused by the baseline questionnaires’; there were concerns over ‘repetition’, specifically, that (in year 9) the content was ‘repeating the same messages’ and that the (year 6) lesson on ‘My Name Matters’ was, essentially, covered in lesson 1 and seemed ‘very similar’. Some teachers also doubted the value of categorising names by religion, describing the exercise as ‘dated’ because ‘names like ‘Ben’ are neutral’ and many Irish names are ‘used by non-Catholics’. There were also concerns that some of the content was controversial and assumed a greater understanding of politics and paramilitary symbols amongst children than is the case. Finally, it was reported that ‘the Wall’ activity made some children, particularly girls, uncomfortable.
Lessons 10 and 11 (year 7) were the most controversial; the child being attacked by other children who said “he’s not one of us” was a wee bit too direct.

They (year 8) didn’t understand certain symbols, they’re just too young; they understand Celtic and Rangers, but don’t have that attachment to murals of paramilitary groups.

There’s too much information in the (year 7) history booklets, they could not grasp it. The symbol cards were very good, but the children didn’t know half the symbols. I know, we take politics for granted, but, it meant nothing to them.

The activity the play, ‘the wall’ was fantastic but the year group I had, it just didn’t suit that class because most of them are incredibly shy and they’d have issues about standing up. There were a number of (year 8) girls in there . . . you just wouldn’t get them up.

**Addressing issues such as sectarianism**

Many of the concerns over addressing issues such as sectarianism highlighted in the teacher evaluations were mirrored and expanded upon in the interviews. It was frequently cited that the children found the ‘sectarian aspect very difficult to understand’ because they don’t ‘see themselves living in a sectarian world’ and that by highlighting such issues the programme was ‘almost encouraging sectarianism’. Although several teachers spoke about the need to equip children for post-primary and beyond, many more claimed that ‘the more you highlight it the more of an issue it becomes’, particularly for schools in communities ‘with very little pre-existing sectarianism’. A similar contrast was found in relation to the ‘12th July’ book, some teachers spoke about the story being ‘close to their experience’, that children ‘would have those fears’ and ‘would know those emotions’. Other teachers argued that the book was ‘too serious’ and that children ‘don’t need to hear about the horrible side’ at their age. More broadly, it was felt that the programme appears to direct children to ‘defend their own culture’ instead of ‘accepting other people’s culture’.

“Would you find easy to forgive someone who had murdered someone in your family?” It was an issue I didn’t like to have to address . . . I thought it was quite heavy for a wee P6 class.

The children asked why Town X was bombed; how many people were killed in it? That opened a whole box of worms . . . I don’t think that should have been discussed within a school situation.

I feared that they’d think “well maybe we should have these feelings” and “why are we not having these feelings?” It’s great that they find out about this, but you don’t want to reinforce sectarian identification.

I know people may talk about planting the seed, but nobody is living in a nutshell or a bubble. They’re going to be going to secondary school so they’re going to find out this stuff anyway, maybe in a negative way.

**4.2.3 ‘Curriculum + Contact’ and ‘Curriculum Only’ programme implementation**

There were a range of benefits associated with the contact element of the programme and, in general, the shared lessons were seen as ‘very positive’. The main issue with contact related primarily to difficulties in terms of co-ordinating timetables. The general view of the teachers in the Curriculum Only group was that shared lesson would have been beneficial, however, it was also suggested that, in some cases, it may have proved problematic.

---
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Benefits of the Curriculum + Contact intervention

The consensus amongst the teachers in the Curriculum + Contact group was that it was more beneficial to discuss issues such as sectarianism in a mixed group than in ‘a room full of people all of the same background’. It was also claimed that the Curriculum + Contact children were given the opportunity to ‘learn about each other, learn about our history and have more of an understanding of how we got to where we are’. Several teachers reported that their schools saw the contact element as a ‘very positive activity’, ‘good PR being seen working with other schools’ and that they would have felt ‘disappointed if we’d went through all this and been told, you’re just a control group’. The wide spread view of Curriculum + Contact teachers was that ‘the children got on like a house on fire’; friendships have been maintained; and that ‘like met like, quiet ones with quiet ones, noisy ones with noisy ones’.

The contact time went really well and I would have loved all of the (year 7) lessons delivered contact.

They (year 8) enjoy the contact, “the School A ones are coming tomorrow” and they’re hyper in the corridor; they really enjoyed it far more than the normal classroom setting. So, the enthusiasm for it . . . I think they are bound to have learnt more from it. When they were sitting here on their own without the Academy boys and girls, it didn’t have the same zing to it.

By the third session they had organised themselves; you could see that the quieter ones from both schools going together; the boisterous, confident ones were picking out the loud, confident girls and boys from the Academy and sitting with them. The only stipulation that we had on the tables of 6 was that it was 3 from each school, but we let them decide where they were sitting.

Issues with the Curriculum + Contact programme

One of the key issues raised in relation to the contact element was the logistical challenges of ‘co-ordinating arrangements’ with the partner school, which were ‘very hard to plan’. Moreover, the sensitive nature of some of the content persuaded several Curriculum + Contact teachers to deliver certain lessons separately. For example, one teacher commented that the ‘12th July’ lesson was ‘a bit too pointed and a bit too contrived’. Other concerns were raised over the influence of ‘awkward personalities’ which it was claimed often have a greater impact on the class than the teacher. Many of these, as it transpired, unfounded fears related to teachers’ concerns over how both sets of children would behave towards each other. In addition, one teacher reported that perhaps some children felt restricted in what they could say in a mixed group, while another questioned if levels of enthusiasm amongst the children could be maintained.

I had fears about their children coming into our school and getting abused by some of our lot and that didn’t happen.

I can keep my own girls under control but what happens if some of these kids from another school start kicking off.

After a (year 7) contact lesson, one pupil said ‘I wanted to say “she probably didn’t like the bands because she was a Catholic” but I didn’t want to say it in front of the other class in case I offended anybody’.

I’ve told my class this year that we’re going across to School B, and one guy says “do we have to?” I don’t know if he was joking or serious or not . . . so, there might be a drop down in enthusiasm from the children as the novelty wears off.
The Curriculum Only intervention

There was a range of often contrasting views expressed by teachers in the Curriculum Only group. Several felt that contact would have made the lessons more meaningful, while several others pointed out that it would have created too many difficulties. It was highlighted that being a Curriculum Only school allowed for more flexibility in terms of timetable issues; that teachers being less aware of the ‘background’ of the other children would have entailed more preparation and planning; that some teachers did not know if they could have been ‘as forthright’ with some of the content; and that some pupils may have felt less confident. It was also suggested that successful contact between schools was contingent on pre-existing relationships.

Being a contact school would have been beneficial; they could have seen that it’s not an idea, its real life. It’s not something that their teacher is telling them, they do live in a mixed community.

I think contact would have been really disruptive . . . they would missed other (year 8) lessons and I think there would have been a knock-on effect there that might have negated any benefit they’d have got from contact.

If they (year 6) are thrown in with a larger crowd, they will not be as vocal, they won’t participate as much, they’re just kind of swamped . . . they do sometimes prefer learning in their own environment.

I actually don’t think I was ready to do that with a contact school because some of the (year 7) lessons were so contentious . . . difficult unless you had a very good relationship with your contact school first of all. Perhaps better on your own before you embark upon contact.

4.2.4 Impacts of the programme, proposed changes and suggestions

The consensus here was that the children had benefited from the programme, particularly in terms of improved cross-community understanding and preparation for post-primary and beyond. There appeared to be very little parental feedback on the programme. However, teachers outlined the need for such programmes in Northern Ireland, made several suggestions in terms of improving the programme, and highlighted areas where additional measures could be put in place to address issues such as sectarianism.

Changed attitudes amongst children

Although the teachers accepted that attitudinal change was difficult to measure, the consensus was that the children have taken ‘an awful lot away from it’ and seem ‘very enthusiastic’ about continuing the programme for a second year. A few teachers were ‘very sceptical’ of changed attitudes, primarily, because ‘the children didn’t go in with attitudes’. However, most agreed that the children have become ‘more acceptant’ and ‘more amenable’ to ‘cross-community discussions’. It was also suggested that the interaction between children from Curriculum + Contact schools has further developed through social media. However, several teachers highlighted that some of the children were also involved in a range of parallel processes of cross-community engagement, thus it was difficult to accurately ascertain if the PRTSCE programme was solely responsible for any detected attitudinal change.

They probably have a better understanding of their own community, about other communities and their own identity, and feeling more confident in what they believe.

You don’t know how long lasting the benefit to children is . . . contact needs to be sustained.
Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme

The pupils were very quickly swapping Facebook names and making friends with new people, the boys, not so much perhaps.

We were a non-contact school, but in a separate project, they visited an Irish speaking school; that could skew your results a wee bit.

**Preparation for post-primary and beyond**
There was a widely held view amongst the teachers that the programme was especially helpful to primary school children who are now ‘better equipped’ in terms of moving on to post-primary school and a ‘completely different environment’. In particular, it was felt that the programme would alleviate fears in terms of studying subjects in schools with mixed denominations.

This is maybe a good age to start (P7) before they leave and move on.

It’ll do them good in a few years because we have so many students crossing over to study subjects. They’re more likely now to say “I’m going to do Spanish down in the Academy” and not worry about it.

**Parental feedback**
A consistent finding from the interviews was that there was very little or no feedback from parents. Although parental consent letters were sent out, and children were ‘bound to have told their parents’ about the programme, many teachers reported that there was ‘no feedback at all from parents’, and that ‘nobody complained about anything’. The consensus was that ‘the silence is a good thing’ because ‘if the parents were not happy, we would have heard about it’. However, one teacher recalled an encounter with a parent concerning group photographs of the Deputy First Minister and the children who participated in the programme, a meeting that was not part of the programme but a follow-up to it.

I put them (photos of Martin McGuinness with the class) up in my classroom wall and the cleaner came in whose daughter is in my class and she said “whatever you do don’t you dare send that photo out to my house for it’ll go in the fire”.

**The need for such programmes in Northern Ireland**
There was broad agreement that there was a definite need for programmes which focus on issues such as community relations, sectarianism and reconciliation. The general view was that ‘misconceptions will breed in the absence of such programmes’; that schools are ‘doing a massive disservice’ to any child if you don’t ‘make them aware of what’s out there and how to deal with it’; and that such programmes need to be ‘continual’.

I would like to see this project rolled out within every school in Northern Ireland, there’s no point in us teaching this now for the next two years and then sweeping it back under the carpet again it would just be a waste of money and a waste of time.

**Proposed changes to programme**
The interviews highlight several areas where the programme could be improved. The most frequently cited ‘deficiency’ was the absence of any ‘recording methods’. One teacher spoke about wanting to ‘see a result, or a finished product’; another argued that as the programme was not ‘tested’ or ‘assessed’ children were likely to ‘take it less seriously’ because they know they are not required to evidence their learning. A second suggestion related to pupils who have completed the programme mentoring those who are about to participate. Three other improvement suggestions were made relating to: firstly, the provision of resources to ensure that every child has books of their own; secondly, that the 12th lesson of year 7, where the children are asked to ‘celebrate their
culture’, is held in a school assembly hall with an audience to give the event ‘more meaning’; and finally, that teachers are more informed of the programme’s core requirements to allow them to be more selective in terms of the content they are able to deliver.

It’s very hard to assess them; you say go home and revise and they’ve really got nothing to revise; parents want to see things written down.

I wanted the 12th July book for every child; it would be cross-curricular with the potential for lots of literacy skills development.

In the final lesson of year 7, they had to celebrate their culture; it wasn’t much of an event or a celebration; we should have it in a whole school assembly . . . try and maybe have an audience.

There’s 35 minutes, you have to cover the core . . . ideally it would be great if you were told ‘you must cover this . . . and you choose to cover this or this’ . . . we should be made aware of the core requirements.

**What else should be done to address sectarianism?**
The teachers were also asked what other initiatives could make a positive impact on children in terms of addressing issues such as sectarianism. Most teachers framed their responses round the realities of the segregated education system in Northern Ireland. The consensus was that although many ‘single faith schools are terrified of integration’, there was a definite need for them to work more closely together. One teacher argued that ‘there has to be ways’, particularly, in sport and other extra-curricular activities. Another teacher highlighted persistently high levels of residential and social segregation and the limited effect schools can have. Finally, one teacher presented a more pessimistic outlook for Northern Ireland’s children in terms of them broadening their social and cultural horizons.

You’re either in a Catholic school or a Protestant school and it's a long, long process. We can only do bits and pieces in school.

It doesn’t matter what they teach you in school, but if you go home to your own community and you’re still separate, and you never meet anybody that’s any different from yourself, that’s the way you’re going to be. I don’t think it should be solely left just in the hands of schools.

Just call Northern Ireland a closed community and then say to them “get the first plane or the first boat out of it if you want to see the world and see what’s not narrow”. I don’t think you ever really get a broad view if you remain here.

**4.3 Findings from the lesson observations**

Detailed lesson observations were conducted for one full lesson (ranging from 15 to 124 minutes) in 16 out of 18 intervention schools between March 2012 and May 2012. Lesson observations were conducted in all 12 Curriculum Only schools and for four out of the six Curriculum + Contact schools. Observations in the contact schools took place during a contact lesson. In total, three lessons were observed with post-primary classes and nine were observed with primary classes. This reflects the overall pattern in the sample whereby the majority of intervention schools were primary. A copy of the observation schedule is presented in Appendix 5. The observation schedule involved the observation and collection of information related to the timing of the lesson, whether or not the learning intentions were met, planning, teaching and learning, interaction between the children (both in Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact lessons) and assessment. There were also
sections on the interaction between teachers, when the lesson observed was a Curriculum + Contact lesson. There was also space for further notes/observations. In this section, the researcher mainly commented on what they children were saying and/or presenting during the lesson and any other pieces of information given by the teacher about the programme, during the visit. For example, there was often time to briefly chat before/after the lesson observation.

4.3.1 Timing of the lessons and learning intentions

As part of the observations, information was collected on how long each lesson took and whether or not the learning intentions were met. It is interesting to note that the post-primary lessons were considerably shorter than the primary lessons and, in turn, it was more difficult for post-primary teachers to meet all the set learning intentions for a given lesson. This reflects the concern outlined by post-primary teachers in their interviews in relation to ‘fitting everything in’ to one timetabled lesson at post-primary level. The observation data therefore highlights that almost all the primary sessions observed resulted in a greater focus on the learning intentions, more time to relate back to these and time to address all learning intentions outlined for a given lesson. However, several teachers commented on the level of content during the observation visits in terms of how long it takes to draw out understanding with the children, that the programme takes up all of their allotted PDMU time and it is not possible to complete everything outlined in the lesson plans in an hour – many had allocated more time for this programme – something which is not possible at post-primary level because of timetabling constraints.

4.3.2 Planning, teaching and learning, assessment

The observation schedules set out to consider quite a few aspects of planning. Observations were recorded in relation to the planned content, planning of resources and the layout of the teaching space. In two out of the three Curriculum + Contact lessons observed it was evident that teachers had organised what they were going to teach in advance and had been in contact to sort this. In the third school the host teacher had led the planning, however, her co-teacher had been absent in the run up to this Curriculum + Contact lesson. All of the teachers observed had clearly worked hard to have all of the resources very well prepared and were ready to move between tasks smoothly. All of the resources were prepared to a very high standard. In relation to the planned content, several of the observed lessons included the story ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes’. On all occasions the message from this story seemed too difficult for the children to grasp and they found ‘sectarianism’ difficult to understand. However, it was obvious that the active learning elements of the planned content were going very well, the novel was also well received in Year 7 and teachers and children alike were enjoying the overall content and approaches. It is interesting to note that for almost all of the Curriculum Only lessons observed children worked in mixed groups, which were not their usual groups within the class, for the majority of the lessons. In all of the Curriculum + Contact lessons observed, children were also ‘mixed up’ with children from the other school. Teachers deviated from the planned content on two occasions – during one Curriculum + Contact session (several lessons delivered together in one afternoon) and during a ‘celebration event’. Both lessons felt like more of a ‘showcase’ and resulted in deviations from the main messages outlined for those particular lessons.

