

A critique of Youth For Christ's (Y.F.C.) philosophy to reach young people with a particular emphasis on the "Rock Solid" programme for young people aged 11-14.

Introduction:

With over 50 local centres plus a number of performing arts teams Y.F.C. must be one of the largest (if not the largest) para-church youth organisations in Britain. They operate under the tag line "Taking the Good News Relevantly to Every Young Person in Britain" and as such are constantly developing new ways of contacting and evangelising young people. One such program is "Rock Solid" which has been running now for a number of years and is being "sold" to individual churches as a method of reaching young people aged 11-14, with the added advantage that it is meant to attract and connect with young people who have little or no church background.

This essay seeks to critique Y.F.C.'s overall philosophy of youth evangelisation, in particular of the "Rock Solid" program. James Fowler's "Stages of Faith" will be used to offer the critique, although it will be clearly shown that there are some basic underlying differences in the theology of Fowler and that of Y.F.C. which need to be taken into account before any meaningful dialogue can take place between the two.

It begins with a short introduction into the work of James Fowler, why he is important and what impact he may have on anyone working with a particular age group. This will lead on to looking at Christian critiques of Fowler's work, including post-Fowler developments. The foundation will then have been laid to move on to a description of Y.F.C. philosophy and particularly the principles and practice of the "Rock Solid" program. In the final section a critique will be offered not only on the basis of