Several aspects relating to teaching and learning were also considered during the observations. These can be summarised as: positive ethos, using a variety of skills and strategies, effective questioning and discussion, the management of time and resources as well as evidence of differentiation and assessment. All of these aspects were commented on for every lesson and will be summarised below. The information presented in the following sections is discussed in relation to
each individual session and does not represent the frequency of behaviours noted during observations.

There was a very positive ethos throughout all of the lessons observed. This was evidenced by the use of positive praise, and children being encouraged to use ‘positive words’ even if the content/task could be perceived as negative. For example, the de Bono’s hats exercise contained two areas that could be seen as negative (five things that make them cross on red paper), five things they don’t like on black paper). Also, the teachers observed tended to use words that encouraged the celebration of difference and enjoying our differences. It was noted that children were emotionally positive and very engaged in the tasks.

An abundance of skills and strategies were adopted by all of the teachers observed. In particular, teachers made excellent use of effective questioning to probe and draw out ideas from the children – this helped to ensure high level of engagement in almost all of the tasks and activities observed. In all but one of the observed lessons (the celebration assembly) appropriate questions were asked and key concepts were communicated. In five of the observed lessons teachers elaborated beyond the curriculum content but, very often, this was to explain things a little more, to give examples, or answer the children’s additional queries, particularly those related to the ‘other’ community and things they had heard (see section 4.4.4). The questioning was very focused on the lesson content, particularly in the post-primary schools perhaps as a result of a more limited time allocation. A particular skill noted was the excellent explanations given for terminology and for the texts used. This was enhanced by lots of examples in quite a few of the lessons and teachers demonstrated and modeled in three of the observed lessons. Solid recapping was also a feature in most of the lessons and, in particular, the explanation and instructions given for tasks was very clear and step-by-step. It was evident that teachers were very familiar with the tasks, even though this was the first time they were carrying them out with a class. Perhaps this was a result of the training and trying the tasks out for themselves (see section 4.2.1 teacher interviews).

A variety of strategies were also employed, in line with those suggested in the lesson plans. Lessons tended to start with a whole class introduction with clear instructions but the majority of tasks were completed in groups and, in seven of the observed lessons specific efforts were made to ensure the children learned collaboratively in their groups. For example: giving presentations, explaining things to each other and coming up with answers as a group.

The resources were very well used throughout all of the lessons observed. These were well prepared and used to support and engage children in all of the tasks and activities. The children clearly engaged with the activities and enjoyed the active learning element involved in using the resources.

Assessment and differentiation was obvious throughout all of the observed lessons. In particular, teachers had obviously prepared and thought about how to clarify more complex terms and concepts were very clearly clarified throughout all of the lessons. Another obvious trend was the support given at group level, in particular, to weaker groups and children who teachers had pre-empted would find some of content difficult.

### 4.3.3 Interaction between students, interaction between teachers

For three Curriculum + Contact sessions observed, children seemed to interact well during task time and were enthusiastic to respond, for the most part. During one Curriculum + Contact lesson the teacher commented that they overheard them talking about other things too (mobile phones). For two out of three of the Curriculum + Contact lessons observed the majority of children stayed in their prearranged ‘mixed school’ groups during non-task time – only one group of girls ‘stuck
together’ during break time in their own school group. However, in one of the Curriculum + Contact lessons observed it was interesting to note that, during non-task time the children tended to gravitate towards children from their own school. Consideration of how non-task/non-lesson time is spent requires further exploration (see section 4.4.3) in relation to the findings from the children’s focus groups. Interaction between children during the Curriculum Only lessons was also largely positive. Children contributed and interacted well at group level and there were a few examples of ensuring agreement at group level before reporting back to the teacher.

The interaction between teachers was also observed for the three Curriculum + Contact lessons observed. In all three lessons, one teacher tended to dominate delivery. In one of the observed Curriculum + Contact lessons it was the visiting teacher who dominated. Although they had planned to teach half of the session each, the visiting teacher still tended to dominate proceedings. In two out of the three lessons, it was the host teacher who dominated delivery – in one session the other teacher took on more of a classroom assistant role and in the other session the other teacher did not contribute at all. Nevertheless, the leading teacher (for all three lessons observed) made a very real effort to engage children from both schools and were very comfortable at asking questions and disciplining children from both schools.

4.3.4 Discussion of community relations, sectarianism and reconciliation

During the two shared lessons observed the children and teachers were discussing potentially sensitive issues. In one school they were looking at the bonfire story and children there seemed to share their opinions freely and use phrases like “because he was Catholic”. However, in the other Curriculum + Contact lesson, the children appeared more apprehensive and one child mentioned to the teacher that they “didn’t want to offend anyone”. A fear of offence was also mentioned in the children’s focus groups (see section 4.4.4). The teacher did reassure the child that it is OK to share your opinion and that no-one will be offended. Interestingly, at the end of this session, when asked if children from different culture should go to different schools the children in the controlled school all said “yes”.

Observation of the 11 Curriculum Only lessons revealed that, in three schools, children were much more open about their viewpoints with respect to their own community. In particular, in one post-primary lesson during the ‘5 whys activity’ children frequently mentioned that England/Britain “decided tied to take over Ireland”, “tried to make it into a Protestant country” and “Tried to change the Irish religion and culture”. The teacher attempted to direct the children towards reflecting upon this and the possible reasons but this did not seem successful. During another primary lesson during the deBono’s hats activity the children also mentioned that “Ireland got taken over by England” and talked a lot about “bombing” in relation to what they did not like about their country – the teacher did not directly address these comments and the class went on to draw up ‘facts’ and ‘opinions’ about their country without recognition that these may be considered differently by some members of the Northern Ireland community (e.g. Irish flag is the Tricolour, England took over Ireland). Again, the teacher did not challenge these. In fact, this appeared to be the case in most of the observed lessons which contained explicit reference to more sensitive issues – teachers either did not seem to tease out comments like these or deflected with more content/fact based questioning. Several teachers commented on their concerns that children in rural areas may not be aware of things like sectarianism and one teacher worried that she could “plant seeds”, another mentioned that she was concerned about “rocking the boat”. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the observations were carried out in the middle of the first year and the teachers who spoke about their worries in this way did say that they were becoming more reassured and less worried as they progressed through the programme. There was also evidence, during the names activity that was observed in
two lessons, that children were taking a positive message namely that one cannot judge people by their names.

It is clear that the content and activities of the lessons observed may also have provoked different types of responses from the children – something which the reader must take in to account when reflecting on the findings from the observation data. Also, it is important to note that only 16 lessons were observed within the first year of the programme and the further detail given in the findings from the teacher lesson evaluations (section 4.1), teacher interviews (4.2) and children’s focus groups (4.4) add greater depth to these results and cast more light on details and issues relating to specific lessons and tasks/activities.

4.4 Findings from the initial teacher questionnaire, additional questionnaire and teacher lessons evaluations

The initial teacher questionnaire was completed by 21 out of 23 intervention teachers and seven out of 12 control teachers. The sample comprised 19 primary school teachers and 9 post-primary teachers. The majority of teachers had said they had previous teaching experience in the area of community relations though only half of them reported to have attended specific training the area previously to the programme. The majority of teachers stated that they felt quite confident in teaching community relations and citizenship. There was a significant difference in the responses given by primary and post-primary teachers, with post-primary teachers reporting to be the most confident about teaching both Community Relations and Citizenship.

Teachers’ personal ‘hopes’ for the training were about dealing with community relations and/or reconciliation. Teachers talked about wanting to increase their confidence in teaching about these issues as well as the knowledge, skills and strategies for teaching in this area. Teachers also mentioned professional development, new resources, development of the curriculum area in their school and how they want the training to help them to change and develop children’s attitudes and perceptions. A few teachers also talked about the training as a vehicle for setting up contact with other schools. The majority of ‘concerns’ mentioned centred around dealing with and teaching reconciliation issues as well as worries about finding the time to train, co-ordinate and teach the programme. The concerns over teaching ‘these issues’ mainly came from primary teachers. Concerns about the time required to train, plan/co-ordinate and teach the lessons came from primary and post-primary teachers.

Out of the possible 23 questionnaires for the intervention groups which tried to gauge the impact of the flag protests, 12 were returned. Overall, findings indicated that about half of the teachers responding to the survey perceived the flag impact to have a slightly negative impact on their school as a whole and the classes involved in the intervention. However, the majority of them stated they would not amend curricular content as a result of it. Given that there may have been some differential impact of the socio-political situation on schools, this may have influenced the findings of the results and this needs to be borne in mind as a future possibility.

An analysis of the curriculum of the PRTSCE programme is based on the completed Teacher Evaluations. 58 evaluations were received for year 6, 87 for year 7, 20 for year 8, and 15 for year 9. The first three questions in the Teacher Evaluations sought to establish: the number of lessons which were shared, the number of Learning Intentions achieved, and the number of Specified Activities which were completed. In terms of year-by-year breakdowns, the evaluations received were based on the following reports:
Firstly, 1 lesson evaluation received was reported as shared in year 6, 20 in year 7, 5 in year 8, and 5 in year 9.

Secondly, in year 6, 125 out of a possible 126 Learning Intentions were reported as achieved, in year 7 the corresponding figures were 218/220, in year 8 42/51, and in year 9 32/34.

Thirdly, in year 6, 135 out of a possible 144 Activities Specified for Lesson were reported completed, in year 7 the corresponding figures were 228/254, in year 8 44/52, and in year 9 33/34.

The data above is presented in the table in Appendix 11 and provides details in terms of each individual lesson evaluation received across years 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The quantitative findings from the lesson evaluation, i.e. numbers of those who indicated they were ‘very confident’, ‘quite confident’, and ‘not at all confident’ in the delivery of individual lessons are presented in the tables in Appendix 12. In broad terms, this quantitative data indicates the following:

Out of a total of 180 received teacher evaluations, only three reported being ‘not confident at all’ in delivering a lesson; 79 ‘quite confident’; and 98 ‘extremely’ confident’. The teachers in the year 7 programme were the most confident, particularly, in lessons 10 and 11. In contrast, teachers reported being least confident in year 8, particularly, in lessons 5 and 2.

The evaluations also indicate positive results in terms of ‘how well the lesson went’, pupil’s enjoyment, and participation. Only one lesson across the four years (year 7 lesson 1) was thought to have gone ‘not well at all’; 42 ‘reasonable well’; and 137 ‘very well’. Interestingly, a greater percentage of Curriculum + Contact lessons were reported as having gone ‘very well’ than Curriculum Only lessons. Only one evaluation (year 6, lesson 4) reported that the pupils seemed to enjoy the lesson ‘not at all’; 18 ‘a bit’; and 161 ‘very much’. There was no significant difference across the years or between Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact. In terms of participation, no evaluations reported ‘no participation at all’; 21 ‘some participation’; and 159 ‘a lot of participation. However, slightly more participation was reported in the Curriculum + Contact lessons than the Curriculum Only lessons.

Across the four years, there were very few ‘barriers to learning’, negative ‘unforeseen outcomes or lessons reported as ‘very controversial’. In 141 lessons, no barriers to learning were reported. In 39 lessons barriers were identified and related, primarily, to time pressures and the accessibility of some of the children’s reading material. In 139 lessons there were no unforeseen outcomes (positive or negative); the 41 lessons which did report such outcomes were predominantly positive and related to, for example, children proactively supplementing their learning with addition reading. 10 evaluations indicated that the lesson was ‘very controversial’; 26 ‘quite controversial’ and 144 ‘not controversial at all. None of the Curriculum + Contact lessons were seen as ‘very controversial’. The most controversial lessons were: year 6 lesson 11; and year 7 lessons 7 & 8.

The evaluations also show that the resources and activities provided were highly effective learning methods: 141 evaluations reported that the activities were ‘very useful’; 39 ‘quite useful’ and none ‘not useful at all. The resources for the lesson were seen as ‘very useful’ in 152 lessons; ‘quite useful’ in 28 lessons. No teacher reported that the resources were ‘not useful at all’. There was no significant difference across the four years or between Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact.

Finally, and in relation to the 31 shared / Curriculum + Contact lessons, no evaluations reported ‘no interaction at all’; one ‘some interaction’; and 30 ‘a lot of interaction’.
The qualitative analysis below is based on the comments and explanations made by the teachers in response to the open-ended questions of the Evaluation sheets. The responses from the above questions are presented in the following sections and have been categorised into the four most frequently cited aspects of the programme. For example, the most prevalently cited aspect was the content and approaches of the lessons. This section is followed by the next three most prevalent aspects: addressing community relations and sectarianism in primary and post-primary settings; shared lessons with partner schools and comparisons between Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only; and finally, the efficacy of the resources provided and the activities specified for the lessons. The responses from the evaluations are presented with illustrative quotes. However, further quotes are laid out in the individual lesson evaluations which provide a summation of the findings for each of the 12 lessons across years 6, 7, 8 & 9 (see Appendix 13).

### 4.4.1 Positive aspects relating to content and approaches of the lessons

A significant majority of the Teacher Evaluation responses in respect of the lessons’ content and approaches were positive, particularly in terms of the active learning strategies employed and the children’s engagement within them. The main issues reported related to time management pressures and the claim that the programme placed too great an emphasis on sectarian divisions.

The most frequently highlighted positive aspect in the Teacher Evaluations was the way in which the lessons encouraged children to openly discuss their own opinions and to reflect on the opinion of others. The structure of the lessons and the resources provided meant that controversial issues were examined ‘safely’ and that children were encouraged to express their own thoughts. A second frequently mentioned aspect was raising children’s awareness of their own identity and different cultures and traditions. In particular, it was claimed that the lessons gave the children a fuller understanding of the meaning of celebration across a range of different contexts. The third positive aspect related to the addressing of ‘difficult issues’ such as stereotyping and sectarianism. The fourth positive concerns the value of the active learning strategies employed and the ‘very practical nature’ of the programme. Here many teachers hoped to use several of the active learning strategies in other subjects as they claimed they were ‘so successful’. More broadly, one teacher recalled that the children were ‘sad to have reached end of project’ and agreed that the programme has been ‘extremely valuable’.

They really enjoyed the process of making choices then reflecting on these choices – was someone else’s choice better than mine?

Lesson was a really good platform for discussing the key issues particularly around the difference between fact and opinion.

Discussions were very mature . . . the children demonstrated an appreciation and acceptance of different traditions.

Lots of discussion on stereotyping, commonalities and differences . . . very clear message . . . pupils saw very clearly their own stereotyping of others.

Activities encouraged interesting debates on sectarianism and reconciliation.

Children have really enjoyed the practical nature of these lessons.
Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme

This programme was worthwhile and hopefully will bear some fruit in the future lives of pupils.

4.4.2 Issues with the lessons’ content and approaches

Issues relating to the challenges of addressing topics such as sectarianism, problems associated with shared lessons, and the accessibility of some of the resources are examined in subsequent sections. Other key issues raised concerned: time management, which was identified as the most important influence in terms of failure to complete activities; the ‘repetitive’ nature of some lessons; children occasionally being unaware of issues ‘they’re expected to discuss’; the fact that many children found reflection ‘very challenging’; and more broadly, that across the programme ‘there was too much emphasis on differences’. There were also views expressed on the benefits for both children and teachers in terms of undertaking a second year of the programme.

Time is a real problem – depending on the ability of the class, some lessons had to be delivered over two sessions.

The lesson was very full there was a need to set time aside (outside of the actual lesson) to read the chapter.

Children were becoming restless with so much discussion in one session.

They got bored of activity quickly because there was too much reading.

Children seemed a little less enthusiastic; they felt they had discussed many of these issues before.

I was very surprised to see how difficult children found reflection; many children struggled with the concept.

I wonder if by teaching year 8 pupils of divisions in society we are highlighting difference.

Children have good knowledge retained from year 8. Level of knowledge and understanding between teachers and pupils is very good.

4.4.3 Positive aspects/impacts of addressing community relations, sectarianism and reconciliation in primary and post-primary settings

Although it was accepted that many of the lessons broached challenging issues, there was also a general consensus that the concept of conflict was introduced in a sensitive way. For example, several teachers pointed out that the children were ‘relaxed talking about events such as the 12th of July’; contentious issues were addressed in a ‘measured way’; and that the lessons were a valuable experience for both teachers and pupils. However, it was also regularly cited in the evaluations that the content placed ‘too much emphasis’ on Protestant and Catholic identities.

The Evaluations highlighted four key positives in terms of the programme addressing issues such as community relations and sectarianism. The most frequently cited was an increased willingness and capacity on the part of the children to discuss contentious issues such as bigotry and the stereotyping of marginalised groups. A second common response was that the lessons gave children the confidence to express their own identity in a safe and structured environment. The positive benefit of ‘broadening out’ such debates to include communities outside of Ireland was also
highlighted. The consensus here was that including other countries and cultures helped to make the lessons less controversial, yet concomitantly, more interesting and enjoyable. It was also claimed by many teachers that the ‘experience’ of delivering such content had increased their own confidence of ‘tackling such issues again in the future’.

They were very willing to talk about different religions and cultures.

Pupils enjoyed talking about issues which are not normally discussed openly in school.

There was a lovely atmosphere of trust.

Working together helped the class to begin to communicate about the issues in a safe way.

Broadening out the issue of flags was very useful; the discussion was informational and not restricted to Northern Ireland which made it more interesting.

Although I was not confident at all prior to the lesson due to the contentious nature of the content, I would feel far more confident delivering something similar in the future.

4.4.4 Issues in addressing community relations, sectarianism and reconciliation in primary and post-primary settings

There were four main concerns raised around the teaching of such concepts. The first related to many of the younger children’s ‘complete lack of awareness’ of sectarianism or its context in Ireland / Northern Ireland. Indeed, several teachers claimed that children’s ‘bafflement’ on any opposition to cultural celebrations was a significant barrier to learning. The second important concern cited here was that the lessons may ‘encourage’ or ‘promote’ sectarian identities. The consensus here was that ‘sectarianism is expected too much’ and that several activities, particularly those which categorised names, made ‘sectarian assumptions which the children do not have’. It was also suggested that several children in years 6 and 7 found some of the content on conflict, particularly violent conflict, ‘very disturbing’. Finally, several teachers also pointed out that the sectarian element of the programme was beginning to impact on some children’s behaviour.

Children didn’t realise the significance of St Patrick’s Day or the Twelfth.

Children could not understand why anyone would not like St Patrick’s Day - They thought it may be due to the little girl not liking the music.

Children are relatively innocent and have never before mentioned anything about the Troubles.

There was too much emphasis on the expectation of organising names by religion.

Lessons dictate a very direct approach to Catholic/Protestant issues.

Children were very shocked by the cards mentioning murdering someone. I had to intervene and discuss the issue – calming down the children.

Some comments from children were forthright and were difficult to deal with sensitively.

I didn’t want to throw up difficult scenarios that could provoke negative behaviour.
When we were discussing the project overall I noticed one child scanning the faces of her classmates for a reaction as we were specifically talking about whether being a Catholic or a Protestant should result in conflict.

4.4.5 Positive aspects/impacts of contact

The lesson evaluations clearly indicate that teachers saw the shared lessons as very beneficial experiences for the children. A range of positive outcomes were identified, particularly around interaction, participation and the opportunity to address concepts such as discrimination. The main issues cited, primarily, related to logistical concerns and the early apprehension of both teachers and pupils.

There were three important findings in respect of the positive aspects of the shared lessons. The first was that the children were routinely comfortable and friendly with each other, enjoyed sharing ideas and were always very keen to meet each other again. Secondly, the children, particularly in years 8 and 9, were very willing to discuss and debate difficult issues and ‘freely discussed’ aspects of both Protestant and Catholic identity. The consensus was that although many of the lessons encompassed content which was controversial, pupils and teachers dealt with them in a ‘very non-threatening way’. The third important finding was that both, the quantitative tables and the qualitative comments emerging from teachers’ lesson evaluations, indicate no significant difference in levels of participation and enjoyment between pupils in the Curriculum + Contact and those in the Curriculum Only group. Indeed, the majority of the comments show higher levels of both participation and enjoyment in the shared lessons.

Students were a little bit slow to get started but the barriers came down very quickly and then they seemed to really enjoy . . . engaging with each other.

The children seemed to get on with each other very well. Pupils did not display any hostility towards each other.

Children very open about their culture and accepting of others.

Pupils enjoyed being together again and were very comfortable discussing controversial issues.

Although the lesson was quite controversial the children dealt very maturely with it; there was no negativity in the class.

4.4.6 Issues with the Curriculum + Contact programme and shared lessons

The most frequently cited concerns in relation to the shared lessons were, primarily, logistical. Several Curriculum + Contact teachers claimed that the large class sizes made delivery of the shared lesson ‘more difficult’; time was lost when pupils transited from one school to another; and that larger rooms were required when schools hosted such joint sessions. Early apprehension on the part of both teachers and pupils was also highlighted. The consensus was that, commonly, the children needed to ‘get over that first engagement’ and that several teachers were concerned, prior to the lessons, that ‘inappropriate comments’ by one set of children could result in arguments. For these reasons, many Curriculum + Contact teachers reported being ‘a little anxious’ at the start.
Importantly, several Curriculum Only teachers conceded that they would not have felt as confident delivering the lesson content to a shared class.

The large class size made it difficult to properly manage the activities; we really do need a larger room for joint sessions.

The hall wasn’t big enough to have them split into two groups with two sets of cards.

The research part of the lesson was not practical when working with 55 pupils.

As this was the first contact lesson it took a while for them to relax with each other.

I was a little concerned that one of the children might say something inappropriate that the partner school might find offensive.

I might not have been as confident if another school was involved.

I don’t know about trying to deliver this content in a mixed group.

4.4.7 Value of the resources and activities

There was wide consensus that the resources and activities encompassed in the lessons were extremely useful. The lessons were seen as well-structured and almost all the teachers commented on how effectively the learning strategies supported the learning intentions. Very few issues were raised, rather, several teachers suggested ways in which the programme could be improved with some minor changes.

The Evaluations clearly indicate that all the teachers were very impressed by the resources provided and the activities specified for the lessons. The universal view was that the resources provided by the CASS of the WELB have been invaluable throughout project; have facilitated the lessons very well; and have significantly reduced teacher preparation. The teachers agreed that the learning strategies adopted engaged the children and encouraged discussion. For example, the ‘Pros and Cons Thinking Frame’ was considered a ‘very productive method’ for stimulating debate, particularly in terms of discussing the ‘consequences of tit-for-tat behaviour’. Additionally, ‘De Bono’s Hats’ were seen as a very useful approach for this age group, drawing attention to the children’s thinking skills.

A second important positive was the way the role-playing activities impacted on the children, in one particular lesson, giving the children ‘a real sense of what it felt like to be bullied or excluded’. It was also reported that the stories selected ‘worked extremely well’, in particular, ‘The Velveteen Rabbit’ and ‘Harry’s Dilemma’ which were both seen as ‘valuable bases’ for the lessons.

People Bingo worked very well and allowed for discussion on topics such as religion.

They enjoyed mindmapping, colourful, different and personal, and sharing with other children; plenty of laughter.

Conflict cards were ideal as the situations were very realistic; some children had fantastic ideas.

Children were very keen to take part in freeze frames - digital photos were a great resource.
The children enjoyed the little bit of drama when finding £10 - Using a real £10 was very stimulating.

The poem ‘I’m Special’ was lovely - an excellent resource.

They loved Harry’s story and were engrossed by the storyline – A real cliff-hanger.

The Velveteen Rabbit story was a great starting point and made the children think.

However, the most positive impact of the resources and activities was the way they helped children achieve a fuller understanding of issues such as discrimination, stereotyping and sectarianism. Several teachers, for example, recalled that the children needed two lessons to ‘gain an understanding of sectarianism’ and that the sectarian-o-meter activity was an invaluable resource in this respect.

The Discrimination Game’ made pupils think about their own prejudices.

The symbol cards were an excellent activity which easily brought home the message of stereotyping.

Pupils were surprised at themselves when sorted the symbol cards – how clear stereotyping was. I would not have anticipated symbol cards would work so well – very enjoyable.

The ‘Walking Debate’ on different levels of sectarianism was very good.

They had little experience of sectarianism and found the concept difficult to understand but had a very clear understanding when they completed the sectarian-o-meter activity.

4.4.8 Issues with resources and activities

There were very few concerns raised around the provision of resources and activities. However, a small number of teachers felt that, occasionally, the activities were ‘somewhat repetitive’. There were also contrasting views on the accessibility of the text on the year 7 cards, some felt the ‘information was clear and user friendly’ while others claimed children found them ‘challenging’ and that the text should have been ‘simpler’. Two further suggestions were forwarded in terms of improving the programme, firstly, that as many pupils ‘could not pronounce Irish names’, phonetic methods should be considered. Secondly, that it would be useful to familiarise children with ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes’ prior to the lesson.

4.5 Conclusions from the process evaluation

There was a broad consensus in both the quantitative and qualitative findings of the process evaluation that the CASS of the WELB’s ‘Promoting reconciliation through a shared curriculum experience’ (PRTSCE) programme was highly regarded and enjoyed by both teachers and pupils. The data from the focus groups with participating children and the lesson observations concur with the teacher evaluations and semi-structured interviews in a number of important areas. From the thematic patterns which emerged from these various data collection methods, the following five broad conclusions can be made:

Firstly, that the programme was designed and structured in a way which made the delivery of very sensitive and, at times, very controversial content ‘as straightforward as it could be’ for teachers; and concomitantly, enjoyable, instructive and engaging for the primary and early post-primary
children who participated. Indeed, the observations reported a ‘positive ethos’ and that the children enjoyed the programme’s focus on the ‘celebration of difference’.

Secondly, in terms of support, it is clear that: the residential training was of the highest standard and provided the teachers with invaluable guidance on the programme and an opportunity to have input in terms of content and the learning strategies employed; the on-going support the teachers received from CASS of the WELB was ‘consistently excellent’; and that the training-aid resources greatly facilitated the delivery of the programme.

Thirdly, and in relation to the programme’s content and approaches, it is equally apparent that the active learning strategies were positively received by both the teachers and their pupils. The activities, resources and methods applied engaged the children and provided safe and enjoyable mechanisms for them to be introduced to (and to explore) difficult issues such as sectarianism and other forms of social discrimination. Similarly, it is clear that the teachers also benefited from the opportunity to use these active learning strategies, particularly in terms of becoming more confident in addressing contentious issues.

Fourthly, the contact element of the programme has, patently, been successful in engaging schools; the lessons which were ‘shared’ were predominantly reported as having gone very well in terms of pupil enjoyment, interaction and participation. Additionally, a majority of Curriculum + Contact teachers felt that the joint sessions were very positive exercises, particularly, in terms of learning from the other teacher’s experience. It is also important to note that although the quantitative data from the process evaluation indicates no significant difference in terms of pupils’ enjoyment and participation across the Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only lessons, the qualitative data shows higher levels in the shared classes. On the other hand, there were clearly logistical challenges, particularly in terms of aligning timetables; and it was reported that there was early apprehension on the part both teachers and pupils. There was some evidence of developmental processes impacting on pupils’ understanding of the issues learnt and their ability to incorporate the newly learnt knowledge into existing cognitive schemata relating to community relations in Northern Ireland.

There was also evidence, particularly from the focus groups, that children in the Curriculum + Contact group had a different, and often broader, learning experience than those in the Curriculum Only groups, but that children in the Curriculum Only groups were more willing to critically reflect on their own community. For example: (a) Curriculum + Contact group children were more likely to discuss their enjoyment of the programme and the relational aspect, while Curriculum Only children tended to focus on their own emotional response to some of the activities; (b) the children in the Curriculum + Contact groups saw fewer differences between their ingroup and the outgroup than children in the Curriculum Only group and the latter were more critical of their own ingroup and their behaviours; and (c) children in the Curriculum Only groups expressed more negative views relating to outside experiences and influences, including negative parental and familial influences and the witnessing sectarian incidents, than children in the Curriculum + Contact groups.

Fifthly, there were both benefits identified and frequently cited concerns in respect of addressing issues such as sectarianism with young children. There was a widely held view that it was important to equip children with the necessary skills to help them better understand such issues, particularly, as they prepare for transition to post-primary environments and beyond. However, it was equally apparent that many teachers felt that the programme placed too great an emphasis on sectarian divisions; that much of the content, particularly around violent conflict ‘disturbed’ some of the children; that many children, particularly those from more rural areas were ‘unaware’ of sectarianism and found the concept difficult to grasp; that the programme appeared to direct
children to ‘defend their own culture’ instead of ‘accepting the culture of others’; and in so doing, ‘encouraged sectarian identifications’.

Notwithstanding these concerns and the fact that the programme broached on many issues not normally addressed in primary and early post-primary environments, the programme was regarded as a valuable experience for both pupils and teachers. It needs to be noted though that some teachers referred to additional community relations programmes which may have impacted on the findings of this evaluation. There was also consensus that pupils, teachers and their schools wanted the programme to continue, particularly, if some of their cited concerns around ‘time pressures’, the accessibility of some of the content, and ‘sectarian identifications’ were addressed.
5. Tentative conclusions

In the following we will highlight a number of tentative main points arising from the cluster RCT and the process evaluation for conclusions. These points should be seen as a starting point for reflection and discussion on the basis of which they may be clarified and amended, reduced or extended.

1. Survey results and the process evaluation clearly show that the PRTSCE programme increased learning about people from different religious communities in Northern Ireland and intergroup relations.

2. Overall, the way the programme was designed and organized enabled teachers to deliver lessons on controversial issues relatively confidently and pupils to enjoy and engage with the learning. Teacher training, teaching resources, methods and activities were regarded as highly successful in terms of their usefulness for teachers and their reception by pupils.

3. The enhanced and more carefully designed use of existing resources through the curriculum had a positive effect on pupils compared to what schools normally do in the Curriculum Only groups. This is especially evident in terms of an apparently more critical view of pupils’ own ingroup, an acceptance of different cultures/traditions and less tendency to respond to instances of injustice in an aggressive manner.

4. Some further work seems to be required though in terms of attitudes towards specific outgroups and also in relation to encouraging more positive responses to instances of injustice.

5. The addition of contact seemed to diminish the effectiveness of the curriculum in relation to ingroup attitude outcomes and exploratory analysis indicated that more Curriculum + Contact lessons may actually increase religious ingroup bias. This could be due to different processes being promoted by Curriculum Only and Curriculum + Contact interventions. In particular, contact may heighten enjoyment of shared lessons but also awareness of ingroup belongingness as experienced by the child in such a context, as highlighted in the process evaluation. Such experiences may thereby increase ingroup bias and take precedence over critical reflection on pupils’ own religious community. However, findings may also reflect the problems schools have faced in terms of organizing and planning contact and thus the fact that such practical issues tend to reduce the space available for exploring the curriculum more fully (and especially relating to ingroup evaluations).

6. Contact, in itself, did not lead to negative effects of the curriculum and the findings of this study should not be used to question the importance of contact. Moreover, there is some evidence that the addition of contact to the curriculum did have the effect of encouraging more positive attitudes towards religious and alternative outgroups than when compared to the effects of the curriculum alone. However, the findings clearly indicate that the programme delivered through shared lessons does not necessarily enhance the effectiveness of the curriculum on its own and highlights the importance of preparing for contact and planning it very carefully.

7. The process evaluation indicated that contact was experienced very positively by teachers and pupils. While the teaching contents and methods were regarded as enjoyable, they were also clearly challenging and pupils appeared to struggle to cognitively integrate their understandings of relations between Catholics and Protestants in everyday life, their families, communities, the news and the media with their new learning through the
curricular lessons. As such, the programme appears to have successfully challenged pupils’ existing schemata relating to community relations in Northern Ireland and they still appeared to be in the process of incorporating this new learning in their existing worldviews. Follow-up research to investigate long-term effects of the PRTSCE may thus be crucial to determine its long-term impact as programme effects may alter as a result of the process of new knowledge integration into pupils’ worldviews.

8. There was no evidence of consistent patterns of significant differences between gender, religion or Free School Meal percentage in School relating to the impact of the programme. This means that there is currently no evidence to suggest that the programme would need to be differentiated for these groups in future.

This is one of the first studies to use a cluster randomized control trial design to compare the effects of a curriculum only intervention in comparison to one introducing contact at the same time. Results need to be interpreted carefully, as non-significant findings may be due to the trial’s sample size being relatively small and therefore only large effects being shown up as significant. As such, further effects may have occurred but may not have been large enough for them to be picked up in the analysis. Moreover, sample size had an effect on exploratory sub-group analyses so that the findings from these will need to be interpreted cautiously. Other caveats to the findings that may need to be borne in mind are teachers’ references to additional community relations programmes, which may have impacted on the findings, as well as external circumstances including a potentially differential impact of the flag protests. However, findings did clearly highlight important issues and raise a number of questions for educational practitioners, policy-makers and academics and researchers.

Sustainability of positive effects of peace education programmes has been highlighted as one of the major challenges for such initiatives (Salomon, 2011). In the context of such work in mid-childhood, where learning about such issues may present a cognitive challenge for children, sustainability may adopt an additional meaning. This evaluation raised questions relating to the long-term impact of the learning which appeared to challenge children’s cognitive structures and schemata. Aboud et al. (2012) suggest that while current theories of prejudice development incorporate socio-contextual (e.g. contact) and socio-cognitive elements, considerations relating to the latter are rarely incorporated in educational interventions. The authors warn that the lack of consideration of age-related processes could be “an oversight that might jeopardize success” (p. 2). This may have resulted in the lack of significant impact of the programme on attitudes in the Curriculum + Contact group in particular, who were challenged not only by curricular content but also contact and who had less time for critical reflection. However, it may also be the case that the programme effects may emerge in the medium or long-term due to time required for children especially in this age group to incorporate new and divergent learning into their existing worldviews.

In line with suggestions by McGlothin & Killen (2010) and others, the evaluation clearly demonstrated the usefulness of differentiating between ingroup and outgroup bias when designing evaluations and interventions. What is new in the findings of this study is the apparently differential effect of the curriculum on such intergroup bias depending on whether it is delivered in single identity or contact settings. Further research would be required to see if these effects hold up in different settings and programmes and work would need to be done to explore how they could be streamlined so that both pupils’ ingroup and outgroup attitudes can be addressed more effectively in settings with divergent pupil compositions.

Bekerman & Zembylas (2011) caution that peace education efforts based on intergroup theories may run the risk of essentialising group categories and reinforcing intergroup boundaries.
The findings of this study show evidence of a more critical ingroup understanding in the Curriculum Only group, whereby this impact on ingroup bias is not evident in the Curriculum + Contact group. Based on the findings of this study, the potential of reinforcing intergroup boundaries may be heightened by the introduction of contact and more attention may need to be paid to incorporating teaching that enables pupils to deconstruct notions of social categories and identities, whereby a critical understanding of ingroup differentiation and intersectionality of divergent social categories (such as gender, class and ethnicity) and how they have been impacted by the conflict in the past and present may provide useful tools for exploration.

With regard to shared education, Hughes (2013) found that experiences of shared education may impact differently on pupils in different school contexts and depend on a variety of factors (e.g. perceived convergence of schools’ norms, community characteristics, children’s own perspective on community relations and opportunities for maintaining cross-community friendships) and concluded that shared education at the very least reduced intergroup anxiety. While findings from this study support this conclusion, they also send a note of caution to assumptions that dealing with controversial issues through shared education necessarily adds to curricular programmes and suggest that it may in fact reduce their impact on pupil attitudes.
References


Appendix 1

A copy of the children’s online questionnaire (this example shows the questions that a Catholic boy would answer)

Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme_FINAL

Please read the following carefully and listen carefully to the instructions given.

We would like you to answer the following questions so that we can find out some things about what you think. Just put your identification code in the box below and click on next at the bottom of the page. The researcher will give you your identification code - there is a different one for every person. This is not a test so don’t worry about spelling - just have a go or you can put your hand up if you would like some help. If there are some questions you don’t want to answer you can just leave them out. It’s up to you.

Everything you tell us today is confidential. That means we will not show your answers to anyone, not even your teachers or your parents. The only people that will see your responses will be the research team at Queen’s University. The research team will then write a report summarizing what all pupils said and explain it for teachers and schools.

If you have any questions at this point, please raise your hand and ask the researcher.

* What is your identification code? (for example A32 or B56)

Next >>

2 % completed

© Copyright www.QuestBack.com. All Rights Reserved.
Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme FINAL

About you

Please answer the following questions by clicking on the boxes or using the spaces provided to type in:

Are you a boy or a girl?
- Boy
- Girl

What is your date of birth?

What is the name of your school?

In which country were you born?
- Northern Ireland
- England
- Wales
- Scotland
- Republic of Ireland
- Somewhere else (please say where)

© Copyright www.QuestBack.com. All Rights Reserved.
In Northern Ireland, many people say they were brought up in the Catholic community or the Protestant community. Others say they come from a different religious community background (for example, from the Muslim community). Some people say they are from no religious community background and that’s fine. Some may not know which religious community background they are from and that’s fine too. The answer you give about your religious community will make the questionnaire take you to a certain question, so don’t worry if your next page is different to the person next or near to you.

Which religious community are you from?

- Catholic
- Protestant (e.g. Baptist, Church of Ireland, Methodist, Presbyterian)
- Other, please type what it is
- Don’t know

How many of your family members are from a different religious community to you?

- None
- Some
- Most
- All
- Don’t know

How many of your friends are from a different religious community to you?

- None
- Some
- Most
- All
- Don’t know

7 % completed
**Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme_FINAL**

Please read the statements below carefully and click on one of the circles for each statement to say how much you agree or disagree with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have spent time finding out more about my religious community such as its history, traditions and customs.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I belong to clubs or teams mostly with people from the same religious community as me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my religious community means for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my religious community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of my religious community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly feel I belong to my own religious community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand pretty well what belonging to my religious community means to me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have often talked to other people about my religious community so that I can learn more about it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud of my religious community and what it stands for.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do things that are special to my religious community, such as sports, music or language.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel strongly attached to my religious community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my religious community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 % completed
Imagine you have met a child from the Protestant community. In the pictures above you are the blue stick child and the Protestant child is the green stick child. Please indicate how close you feel to the Protestant child.

- [ ] I feel that the Protestant child is not close to me at all
- [ ] I feel that the Protestant child is somewhat close to me
- [ ] I feel that the Protestant child is very close to me

IF YOU WANT TO, you can now write why you choose this answer in the box below OR if you don’t want to, click next.
Now imagine you have met a child from the Catholic community. In the pictures above you are the blue stick child and the Catholic child is the purple stick child. Please indicate how close you feel to the Catholic child.

- I feel that the Catholic child is not close to me at all
- I feel that the Catholic child is somewhat close to me
- I feel that the Catholic child is very close to me

IF YOU WANT TO, you can now write why you choose this answer in the box below OR if you don’t want to, click next.

13 % completed
Imagine you have met a child from the Muslim community (this is a different religious community and is not Catholic or Protestant). In the pictures below you are the blue stick child and the Muslim child is the red stick child. Please indicate how close you feel to the Muslim child.

- I feel that the Muslim child is not close to me at all
- I feel that the Muslim child is somewhat close to me
- I feel that the Muslim child is very close to me

IF YOU WANT TO, you can now write why you choose this answer in the box below OR if you don’t want to, click next.
### Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme_FINAL

Imagine that a new boy from the Protestant religious community has just started at your school. Please read the questions below and click on one box for each question to show what you would do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Probably no</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you go up to him and say hello?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you let him join you at lunch time?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you invite him to call round to your house after school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you share a secret with him?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<< Back  Next >>

29 % completed

© Copyright www.QuestBack.com. All Rights Reserved.
Imagine that a new boy, from the Catholic religious community has just started at your school. Please read the questions below and click on one box for each question to show what you would do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Probably no</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you go up to him and say hello?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you let him join you at lunch time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you invite him to call round to your house after school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you share a secret with him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33% completed
Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme

Explore the 'Northern Ireland - Ireland' programme.

Scroll down and have a good look at the pictures. Please click on those that you think best illustrate your idea of what reconciliation means. Remember you can only choose three pictures.

[Images of various flags and symbols related to different countries and regions, including T-shirt, poppy, maple leaf, Ireland, China, United Kingdom, and others.]

[Progress bar indicating completion status: 30% completed.]
Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme_FINAL

Why did you choose those three pictures?

Next >>

40 % completed
Another boy was asked the same question as you, and he chose the three images below to best describe himself.

Why do you think the boy chose these pictures?
### Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme_FINAL

**Do you think the boy who chose these pictures would be:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44% completed
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Another boy was asked the same question as you, and he chose the three images below to best describe himself.

Why do you think the boy chose these pictures?

<< Back  Next >>

47% completed
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the boy who chose these pictures would be:

49 % completed
Another boy was asked the same question as you, and he chose the three images below to best describe himself.

Why do you think the boy chose these pictures?
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### Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme FINAL

Do you think the boy who chose these pictures would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Imagine that you are standing outside the school gate at the end of the school day. You hear a boy saying something nasty to a younger child from your school, just because he is Catholic.

How would you feel about it?

- I wouldn't mind
- I would be annoyed
- I would be sad
- I would be embarrassed

What would you think about it?

- It's unfair
- It's just a joke
- It's fair enough

What would you do? Please click one circle on each line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>I wouldn't do this</th>
<th>I might do this</th>
<th>I'd definitely do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore it and walk away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a teacher or member of staff about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell the person that they should not be saying nasty things about the boy being Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a friend about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a member of my family about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would start a row with the boy, immediately or later on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would call the boy something nasty to do with his religious community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think you could stop the boy talking like this in future?

- Definitely
- Probably
- Probably not
- Definitely not
- Don't know

58 % completed
Imagine you are walking home from school with your friends. Your friends are making fun of a boy and calling him names because he is Protestant.

How would you feel about it?
- I wouldn’t mind
- I would be annoyed
- I would be sad
- I would be embarrassed

What would you think about it?
- It’s unfair
- It’s just a joke
- It’s fair enough

What would you do? Please click one circle on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I wouldn’t do this</th>
<th>I might do this</th>
<th>I’d definitely do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore it and walk away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a teacher or member of staff about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell my friends that they should not be making fun of the boy because he is Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a friend about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a member of my family about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would start a row with them, immediately or later on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would call them something nasty to do with their religious community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think you could stop your friends talking like this in future?

- Definitely
- Probably
- Probably not
- Definitely not
- Don’t know
Imagine you are walking home from school with your friends. They start to pick on a boy because he is wearing a uniform from a Protestant school. Your friends are taking his school bag and throwing it away.

**How would you feel about it?**

- I wouldn't mind
- I would be annoyed
- I would be sad
- I would be embarrassed

**What would you think about it?**

- It's unfair
- It's just a joke
- It's far enough

**What would you do? Please click one circle on each line.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you would do</th>
<th>I wouldn't do this</th>
<th>I might do this</th>
<th>I'd definitely do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore it and walk away</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a teacher or member of staff about it</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell my friends that they should not be picking on the boy because he is Protestant</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a friend about it</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a member of my family about it</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would start a row with my friends, immediately or later on</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would call them something nasty to do with their religious community</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
<td>⃝</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you think you could stop your friends acting like this in future?**

- Definitely
- Probably
- Probably not
- Definitely not
- Don't know
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Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme  FINAL

Imagine there is a new pupil in your school. He is black and comes from Zambia. During break time, you watch some pupils taking his school bag and throwing it away.

How would you feel about it?
- I wouldn't mind
- I would be annoyed
- I would be sad
- I would be embarrassed

What would you think about it?
- It's unfair
- It's just a joke
- It's fair enough

What would you do? Please click one circle on each line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I wouldn't do this</th>
<th>I might do this</th>
<th>I'd definitely do this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would ignore it and walk away</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a teacher or member of staff about it</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell the other pupils that they should not pick on the boy because of his skin colour</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a friend what the other pupils had done</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would tell a member of my family what the other pupils had done</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would start a row with the other pupils immediately or later on</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would call them something nasty to do with their skin colour</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think you could stop the other pupils acting like this in future?

- Definitely
- Probably
- Probably not
- Definitely not
- Don't know

98% completed
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of 'Promoting Reconciliation' programme - FINAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you think you could make other children think about people from different communities more positively?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitely</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't know</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probably not</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definitely not</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Back" /> <img src="#" alt="Send" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 % completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>© Copyright <a href="http://www.QuestBack.com">www.QuestBack.com</a>. All Rights Reserved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions. Your answers have been sent to the research team at Queen’s University :)  

What you have to say is very important to us!  

You can log off your computer now OR if you are finished early you can click on the link below to play some games:  

http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/bitesize/  
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Appendix 2

A copy of the children’s focus group schedule.

WELB: Peace and Reconciliation Programme

Focus group schedule – Young people

Pupils will be provided with pencils and A4 sheets of paper and during the first 4 minutes and be asked to write down or draw, in pairs, the first three things that come into their mind when they think about the sessions. They will be given a preamble about the audio recorder and this will be turned on at the beginning to capture their discussions of their drawings/word lists whilst in their pairs. After 3-4 minutes - even if the drawings/word list are not completed - young people will be asked the following questions, allowing for interaction between participants.

1) Can you explain your drawing? (How do you feel in the peace and reconciliation lessons?)

2) What did you/the people in your class like/not like about the lessons? Why?

3) Can you tell me a little bit about what you/others in your class learned in the lessons?

4) Do you/people in your class think differently about anything/anyone because of taking part in these lessons? In what way?

5) Do you think other young people in Northern Ireland should take part in this programme? Why/why not?

6) What do your friends/family think about these lessons?

7) If you were a Primary 6/Primary 7/Year 8/Year 9 teacher teaching these lessons is there anything you would like to change about them? Why/why not?

Contact schools (if not already mentioned in earlier questions):
- What did you think about the lessons with the other school? Enjoy/not enjoy?
- How do you/people in your class get on with the young people from the other school?
- Did you learn anything new from the young people from the other school? What?
- Do you think other schools in Northern Ireland should meet up to do activities like this? Why/why not?

8) Have you ever taken part in anything like this before?

9) Is there anything else you would like to add about the programme? Or anything else you would like to say that I may have missed in my questions?

Thanks very much for your time.
Appendix 3

A copy of the additional questions on the post-test children’s questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Promoting Reconciliation programme_POST_INT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132) This year, how much did you learn in lessons about people from different religious communities in Northern Ireland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Nothing at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ A little bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133) What did you think about these lessons?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134) How important do you think these lessons about different religious communities are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ A little important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135) Imagine you were a teacher, how would you teach about different religious communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme
Appendix 4

A copy of the teacher’s interview schedule.

WELB: Peace and Reconciliation Programme
Interview schedule – Teachers

Preamble
The WELB programme has been developed and rolled out over the last year. As part of this process, an evaluation of the effects of the programme is being completed. This interview will focus on issues related to the effectiveness of the programme. Before we start, let me just say that I am not assessing in any way the work of individual teacher or school, and that no individual teacher or school will be named in the final report. That said, may I record this interview? The interview will last for about 25–30 minutes.

1) What do/did you think about the programme? How did you feel at the start? How do you feel now?

2) What aspects of the WELB programme do you feel are going well/went well? Why?

3) Are there any aspects of the WELB programme that you feel are not going so well/did not go so well? Why?

4) If you were asked to assist in rewriting the curriculum for the WELB programme is there anything you feel should be changed?

5) How useful have you found the various training events and meetings for teachers and how have they impacted on your teaching of the programme?

6) How have you found the support from the WELB? How could they support you in the future?

7) Do you think the children in your class/school enjoyed the programme? Why?

8) Do you think this programme has/will benefit the children in your class/school? How?

9) Do you notice any differences (e.g. perceptions/attitudes) within your school as a result of children being involved in WELB programme? (If so, what are they?)

10) Have there been any feedback/comments from parents? What have these been in relation to? How were they handled by you/your school?

11) Do you think there have been any differences in how the programme is implemented here compared to other schools?

12) Are you aware of the children in your class/school being involved in any other similar peace and reconciliation/contact programmes/activities? (If so, what are they?)

13) In your opinion, is there anything that would make it easier for you to do teach this programme in your school? (e.g. training support, etc.)

14) Is there anything else you would like to add about the programme? Or anything else you would like to say that I may have missed in my questions?

Thanks very much for your time.

Contact schools (if not already mentioned in earlier questions):
- What have been the benefits/challenges of the contact element of the programme? (for children, teachers, your school, relationships with other schools/teachers)
- Do you think the children in your class/school enjoyed this element of the programme?
- How do you think the children interacted with children from other schools? (benefits/challenges)
Appendix 5

A copy of the lesson observation schedule.

**WELB OBSERVATION CHECKLIST**

| Date: ______________________ | Time: ____________________ |
| School(s): ___________________ | Class(es): _________________ |
| Contact lesson?: Yes/No | If yes, in which school?: ________________ |
| Learning Intentions: _________________________________________________________ |
| | __________________________________________________________ |
| | __________________________________________________________ |
| | __________________________________________________________ |

### Timing of lesson

| Time (e.g. 10.00am – 10.15) | Content (e.g. exploration of L.I.s) |
| Total length of session:_____mins |

### Planning

| Content of sessions  
(To include pre-visit prep in case of shared lesson) |
| Resources |
| Layout of room  
(e.g. seating, wall displays, space for other activities) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of skills (e.g. explaining, questioning, modelling, demonstrating etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of strategies (e.g. whole class, group, paired work, collaborative learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Questioning (e.g. probing, asking for opinion, recall, compare, predictive, summarise, describe/retell, evaluative) | Appropriate questions  
Elaborated beyond curriculum material  
Did not change the subject  
Key concepts communicated |
| Use of resources (e.g. to motivate and support)                                       |                                                                 |
| Positive ethos (e.g. to capture and maintain attention and involvement, children emotionally positive) |                                                                 |
| Differentiation                                                                      |                                                                 |
| Manage time and space effectively                                                    |                                                                 |

**Interaction between young people**

| During non-task time  
Attendance  
seating arrangement  
general atmosphere  
attitude to engagement  
frequency of responses |                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| During task time  
Breakdown of groups/pairs  
general atmosphere  
attitude to engagement  
frequency of responses  
level of involvement in task  
general content of discussion |                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction between teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching (shared session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo teaching (shared session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo teaching (non shared session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During non-task time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of ‘teaching’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General attitude to taking part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement offered to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During task time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of support to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General content of discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of informal assessment methods to meet needs (e.g. observation, stop to clarify concepts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the learning intentions met?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall summary of the session/additional points of interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 6

A copy of the initial teacher questionnaire

Teacher Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions relating to your professional background and experience

1. Age: ____ (years)

2. Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐

3. Please write down the name of your school: _____________________________

4. Which year groups are you teaching?
   Primary Year ____________
   Post-primary Year ____________
   If you teach in a post-primary school, what subjects are you teaching?
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

5. Do you have any previous experience in teaching about community relations?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please specify:
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

6. Did you attend any training programmes in the past relating to community relations?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please specify:
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

7. How confident do you feel teaching the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely confident</th>
<th>Quite confident</th>
<th>Not confident at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Why do you attend this training session?
I volunteered for it □ I was appointed by my school □ Other □

Please explain your answer
__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

9. What are your personal expectations for the training?

Hopes: ____________________________________________ 
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Concerns: ______________________________________ 
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

10. How do you see the training fitting into your teaching?

Central to my teaching □ Peripheral to my teaching □

Please explain your answer
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

11. What are your expectations with regard to your school’s participation in the programme?

Hopes: ______________________________________ 
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Concerns: _____________________________________ 
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

12. Please write down anything else you might like to add:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
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*Appendix 7*

*A copy of the teacher’s lesson evaluations.*

---

**Lesson Title:**

---

**Date:**

**School:**

**Class:**

**Teacher’s name:**

If paired with a partner school: Was this a shared session (please tick):

Yes [ ] No [ ]

**Learning Intentions for the Lesson:**

*Prior to the lesson,* please list up to three learning intentions for the lesson, and *as soon as possible afterwards* indicate in the relevant tick box whether you believe each learning intention was achieved or not achieved.

1. ________________________________________________________________
   Achieved [ ] Not achieved [ ]

2. ________________________________________________________________
   Achieved [ ] Not achieved [ ]

3. ________________________________________________________________
   Achieved [ ] Not achieved [ ]

**Activities Specified for Lesson**

*Prior to the lesson,* please list up to three activities for the lesson, and *as soon as possible after the lesson* indicate in the relevant tick boxes whether you believe each activity was successfully completed or not.

1. ________________________________________________________________
   Completed [ ] Not completed [ ]

2. ________________________________________________________________
   Completed [ ] Not completed [ ]

3. ________________________________________________________________
   Completed [ ] Not completed [ ]

**Lesson Evaluation Questions**
How confident did you feel delivering this lesson?
Extremely confident [ ]  Quite confident [ ]  Not confident at all [ ]

Please explain your response, e.g. were there any aspects that you felt particularly confident or worried about
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

How did the lesson go overall? (please tick one)
Very well [ ]  Reasonably well [ ]  Not well at all [ ]

Please explain your response
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

How much did pupils seem to enjoy the lesson?
Very much [ ]  A bit [ ]  Not at all [ ]

Please explain your response
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Were there any barriers to teaching this lesson?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, please explain
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Were there any additional, unforeseen outcomes of the lesson (positive or negative)?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]
If yes, please explain

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

How useful did you find the activities for the lesson?

Very useful □   Quite useful □   Not useful at all □

Please explain your response, e.g. any activities that were particularly useful or ineffective and why
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

How much did pupils participate in the activities?

A lot of participation □   Some participation □   No participation at all □

Please explain your response
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Were the resources for the lesson useful?

Very useful □   Quite useful □   Not useful at all □

Please explain your response, e.g. any resources that were particularly useful or ineffective and why
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
How controversial did you find the lesson?

Very controversial ☐  Quite controversial ☐  Not controversial at all ☐

*Please explain your response, e.g. any aspects of the lesson that gave rise to controversial debates and how these were dealt with*

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

If it was a shared lesson, how much did pupils from both schools interact with each other?

A lot of interaction ☐  Some interaction ☐  No interaction at all ☐

*Please explain your response, e.g. how comfortable pupils seemed when interacting with each other*

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Is there anything else you would like to add?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 8

A copy of the first page of the teacher’s time (the second page is the same to ensure there was enough space for all lessons taught).

WELB Peace and Reconciliation Programme – TIME SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson number</th>
<th>Shared lesson?</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, venue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td>_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A copy of the additional teacher questionnaire.

Teacher response sheet – recent developments in Northern Ireland

Date: _____________________
School: _____________________
Class: _____________________
Teacher's name: _____________________

For the purposes of this response sheet, we are considering the two predominant religious communities who reside in Northern Ireland: Catholic and Protestant.

1) Please rate the overall impact of the recent developments in Northern Ireland on the perceptions and attitudes towards people of the other religious community (for the general students body in your school):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very positive impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly positive impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact (neither positive nor negative) on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly negative impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very negative impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish, please comment on your response below:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
2) Please rate the overall impact of the recent developments in Northern Ireland on the perceptions and attitudes towards people of the other religious community (for students in your class who have/will take part in the WELB programme):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Please tick one box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very positive impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly positive impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact (neither positive nor negative) on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly negative impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very negative impact on perceptions and attitudes towards people from the other religious community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish, please comment on your response below:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
3) Have you changed/will you change how you have/will teach the WELB programme, as a result of the recent developments in Northern Ireland:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If yes, will you:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add more content</th>
<th>Remove content</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you wish, please comment on your responses below:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
## Appendix 10

**Exploratory subgroup analysis**

1) **GENDER:** Effect Sizes for Boys and Girls of the Two Interventions (with Significance of Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>+.239</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>+.020</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>+.226</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>+.069</td>
<td>+.129</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>+.048</td>
<td>+.248</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>+.064</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>+.070</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.495</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>+.066</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>+.033</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>+.270</td>
<td>+.030</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>+.388</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>+.340</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>+.239</td>
<td>+.094</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosocl2</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>+.084</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>+.123</td>
<td>+.063</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficy2</td>
<td>+.030</td>
<td>+.217</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>+.082</td>
<td>+.389</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>+.054</td>
<td>+.519</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>+.143</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>+.411</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant findings (p<.05) in **Bold**. Nearing significant findings (p<.10) in *Italics.*

### Adjusted Post-Test Means, (Standard Deviations) and Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2.63 (.53) n=88</td>
<td>2.79 (.40) n=76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2.96 (.38) n=126</td>
<td>2.89 (.36) n=76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3.21 (.84) n=92</td>
<td>3.26 (.99) n=57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3.13 (.97) n=131</td>
<td>3.63 (.98) n=79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) RELIGION: Effect Sizes for Protestants and Catholics of the Two Interventions (With Significance of Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>+.168</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>+.110</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>-.600</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>+.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>+.193</td>
<td>+.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosocl2</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>+.057</td>
<td>+.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficcy2</td>
<td>+.227</td>
<td>+.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>+.302</td>
<td>+.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>+.021</td>
<td>+.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant findings (p<.05) in **Bold.** Nearing significant findings (p<.10) in *Italics.*

### Adjusted Post-Test Means, (Standard Deviations) and Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>3.20 (.45) n=88</td>
<td>3.07 (.344) n=66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>3.02 (.29) n=126</td>
<td>3.05 (.238) n=67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>3.05 (.94) n=91</td>
<td>3.10 (.93) n=67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>3.25 (.88) n=126</td>
<td>3.82 (.97) n=67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) PRIMARY/POST-PRIMARY: Effect Sizes for Primary and Post-Primary Pupils of the Two Interventions (With Significance of Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Post-Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>+.130</td>
<td>+.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>+.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>-.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>+.179</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>-.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>-.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>+.182</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosocl2</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>+.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficy2</td>
<td>+.164</td>
<td>+.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>+.183</td>
<td>+.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>+.173</td>
<td>-.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant findings (p<.05) in Bold. Nearing significant findings (p<.10) in Italics.

Adjusted Post-Test Means, (Standard Deviations) and Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficy2</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.01 (.67) n=87</td>
<td>2.19 (.68) n=50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Primary</td>
<td>2.32 (.56) n=114</td>
<td>2.17 (.63) n=67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Free School Meals (FSM): Effect Sizes for Pupils Attending Schools with Low and High Proportions of FSM of the Two Interventions* (With Significance of Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low FSM</td>
<td>High FSM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low FSM</td>
<td>High FSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>+.051</td>
<td>+.278</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>+.102</td>
<td>+.265</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>+.161</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>+.193</td>
<td>+.010</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>+.104</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>+.274</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>+.156</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>+.147</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>+.542</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>+.095</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>+.014</td>
<td>+.237</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>-.454</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>+.065</td>
<td>+.137</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>+.137</td>
<td>+.108</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>+.224</td>
<td>+.137</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosoc12</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>-.557</td>
<td>+.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.426</td>
<td>+.253</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>+.192</td>
<td>+.031</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>+.025</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>effic2</td>
<td>+.226</td>
<td>+.042</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>+.051</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>+.258</td>
<td>+.237</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>+.350</td>
<td>+.229</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>+.017</td>
<td>+.074</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>+.310</td>
<td>+.069</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant findings (p<.05) in **Bold**. Nearing significant findings (p<.10) in *Italics*.

* ‘Low FSM’ defined as one standard deviation below the mean FSM score. ‘High FSM’ defined as one standard deviation above the mean FSM score.

Adjusted Post-Test Means, (Standard Deviations) and Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>FSM Control</th>
<th>Curriculum Only</th>
<th>Curriculum + Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>Low (sd=.67) (n=467)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>Low (sd=.65) (n=387)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>Low (sd=.74) (n=472)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>Low (sd=.50) (n=452)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) **EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH NUMBER OF LESSONS DELIVERED ON CURRICULUM ONLY GROUP**

Average Increase or Decrease in Outcome Score for Every Additional Lesson Taught (Measured in Standard Deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosocl2</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficy2</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) **EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH NUMBER OF LESSONS DELIVERED ON CURRICULUM PLUS CONTACT GROUP**

Average Increase or Decrease in Outcome Score for Every Additional Lesson Taught (Measured in Standard Deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity exploration</td>
<td>explore2</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity affirmation</td>
<td>belong2</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Ingroup)</td>
<td>inc_in2</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>inc_out2</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of other in self (Outgroup: Muslim)</td>
<td>inc_mus2</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>dis_in2</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>dis_out2</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Ingroup)</td>
<td>tol_in2</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Catholic/Protestant)</td>
<td>tol_out2</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (Outgroup: Chinese)</td>
<td>tol_chi2</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Prosocial</td>
<td>prosocl2</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Aggressive</td>
<td>aggrsve2</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing up against injustice: Ignore</td>
<td>ignore2</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>efficy2</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Maintenance</td>
<td>ac_main2</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation: Contact/Participation</td>
<td>ac_cont2</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme
### Appendix 11

A table showing an overview of the number of shared lessons, the number of Learning Intentions achieved, and the number of Specified Activities for each lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Lesson</th>
<th>Lesson title</th>
<th>No. of teacher evaluations received/No. of shared sessions in responses</th>
<th>Learning intentions /No. of learning intentions reported as achieved</th>
<th>Learning Activities Specified /No. of activities reported as completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 1</td>
<td>Introductions matter - Getting to know you</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received/0 Shared</td>
<td>15/15 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Learn about the programme which they are going to be following 2. Develop skills in identifying and asking appropriate questions to seek information, views and feelings 3. Identify the behaviours that will enable groups to work effectively</td>
<td>8/10 Activities completed: 1. Getting to know you (‘people bingo’) 2. Setting of ground rules together (carousel activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 2</td>
<td>It matters to me. It matters to you</td>
<td>6 Evaluations received/1 Shared</td>
<td>12/12 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Explore and acknowledge personal similarities and differences 2. Understand that difference is natural, important and to be valued</td>
<td>12/12 Activities completed: 1. I’m special – draw/mind map or ‘write, pair, share’ things that really matter to them 2. PMI Chart (‘Pluses, ‘Minuses’ and interesting Points) around having differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 3</td>
<td>It mattered to him</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received/0 Shared</td>
<td>15/15 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Share experiences and point of view 2. Identify and ask appropriate questions 3. Show sensitivity to and respect for the culture of others</td>
<td>10/10 Activities completed: 1. Circle Time: Sentence Completion - “In the circle today I’ve learnt...” 2. Story and Discussion Activity - Declan’s story/Andy’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 4</td>
<td>Opinions matter</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received</td>
<td>15/15 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Learn that people have different</td>
<td>14/15 Activities completed: 1. Spectrum Debate – Yes, No, Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 5</td>
<td>Conflict matters. Falling out and falling in again</td>
<td>4 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>12/12 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Learn that conflict is a normal part of life because we are all different 2. Understand that it is how we deal with it that matters 3. Begin to understand the meaning of the word ‘Reconciliation’</td>
<td>11/12 Activities completed: 1. Conflict Cards - discuss in pairs – how people feel 2. Class Discussion 3. Most Difficult Least Difficult Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 6</td>
<td>My country matters</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>10/10 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Differentiate between facts and opinions 2. Evaluate their experience of living in this country</td>
<td>5/5 Activities completed: 1. Carousel Activity – ‘De Bono’s Hats’ carousel activity - Recording things about their country on five different sheets of paper to represent the five hats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 7</td>
<td>Perceptions matter</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>5/5 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Learn that we will see many things differently because of how we interpret information</td>
<td>15/15 Activities completed: 1. Finished files and Optical Illusions 2. Presentation of cultural pictures and discussion 3. Drawing Activity Create/draw perceptions of either St. Patrick’s Day parade/twelfth of July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 8</td>
<td>Celebrations matter</td>
<td>4 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>8/8 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Develop an appreciation of some personal, family, local and global celebrations 2. Select, classify and compare information</td>
<td>11/12 Activities completed: 1. Classification Activity - pictures related to celebrations 2. Double Bubble - template to compare and contrast two pictures 3. Ranking Activity - of celebrations from most to least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 Lesson 9</td>
<td>My name matters</td>
<td>5 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>14/15 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Explore the meanings of different Christian/first names 2. Consider why these names were</td>
<td>15/15 the following Activities were completed: 1. Circle Time – Name and Action 2. Circle Time – ‘Names Matter’ 3. Circle Time – Speaking Time (Key Questions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 6 Lesson 10
- **Decision matter**
- **Learning Intentions achieved:**
  1. Learn that they will often have to make important decisions
  2. Learn that the decisions they make will often have positive or negative consequences
- **Activities completed:**
  1. Dilemma – Forum Theatre - you find a 10 pound note in the street
  2. Story and Group Discussions. What will Harry/Claire do next?
  3. Improvisations – What happens next?
- **Evaluations received:** 0
- **Shared:** 0
- **Learning Intentions achieved:** 10/10
- **Activities completed:** 14/15

### Year 6 Lesson 11
- **Thoughts and feeling matter**
- **Learning Intentions achieved:**
  1. Learn it is important to consider the feelings of others
- **Activities completed:**
  1. What am I thinking now?
  2. Still Images and thought tracking – children work in groups and take on the role of one character from Harry’s/Clare’s dilemma.
  3. Drawing things together – written piece
- **Evaluations received:** 5
- **Shared:** 0
- **Learning Intentions achieved:** 5/5
- **Activities completed:** 12/15

### Year 6 Lesson 12
- **Reflection matters**
- **Learning Intentions achieved:**
  1. Reflect on what they have learned from the twelve week programme
- **Activities completed:**
  1. Post-it Activity - each child records something
  2. Children to decide on how they are going to share their learning either individually, in pairs or as a group
- **Evaluations received:** 4
- **Shared:** 0
- **Learning Intentions achieved:** 4/4
- **Activities completed:** 8/8

### Year 7 – ‘What Matters’

#### Year 7 Lesson 1
- **Getting to Know You Matters**
- **Learning Intentions achieved:**
  1. Know about the programme they are going to be following
  2. Develop skills in identifying and asking appropriate questions to seek information, views and feelings
  3. Identify the behaviours that will enable groups to work effectively
- **Activities completed:**
  1. Getting to know you – People Bingo
  2. Carousel Activity - Setting of ground rules together
  3. Creating a Class Contract
- **Evaluations received:** 10
- **Shared:** 3
- **Learning Intentions achieved:** 30/30
- **Activities completed:** 30/30

#### Year 7 Lesson 2
- **What Matters to Me**
- **Learning Intentions achieved:**
  1. Explore and acknowledge personal similarities and differences
- **Activities completed:**
  1. Display personal items and explain why they are important to them
- **Evaluations received:** 10
- **Shared:** 3
- **Learning Intentions achieved:** 20/20
- **Activities completed:** 29/30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 7 Lesson 3</th>
<th>My name matters</th>
<th>10 Evaluations received</th>
<th>20/20 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Know the history of their own surname 2. Understand that surnames have changed over time.</th>
<th>25/30 Activities completed: 1. Sorting surnames 2. What does my surname mean? 3. Re-sorting surnames - Revisit categorised names from earlier in lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 Lesson 4</td>
<td>The (hi)story of the country I live in matters</td>
<td>10 Evaluations received</td>
<td>30/30 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Know that Ireland is a country of immigration and emigration 2. Order key events in the history of Ireland chronologically.</td>
<td>27/30 Activities completed: 1. Summarise an historical event 2. Create a timeline of events 3. Write 2 things about immigration and emigration with reference to the history of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 Lesson 5</td>
<td>Culture Matters</td>
<td>9 Evaluations received</td>
<td>27/27 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Understand the word ‘stereotype’ 2. Know that a person is more than their likes/dislikes 3. Recognise that people have commonalities and differences</td>
<td>22/27 Activities completed: 1. Sort the symbols cards into categories 2. Exploring and defining ‘stereotyping’ 3. Creating an identity circle - represent the things that are important to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 Lesson 6</td>
<td>Others’ points of view matter</td>
<td>9 Evaluations received</td>
<td>18/18 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Understand that there are different points of view 2. Use a strategy to consider other viewpoints</td>
<td>26/27 Activities completed: 1. Personal reading of chapter 1 or chapter 2 of the novel ‘The Twelfth Day of July’ 2. Apply DeBono’s Thinking Hat as a thinking strategy 3. Comparison of chapters 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Year 7 Lessons 9&10 | Making choices matters | 8 Evaluations received | 22/24 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Know actions have consequences  
2. Create a Freeze Frame  
3. Study the variety of attitudes in a situation | 22/24 Activities completed:  
1. Summarise ‘The Twelfth Day of July’ story Freeze Frame - children questioned about the character they are portraying  
2. ‘Pro and Con’ Thinking Frame – present to the rest of class |
| Year 7 Lesson 11 | Does celebrating culture matter? | 7 Evaluations received | 14/14 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Know what features are particular to their culture  
2. Know that it is important to celebrate their culture | 11/14 Activities completed:  
1. Carousel - things which represent their community  
2. Agree on 3 key features of own culture that generate a sense of pride |
| Year 7 Lesson 12 | Celebrating my culture matters | 5 Evaluations received | 10/10 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Demonstrate features particular to their culture  
2. Celebrate their culture | 10/15 Activities completed:  
1. Celebrating my culture - -- prepared in groups to tell the other community what is good about their  
2. Recap chapter 17 (Kevin and Sadie)  
3. Recap previous lesson |
| Year 8 | Human Rights (linked to UNCRC articles 2, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 29 and 30) | 2 Evaluations received | 3/4 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Understand the difference between needs and wants  
2. Know about the UNCRC and some of the individual articles | 5/6 Activities completed:  
1. Divide cards into wants and needs working in groups — children sort cards and explain choices  
2. Give each pupil a UNCRC article and ask them to explain  
3. Focus group on 1 article - discuss in groups and feedback |
| Year 8 Lesson 2 | Mapping our community (linked to UNCRC articles 8, 30) | 3 Evaluations received | 8/9 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Think about town or community they live in  
2. Think about reasons for separation  
3. Become aware of visible/invisible barriers | 8/9 Activities completed:  
1. Ballywest Picture – What does it represent?  
2. What is in the collage?  
3. Questions – answer with dots/are they spread out/clustered together? |
| Year 8 Lesson 3 | Symbols that divide us | 2 Evaluations received | 5/6 Learning Intentions achieved:  
1. Reflect on the meaning for them of | 5/6 Activities completed: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8 Lesson 4</th>
<th>Flags and emblems (linked to UNCRC articles 7, 30)</th>
<th>3 Evaluations received</th>
<th>5/6 Learning Intentions achieved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
<td>1. Know how other people express their own identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Understand some of the myths and facts about flags and emblems in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Group work – brainstorming and exploring their school identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Drawing and illustrating the positive identity of other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Comparing identity of different groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lesson 5</td>
<td>Flags and emblems (linked to UNCRC articles 7, 30)</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>4/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
<td>1. Know how other people express their own identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Understand some of the myths and facts about flags and emblems in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6 Activities completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Design their own flag which best represents their identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Notes on what they know about Union Jack/Tricolour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Feedback - decide how best to teach the others in their original group about the flag/emblem they are ‘expert’ in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lesson 6</td>
<td>Breaking down physical barriers (linked to UNCRC articles 2, 13)</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>2/3 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
<td>1. Know that there are visible walls that separate the two main traditions in parts of N. Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develop their questioning skills to unpack the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Be able to structure a creative piece of work on the symbolism of the peace wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lesson 7</td>
<td>Stereotypes (linked to UNCRC article 2)</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>2/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Shared</td>
<td>1. Learn to understand what perceptions and stereotypes are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4 Activities completed:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                |                                                |                      | 1. Perception pictures – PowerPoint showing optical illusions and drawing which depend on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8 Lesson 8</th>
<th>Breaking down the wall (linked to UNCRC articles 7, 15)</th>
<th>1 Evaluations received 0 Shared</th>
<th>3/3 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Learn about some symbols that can represent national identity 2. Become aware of some of the factors that can influence individual and group identity 3. Begin to develop an understanding of what sectarianism is</th>
<th>2/2 Activities completed: 1. Breaking down the wall sketch - about a sectarian wall between two girls and how it can be broken down 2. Wall worksheet - ‘Things that can divide us’ - ‘Things that we have in common’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lesson 9</td>
<td>‘What could you do if...?’ (linked to UNCRC articles 2, 12)</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received 1 Shared</td>
<td>3/3 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Begin to reflect on the consequences of responses to negative or discriminatory behaviour by others 2. Understand what is involved in taking action to stand up for others 3. Reflect on the appropriate responses in different circumstances</td>
<td>2/2 Activities completed: 1. Conflict response sheet – outline examples from their own lives 2. Scenarios and choice cards - discuss how characters would have felt and probable effects on the situation, probable effects on the characters making the choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lesson 10</td>
<td>Taking down the barriers (linked to UNCRC articles)</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>3/3 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Become aware of some of the actions taken to break down barriers within communities 2. Reflect on what can be done to break down remaining barriers 3. Explore how local barriers can be broken down by various people</td>
<td>2/2 Activities completed: 1. Video of peace bridge and Alexandra Park Wall and answer questions in notebooks 2. Recap diversity and barrier maps from lesson 2 - list people who can make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 Lessons 11 &amp; 12</td>
<td>Taking action (linked to UNCRC articles 12, 13)</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received 0 Shared</td>
<td>4/6 Learning Intentions achieved: 1. Reflect on and record their learning from the previous lessons 2. Express their views about sectarianism and reconciliation through a range of media</td>
<td>3/4 Activities completed: 1. Reflection activity - think about how they could challenge and campaign against sectarianism, and for reconciliation 2. Plan and research selection activity and present this to the rest of the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Review of year 8</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>4/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
<td>1. Review their learning from year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Be able to explain various concepts and their meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Them and us</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>4/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
<td>1. Become aware of the assumptions and stereotyping that we and others make on a daily basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discuss what influences the perceptions that we hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>Labelling others</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>4/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
<td>1. Become aware of some of their own prejudice and feelings that they hold about other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Be provided with the opportunity to challenge their immediate perception of a specific image held about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>Labelling other</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>4/4 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cont...</td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
<td>1. Become aware of some of their own prejudice and feelings that they hold about other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have the opportunity to challenge their immediate perception of a specific image held about others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 5</td>
<td>On the margins</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>2/2 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
<td>1. Develop empathy for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Challenge stereotypes of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 6</td>
<td>What’s the news?</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 7</td>
<td>What’s the news? Cont...</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 8</td>
<td>Developing empathy</td>
<td>2 Evaluations received</td>
<td>1 Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 9</td>
<td>Developing empathy</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Lesson 10</td>
<td>Other people’s shoes</td>
<td>1 Evaluations received</td>
<td>0 Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>0 Evaluations received</td>
<td>0/0 Learning Intentions achieved:</td>
<td>0/0 Activities completed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lesson 11 & 12 | 0 Shared | 1. Identify an issue, organise and plan to take some action around the chosen issue  
2. Present their findings and action project  
3. Review their learning from the programme they have been following | 1. Brainstorm all the issues they have working on for the 10 weeks  
2. ‘Get Global, Action card-game’ - think about what actions they might take as a class  
3. Groups present their work, findings, sketches etc to the rest of the class |

---
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Tables showing an overview of the quantitative responses from the teacher lessons evaluations

Table 1: Lessons per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
<th>Total Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Was the Lesson Shared? (Number of lessons shared / total number of lessons completed)

|       | Lesson 1 | Lesson 2 | Lesson 3 | Lesson 4 | Lesson 5 | Lesson 6 | Lesson 7 | Lesson 8 | Lesson 9 | Lesson 10 | Lesson 11 | Lesson 12 | Curriculum only | Curriculum and Contact |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Yr6   | 0/5      | 1/6      | 0/5      | 0/5      | 0/4      | 0/5      | 0/5      | 0/4      | 0/5      | 0/5       | 0/5       | 0/4       | 0/57            | 1/1                   |               |
| Yr7   | 3/10     | 3/10     | 3/10     | 3/10     | 2/9      | 2/9      | 1/9      | 1/8      | 1/7      | 1/5       | 0/67      | 20/20     |                 |                        |               |
| Yr8   | 0/2      | 1/3      | 0/2      | 0/3      | 1/2      | 0/1      | 2/2      | 0/1      | 1/1      | 0/1       | 0/2       | 0/15      | 5/5            |                        |               |
| Yr9   | 1/2      | 1/2      | 1/2      | 0/1      | 0/1      | 0/1      | 1/2      | 0/1      | 0/1      | 0/1       | X         | 0/10      | 5/5            |                        |               |
Table 3: Were the Learning Intentions for the Lesson achieved? (Number of LIs achieved / total number of LIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>123/124</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>30/30</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>20/20</td>
<td>30/30</td>
<td>27/27</td>
<td>18/18</td>
<td>27/27</td>
<td>22/24</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>170/170</td>
<td>48/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Were the Activities Specified for Lesson completed? (Number of specified activities completed / total number of specified activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>133/142</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>30/30</td>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>25/30</td>
<td>27/30</td>
<td>22/27</td>
<td>26/27</td>
<td>26/27</td>
<td>22/24</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>185/194</td>
<td>43/60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>20/25</td>
<td>24/27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Evaluation Questions

Table 5 How confident did you feel delivering this lesson?  Extremely confident / Quite confident / Not confident at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr6 E/Q/N</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 E/Q/N</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td>3/3/0</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td>2/2/1</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>28/28/1</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 E/Q/N</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>7/3/0</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>3/7/0</td>
<td>5/4/0</td>
<td>5/3/1</td>
<td>5/4/0</td>
<td>7/1/0</td>
<td>7/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>45/21/1</td>
<td>11/9/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 E/Q/N</td>
<td>0/2/0</td>
<td>0/3/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/1</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>6/9/0</td>
<td>0/4/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 E/Q/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>0/2/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table6: How did the lesson go overall?  Very well / Reasonably well / Not well at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr6 V/R/N</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 V/R/N</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>43/14/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 V/R/N</td>
<td>8/1/1</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>7/1/0</td>
<td>5/2/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>54/13/0</td>
<td>16/3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 V/R/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>11/4/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 V/R/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>0/2/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4/6/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: How much did pupils seem to enjoy the lesson? Very much / A bit / Not at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>5/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/0/1</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>49/7/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>7/3/0</td>
<td>9/0/0</td>
<td>8/1/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>8/0/0</td>
<td>7/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>62/5/0</td>
<td>18/2/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>2/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>14/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Were there any barriers to teaching this lesson? Yes / No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>13/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>23/44</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Were there any additional, unforeseen outcomes of the lesson (positive or negative)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 Y/N</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>16/41</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 Y/N</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>18/49</td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 Y/N</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 Y/N</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: How useful did you find the activities for the lesson? Very useful / Quite useful / Not useful at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 V/Q/N</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>6/0/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>47/10/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 V/Q/N</td>
<td>5/5/0</td>
<td>8/2/0</td>
<td>7/3/0</td>
<td>8/2/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>9/0/0</td>
<td>7/1/0</td>
<td>6/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>59/8/0</td>
<td>10/10/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 V/Q/N</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>12/3/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 V/Q/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: How much did pupils participate in the activities? A lot of participation / Some participation / No participation at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 A/S/N</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>5/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>51/6/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 A/S/N</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>8/2/0</td>
<td>8/1/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>9/0/0</td>
<td>8/0/0</td>
<td>7/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>63/4/0</td>
<td>18/2/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 A/S/N</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>11/4/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 A/S/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/3/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Were the resources for the lesson useful? Very useful / Quite useful / Not useful at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6 V/Q/N</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>6/0/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>3/1/0</td>
<td>2/3/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
<td>47/10/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7 V/Q/N</td>
<td>7/3/0</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>9/1/0</td>
<td>8/2/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>7/2/0</td>
<td>9/0/0</td>
<td>8/0/0</td>
<td>7/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>62/5/0</td>
<td>15/5/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8 V/Q/N</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>13/2/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9 V/Q/N</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/4/0</td>
<td>3/2/0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: How controversial did you find the lesson? Very controversial / Quite controversial / Not controversial at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Curriculum only</th>
<th>Curriculum and Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>V/Q/N</td>
<td>0/0/5</td>
<td>0/0/6</td>
<td>0/2/3</td>
<td>0/2/3</td>
<td>0/1/3</td>
<td>0/0/5</td>
<td>1/1/3</td>
<td>0/0/4</td>
<td>0/0/5</td>
<td>1/2/2</td>
<td>2/1/2</td>
<td>0/1/3</td>
<td>4/10/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>V/Q/N</td>
<td>0/1/9</td>
<td>0/0/10</td>
<td>0/1/9</td>
<td>0/2/8</td>
<td>1/1/7</td>
<td>0/0/9</td>
<td>3/1/5</td>
<td>1/0/7</td>
<td>0/1/6</td>
<td>0/0/5</td>
<td>5/5/57</td>
<td>0/2/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>V/Q/N</td>
<td>0/0/2</td>
<td>0/0/3</td>
<td>0/1/1</td>
<td>0/2/1</td>
<td>0/0/2</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>1/0/1</td>
<td>1/2/12</td>
<td>0/1/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9</td>
<td>V/Q/N</td>
<td>0/1/1</td>
<td>0/0/2</td>
<td>0/1/1</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/0</td>
<td>0/1/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0/4/6</td>
<td>0/2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: If it was a shared lesson, how much did pupils from both schools interact with each other? A lot of interaction / Some interaction / No interaction at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
<th>Lesson 11</th>
<th>Lesson 12</th>
<th>Total Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr6</td>
<td>A/S/N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr7</td>
<td>A/S/N</td>
<td>2/1/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr8</td>
<td>A/S/N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr9</td>
<td>A/S/N</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13

Individual Lesson Evaluations

The Teacher Evaluation sheets were designed to assess the impact of the delivery of the programme on pupils. The teachers were asked to complete one lesson evaluation sheet for each lesson they delivered. The overarching aim of these lesson-specific evaluations was to provide detailed information about what teachers thought about implementing the programme in their particular contexts.

Yr6 – 58 lessons – 1 shared

Yr6 Lesson 1: Introductions matter - Getting to know you

Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and eight out of a possible ten Activities were completed. The teachers agreed that this lesson was enjoyed by the children, that the activities encouraged meaningful participation and created opportunities for valuable discussion.

A lot of participation, even my special needs pupils were joining in.
People Bingo worked very well and allowed for discussion on topics such as religion.
The Carousel activity to create group rules was great and aroused interest.
Pupils were familiar with drawing up rules for Circle Time and had great fun during discussing the project.

Although it was accepted that the lesson broached challenging issues, there was also a consensus that the concept of conflict was introduced in a sensitive way. One particular barrier in the lesson was highlighted alongside the value of the resources provided.

No-one queried or questioned why you would help someone from another community.
Some did wonder why such conflict exists in the first place.
Children did find developing appropriate ground rules difficult, but the guidance lesson plan helped us over come this.

Yr6 Lesson 2: It Matters to Me - It Matters to You

Six teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The teachers were very confident and the children enjoyed and participated fully. In particular, the resources and activities were seen as extremely useful.
There was also agreement on the key learning outcome of the lesson.

The poem ‘I’m Special’ was lovely - an excellent resource.
Story was excellent – highlighting that some people are better at things than other.
Dot resource was also a good ‘warm-up’ activity.
They enjoyed mindmapping, colourful, different and personal, and sharing with other children.
That they would think deeply about their similarities and differences rather than what is physically obvious.

Yr6 Lesson 3: It mattered to him

Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The value of the resources was highlighted; however, there were contrasting views on the Circle Time activity. Several teachers
reported that there were barriers to this lesson, particularly around the significance of, and opposition to cultural celebrations.

Resources were useful; they facilitated the lesson very well, reducing teacher preparation. Pupils really enjoy talking to the whole class in circle time about their interests. They all wanted to read their ‘I Wonder’ questions. Sometimes during circle time it was hard to get children to share views in any detail. Children could not understand why anyone would not like St Patrick’s Day - They thought it may be due to the little girl not liking the music. Children didn’t realise the significance of St Patrick’s Day or the Twelfth. More detailed content describing these calendar events would have been helpful.

Yr6 Lesson 4: Opinions Matter - Spectrum Debate
Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 14 out of a possible 15 Activities were completed. The lesson really encouraged children to openly discuss their own opinions, and in some cases to be persuaded to reflect on the opinion of others. It was also highlighted that the children are beginning to relate their own personal experiences to the content of the programme.

Good participation and discussion – some children changed opinion after listening to others and they all enjoyed the drama. They all wanted to express opinions at some point. They were very willing to talk about different religions and cultures. One child was able to relate to her own experience of being in a school in England where ethnic minorities were picked on.

Yr6 Lesson 5: Conflict Matters - Falling out and falling in again
Four teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 11 out of a possible 12 Activities were completed. Although levels of participation and enjoyment were high, two teachers reported that this was a very challenging lesson to deliver. Some children found the notion of conflict, particularly violent conflict, disturbing. Some also struggled to understand the concept of ‘different’ schools. Notwithstanding these concerns, the resources and activities were seen as ‘very useful’.

Children were not aware of the meaning of a controlled school - When they were informed that Protestant children attended these schools, they still had difficulty thinking of a reason for conflict arising. Children were very shocked by the cards mentioning murdering someone. I had to intervene and discuss the issue – calming down the children. Conflict cards were ideal as situations were realistic. The conflict cards and drama generated great discussion, some children had fantastic ideas. The ‘Most Difficult Least Difficult’ activity really got the kids thinking.

Yr6 Lesson 6: My Country Matters (Ireland, Northern Ireland or the British Isles)
Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. This was a very popular lesson which generated discussion and encouraged debate, particularly around the difference between a ‘fact’ and an ‘opinion’. It was also reported that the activities and resources were ‘very useful’. The barriers identified in the lesson related to the children’s ‘complete lack of awareness’ of the ‘Troubles’.
Promoting Reconciliation through a Shared Curriculum Experience Programme

Full participation – good discussion within groups and then between groups. All very enthusiastic in coming up with opinions - They all listened attentively. They enjoyed the carousel activity on the colour coded sheets of paper which tied in with De Bono PowerPoint. However, I think I would prefer to use actual hats in class. Children are relatively innocent and have never before mentioned anything about the Troubles.

Yr6 Lesson 7: Perceptions matter
Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. Although the lesson was enjoyed and participation was high, two teachers reported that it was ‘quite controversial’. One teacher claimed that she had difficulty responding to certain comments, while another highlighted that this was the first lesson that the children did not pay full attention to. A third teacher reported, however, that despite the fact the lesson was observed, the children were ‘responsive’ and ‘participative’.

The lesson was very enjoyable and generated a lot of discussion. Some comments from children were forthright and were difficult to deal with sensitively. Maybe more of mixed participation would’ve been better as some children were becoming restless with so much discussion in one session.

My class are usually very shy in front of visitors and can remain very quiet when I ask questions. However, during these lessons when I had Queen’s and WELB representatives in, I had no such bother.

Yr6 Lesson 8: Celebrations Matter
Four teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 11 out of a possible 12 Activities were completed. This was another very popular lesson which the teachers agreed gave the children a fuller understanding of the meaning of celebration across a range of different contexts. It was also claimed by two teachers that several of the active learning strategies adopted in the programme thus far were so successful that they hoped to utilise them in different curricular settings.

The classification activity was very good and generated great discussion – the children loved it. They really enjoyed the process of making choices then reflecting on these choices – was someone else’s choice better than mine?

Yr6 Lesson 9: My Name Matters
Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. 14 out of a possible 15 Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. Two teachers reported that that this was the children’s most enjoyable lesson to date. Key learning outcomes were identified as (a) the importance of first names (i.e. what influenced their parents decision); and (b) the hurt caused by name calling. Again, the activities and resources were found to be ‘very useful’. In one of the classes, and in contrast to the earlier observed lesson, the presence of an inspector did seem to affect the children.

They loved to talk about their personal stories behind their names but also any negative experiences regarding name calling. The Circle Time activities really seem to bring children out of their shells. Name and actions activity - plenty of laughter.

Had an inspection in this lesson, thus Class quiet and well behaved but not as responsive as usual.

Yr6 Lesson 10: Decisions Matter - Harry’s Dilemma/Claire’s Dilemma
Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 14 out of a possible 15 Activities were completed. The children enjoyed the role playing, were very interested in the story and all participated in ‘lively’ discussions. The lesson was very useful in terms of introducing the concept of consequences. However, only two out of five teachers felt confident in the delivery of this lesson and three out of five found the content ‘quite controversial’ or ‘very controversial’.

Found story difficult – very controversial therefore not confident in delivery.
I didn’t want to throw up difficult scenarios that could provoke negative behaviour.
The Dilemma – sparked a lot of discussion - Children enjoyed role play activity.
They loved Harry’s story and were engrossed by the storyline – A real cliff-hanger.
The children enjoyed the drama when finding £10 - Using a real £10 was very stimulating.

Yr6 Lesson 11: Thoughts and feelings matter

Five teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 12 out of a possible 15 Activities were completed. This lesson was viewed by the teachers as the most controversial and the most difficult to deliver to date. While two teachers found the story a very helpful resource, the other three found it very challenging. Another teacher questioned if the programme was becoming tedious for the children. There was agreement however that the still images did not really engage the children.

Very controversial story content – this and previous lesson were most difficult to deliver.
An excellent story to spark discussion.
All children participated fully despite disliking still images.
Boring compared to the others - Starting to feel this has gone on too long.
The children loved ‘What am I thinking’ and played this in pairs - I was impressed with how intuitive their responses were.

Yr6 Lesson 12: Reflection Matters

Four teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. Contrasting views were expressed by teachers over the children’s ability and enthusiasm to reflect on the programme and what they had learned. There was agreement that the Post-it activity was very useful, in particular, collaborating in pairs. One teacher, however, was concerned that the sectarian element of the programme was beginning to impact on some children’s behaviour.

I was very surprised to see how difficult children found reflection.
They were keen to remember other lessons.
Post-it activity was excellent - They enjoyed creating a poster with a partner.
When we were discussing the project overall I noticed one child scanning the faces of her classmates for a reaction as we were specifically talking about whether being a Catholic or a Protestant should result in conflict.

Yr7 – 87 lessons – 20 shared

Yr7 Lesson 1: Getting to Know You Matters

Ten teacher evaluations were received; three were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teachers reported that the children were very comfortable with each other, responded well during the activities and agreed on ‘sensible and relevant rules’. There were however, concerns that the children were unaware of the issues ‘that they’re expected to discuss’; the activities were becoming repetitive; and that there was too much emphasis on differences. It was also highlighted that the programme assumes a greater knowledge of Sunday Schools than is the case.
As this was the first Curriculum + Contact lesson it took a while for them to relax with each other. The Carousel Activity was an interesting approach to use when establishing ground rules. Children very open about their culture and accepting of others. Group were very respectful of the personal views shared by everyone. Would have been more interesting if human bingo sheet for Y7 had been different from Y6. The human bingo was a bit too focused on their differences. Pupils were curious to find out more about Sunday School as no-one in our class had been.

**Yr7 Lesson 2: What Matters to Me**

Ten teacher evaluations were received; three were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 29 out of a possible 30 Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teachers reported that they enjoyed working with another school and that the children really enjoyed finding out about the culture and traditions of the ‘other’ community. Although a few children did not wish to share their personal items, those who did were ‘enthusiastic’. The Velveteen Rabbit was seen as a very good basis for the lesson and the ‘What Matters to Me’ activity was very popular.

They really enjoyed talking about their items and discussing their similarities and differences. They were interested in listening to others talk about their items and were excited to share. The story (Velveteen Rabbit) was a great starting point and made the children think. Children enjoyed the lesson and showed respect. Pupils wanted to spend longer than 15mins on their personal ‘What Matters to Me’ sheet, and we extended the time.

**Yr7 Lesson 3: My name matters**

Ten teacher evaluations were received; three were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 25 out of a possible 30 Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teachers claimed that the pupils interacted very well with each other and enjoyed researching their surnames. However, it was felt that the research element ‘was not practical when working with 55 pupils’. Additionally, several teachers stated that too much emphasis in the lesson plan was put on the ‘expectation of organising names by religion’. More broadly, it was reported that the children found this to be the most interesting lesson to date.

The lesson went really well and the pupils were on-task all of the time. The children were engaged and enjoyed the chance to speak, listen and draw. Sectarianism is expected too much – categorising names made sectarian assumptions which the children do not have. They enjoyed finding out and talking about their surnames.

**Yr7 Lesson 4: The (hi)story of the country I live in matters**

Ten teacher evaluations were received, three were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 27 out of a possible 30 Activities were completed. The lesson engaged all pupils and was ‘interactive’ and ‘enjoyable’. However, the Curriculum + Contact teachers reported that the large class size made it difficult to properly manage the timeline activity. There was also contrasting views on the accessibility of the text on the cards, some felt the ‘information was clear and user friendly’ while others claimed children found them ‘challenging’ and that the text should have been ‘simpler’.

Children were interested and engaged, they learnt lots of new things and asked questions. We were working with large numbers, so it was three pupils per Timeline card.
The hall wasn’t big enough to have them split into two groups with two sets of cards. History cards were easy to understand. Some of them found it difficult to understand some of the text - some information was over their heads – they need to be adapted so children can understand completely. I had to make sure lower ability children had cards with only a few facts.

Yr7 Lesson 5: Culture matters
Nine teacher evaluations were received; two were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 22 out of a possible 27 Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teachers claimed that the children were very comfortable and friendly with each other, enjoyed sharing ideas and ‘freely discussed Protestant and Catholic symbols’. More broadly it was agreed that the symbol cards were an excellent activity which ‘easily brought home message of stereotyping’. Several teachers were also impressed with the quality of the children’s discussions and their categorising during the sorting activity. It was also stated that many of the children took identity circle sheets home to complete and allowed parents to become involved.

Lots of discussion on stereotyping, commonalities and differences
Very clear message – pupils saw very clearly their own stereotyping of others.
Pupils were surprised at themselves when sorting the symbol cards – how clear stereotyping was.
I would not have anticipated symbol cards would work so well – very enjoyable.
They enjoyed thinking of things close to them they could put in their identity circle.
Pupils freely asked questions if they did not recognise signs or symbols.

Yr7 Lesson 6: Others’ point of view matters
Nine teacher evaluations were received; two were delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 26 out of a possible 27 Activities were completed. The children enjoyed the novel and were familiar with the story. However, it was conceded that as the lesson was ‘very full’ there was a need to set time aside (outside of the actual lesson) to read the chapter. It was also agreed that it was beneficial that pupils had previous knowledge of De Bono’s Hats. Nonetheless, many found the ‘Thinking Hat’ strategy ‘quite difficult’. Several teachers also pointed out that although the Children were ‘relaxed talking about events such as the 12th of July’, there was ‘too much emphasis’ on Protestant and Catholic identities. It was also agreed that delivery of the lesson was supported by the teacher’s notes which were ‘explicit’ and an ‘excellent resource’.

They enjoyed discussing comparison of chapters and worked well in pairs and in groups.
We have been reading novel for a while and they have a feel for the book.
‘De Bono’s Hats’ are a very useful approach for this age group - drawing attention to their thinking skills.
Lesson dictates very direct approach to Catholic/Protestant issues.

Yr7 Lessons 7 & 8: What I think and do matters
Nine teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 26 out of a possible 27 Activities were completed. Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only teachers agreed that although the content was ‘controversial’, it was dealt with in a ‘very non-threatening way’. However, one Curriculum Only teacher conceded that she ‘might not have been as confident’ if another school was involved. It was also agreed that the children needed two lessons to ‘gain an understanding of sectarianism’ and that the sectarian-o-meter activity was an invaluable resource in this respect. More broadly it was felt that: the lesson reinforced the concept of ‘actions having consequences’; the discussions were ‘very mature’; and that the children demonstrated an appreciation and acceptance of different traditions. Two suggestions were forwarded, firstly, that it would be useful to familiarise children with ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes’
prior to the lesson; and secondly, that as many pupils ‘could not pronounce Irish names’, phonetic methods should be considered.

Pupils enjoyed talking about issues which are not normally discussed openly in school. They had little experience of sectarianism and found the concept difficult to understand but had a very clear understanding when they completed the sectarian-o-meter activity.

At beginning of sectarian-o-meter activity children mostly followed friends, it took a little discussion to help them make own decisions.

The ‘Walking Debate’ on different levels of sectarianism was very good.

**Yr7 Lessons 9 & 10: Making choices matters**

Eight teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. 22 out of a possible 24 Learning Intentions were achieved and 22 out of a possible 24 Activities were completed. The teachers agreed that this lesson engendered ‘open, frank and respectful discussions’. In particular, the ways in which ‘very controversial’ issues were examined ‘allowing children to express their thoughts and opinions’ in the context of the book. Similarly, the ‘Freeze Frame’ activity captions were seen as ‘very suitable with just the right amount of information’; and the ‘Pros and Cons’ Thinking Frame was considered a ‘very productive method’ for stimulating debate, particularly in terms of discussing the ‘consequences of tit-for-tat behaviour’. More broadly, it was also agreed that the children have ‘really enjoyed’ the practical nature of these lessons.

Good, clear lesson plan.
Lesson provided good summary of novel so far, great participation and enjoyment of story.
Chapter summary very good and pupils are now very familiar with characters.
Children were very keen to take part in freeze frames - digital photos were a great resource – good co-operation, good discussion.
Pros and cons thinking frame was fantastic for generating discussion.

**Yr7 Lesson 11: Does celebrating culture matter?**

Seven teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 11 out of a possible 14 Activities were completed. Several teachers reported that the children took great pride in identifying and examining the important features of their own culture. In particular, they enjoyed creating graphic representations of their identity, learning the value of celebrating their own culture and the importance of allowing other traditions to do likewise. It was also claimed that the content was a ‘natural progression’ and was ‘very much’ related to learning outcomes of previous lessons. One teacher commented on the benefit of pupils and teachers undertaking a second year of the programme in terms of ‘levels of knowledge and understanding’. However, another suggested that the children seemed ‘a little less enthusiastic’ because they ‘felt they had discussed many of these issues before’.

The Carousel activity generated a lot of participation, discussion and engagement.
Pupils thoroughly enjoy the topic and engage with lessons, discussions and activities.
They enjoy being proud of their culture and drawing pictures representing their identity.
Agreeing the three most important features of their culture was challenging, but rewarding.

**Yr7 Lesson 12: Celebrating my culture matters**

Five teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and 10 out of a possible 15 Activities were completed. Curriculum + Contact and Curriculum Only teachers agreed that although many of the children ‘struggled’ with the concept of reflection, the lesson provided a good opportunity to revisit the key learning outcomes of the P7 programme. It was seen as particularly useful to review the key features of their own and others
cultures and also to recap the important elements of the reading. The children also ‘really loved’ making the posters on the computer and many of the designs were ‘very imaginative’. The teachers also reported that they and the children were ‘sad to have reached end of project’ and agreed that the programme has been ‘extremely valuable’.

The Lesson was a very good culmination of work covered in previous lessons. The resources provided by the WELB have been invaluable throughout project. This programme was worthwhile and hopefully will bear some fruit in the future lives of pupils.

Yr8 – 20 lessons – 5 shared
Yr8 Lesson 1: Human Rights
Two teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. Three out of a possible four Learning Intentions were achieved and five out of a possible six Activities were completed. Both teachers reported that levels of participation were high and that the children enjoyed the learning about Human Rights and the difference between ‘wants’ and ‘needs’. The group work activities engaged the children and it was also felt that the lesson provided a ‘really good platform’ for discussing the key issues. No barriers to learning were identified and the teachers agreed that the resources were very useful.

Yr8 Lesson 2: Mapping our Community
Three teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. Eight out of a possible nine Learning Intentions were achieved and eight out of a possible nine Activities were completed. The teachers agreed that this lesson was the least controversial to date; that participation levels were very good; and that the resources were very supportive of the learning intentions. The activities were seen as interesting, informative and linked in well with the previous lesson. One Curriculum + Contact teacher claimed that a safe and friendly ‘space’ was developing which was allowing the children to discuss difficult issues confidently.

There was a lovely atmosphere of trust.
Working together helped the class to begin to communicate about the issues in a safe way.

Yr8 Lesson 3: Symbols that Divide Us
Two teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. Five out of a possible six Learning Intentions were achieved and five out of a possible six Activities were completed. Both teachers agreed that this lesson gave the children an opportunity to examine in more depth some of the issues raised in the previous two lessons. The resources were seen as very helpful; the activities were enjoyed and helped the children learn about each other. It was also felt that school uniforms were a good starting point in terms of discussing personal identities. No barriers to the lesson were highlighted; however, one teacher felt the emphasis on difference made the lesson ‘quite controversial’.

Not really controversial, though the discussion went a little deeper than in previous lessons. They spent a lot of time finding out about each other through the mapping stimulus material.

Yr8 Lesson 4: Flags and Emblems
Three teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. Five out of a possible six Learning Intentions were achieved and seven out of a possible nine Activities were completed. Although two teachers reported that the lesson was ‘quite controversial’, there was agreement that broadening out the issue of flags to include other countries and cultures helped to make the lesson more interesting and enjoyable. The activities encouraged ‘lively’ engagement and
the resources were seen as very useful. It was also stated that the children were becoming increasingly more confident in group work settings.

Discussion of flags was informational and not restricted to NI which made it more interesting. Students enjoyed the lively nature of this lesson and the pace of the tasks. They thrived on sharing the information they had learned and the responsibility of returning to their group to deliver it to the others.

**Yr8 Lesson 5: Flags and Emblems**

Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and five out of a possible six Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teacher reported that although she was ‘not confident at all’ prior to the lesson due to the contentious nature of the content, the lesson went very well and the children enjoyed and ‘felt confident expressing their identity to the whole class’. The PowerPoint resource was seen as particularly useful. However, both teachers agreed that the lesson did not provide as many opportunities for group work or shared learning as previous lessons.

I felt that this could be a controversial lesson - It was only our 2nd meeting and flags can be contentious.

Pupils worked well and confidently.

I am not sure whether the students enjoyed this lesson as much as some of the others as there was a lot more teacher input and less group work than in previous lessons.

PowerPoint resources good to demonstrate the flags - students enjoyed the animations.

**Yr8 Lesson 6: Breaking down Physical Barriers**

One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. Two out of a possible three Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The teacher reported that the lesson was enjoyed, was not at all controversial and that the activities and resources were very useful in terms of helping the children to develop questioning skills.

The videos were good stimulus material as there are no peace walls to see in Limavady.

**Yr8 Lesson 7: Attitudinal Barriers – Stereotypes**

Two teacher evaluations were received; both were delivered on a shared basis. Two out of a possible four Learning Intentions were achieved and three out of a possible four Activities were completed. Both teachers claimed levels of participation were high and that, despite the subject matter, the lesson was ‘not at all controversial’. The perception exercises were ‘clearly enjoyed’ and the children were able to make the link between perception and reality. Additionally, the children ‘seemed to get on with each other very well and were keen to meet each other again’. However, one teacher questioned if the lesson placed too much emphasis on division.

Activities provided great opportunity for pupil discussion.

Pupils did not display any hostility towards each other.

I wonder if by teaching year 8 pupils of divisions in society we are highlighting difference.

**Yr8 Lesson 8: Breaking down the wall**

One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The teacher claimed that the children enjoy the lesson and participated very well. No barriers to learning were identified, the resources and activities were seen as very useful and the lesson was ‘not at all controversial’.
Yr8 Lesson 9: What could you do if.....?
One Curriculum + Contact teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The teacher’s responses were identical to the above lesson, but she added that ‘the activity was very good - it created a very structured activity that allowed the pupils to interact with each other’.

Yr8 Lesson 10: Taking down the Barriers
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The children enjoyed and were engaged by the lesson, in particular, the video footage and the fact that there was ‘not a lot of writing activities’. No barriers to learning were identified, the resources and activities were seen as very useful and the lesson was ‘not at all controversial’.

Yr8 Lesson 11 & 12: Taking Action
Two teacher evaluations were received; none were delivered on a shared basis. Four out of a possible six Learning Intentions were achieved and three out of a possible four Activities were completed. Although both teachers agreed that the activities encouraged interesting debates on sectarianism and reconciliation, one found the lesson ‘very controversial’ while the other ‘not controversial at all’. Both agreed that the reflection activity ‘worked very well’ and that the resources were valuable in terms of reflection.

Yr9 – 20 lessons – 5 shared
Yr9 Lesson 1: Review of Year 8
Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. Importantly, the Curriculum + Contact teacher highlighted the value of children coming together for a second year, both in terms of knowledge retention and feeling comfortable with each other. Similarly, the Curriculum + Contact teacher reported higher levels of enjoyment and participation than the Curriculum Only class. Both teachers agreed, however, that the children ‘got bored of activity quickly’ because there was ‘too much reading’.

Pupils enjoyed being together again and were very comfortable discussing issues. Children have good knowledge retained from Yr 8. Concept cards were wordy and there were too many of them.

Yr9 Lesson 2: Them and Us
Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teacher reported ‘a lot of interaction’ and singled out the silent conversation activity as particularly helpful in terms of providing ‘an opportunity to gather thoughts’ with ‘no pressure to express feelings’. Both teachers agreed that the lesson was enjoyed, the children were engaged throughout and that the resources were ‘very useful’.

Pupils enjoyed the experience and could move freely around the room. Team work meant that no one was singled out.

Yr9 Lesson 3: Labelling Others
Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teacher reported ‘a lot of interaction’ and positive engagement. Both teachers agreed that, firstly, the ‘Discrimination Game’
made pupils think about their own prejudices; secondly, the visualisation activity worked really well; and thirdly, that comprehension of the photographs was difficult as no background information was provided.

Pupils enjoyed lesson as there was a lot of discussion but a lot of additional explanation was needed as some pupils unfamiliar with photo scenes which had no explanation or caption.

**Yr 9 Lesson 4: Labelling Others (continued)**
Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. All Learning Intentions were achieved and three out of a possible four Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teacher felt that although the lesson was ‘quite controversial’ the children ‘dealt very maturely with it’ and that there was ‘no negativity in the class’. She also highlighted the value of the role-playing, but raised concerns about needing a larger room for joint sessions. Both teachers agreed that the resources were ‘very useful’ and that the labelling and identifying activities ensured the lesson was ‘lively’ and ‘interesting’.

**Yr 9 Lesson 5: On the Margins**
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The teacher reported that she found the lesson ‘quite controversial’ in terms of children having to address the stereotyping of marginalised groups. However, participation was very good, there were no barriers to learning and the resources provided were ‘very useful’.

**Yr 9 Lesson 6: What’s the News?**
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. This teacher claimed that the lesson was ‘not at all controversial’, that the children enjoyed it very much and that there were no barriers to learning. The resources and activities were seen as ‘quite useful’, the lesson went ‘reasonably well’ and there was only ‘some participation’ in the photograph and thought tracking activities.

**Yr 9 Lesson 7: What’s the News? (continued)**
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. This teacher reported that the lesson was ‘quite controversial’, no barriers to learning were identified, resources and activities were ‘quite useful’ and there was ‘some participation’ in the activities. Like several other teacher evaluations, these responses were incomplete because the teacher did not provide explanations for her answers – why was it quite controversial? Why only some participation?

**Yr 9 Lesson 8: Developing Empathy**
Two teacher evaluations were received; one was delivered on a shared basis. Three out of a possible four Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. The Curriculum + Contact teacher claimed that there was ‘a lot of interaction’ but that the lesson was ‘quite controversial’. In contrast, the Curriculum Only teacher found it ‘not controversial at all’. Both teachers agreed that levels of participation and enjoyment were high, the resources were ‘very useful’, there were no barriers to learning, and that the role play drama activity worked well and gave the children ‘a real sense of what it felt like to be bullied or excluded’.

I was a little concerned that one of the children might say something inappropriate that the partner school might find offensive.

Students were a little bit slow to get started but the barriers came down very quickly and then they seemed to really enjoy the activity.

The poems templates and instructions for preparing and carrying out role play were very useful.
Yr 9 Lesson 9: Developing Empathy
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. No other information was provided.

Yr 9 Lesson 10: Other People’s Shoes
One Curriculum Only teacher evaluation was received. All Learning Intentions were achieved and all Activities were completed. No other information was provided.

Yr 9 Lesson 11 & 12: Taking Action? No teacher evaluations were received.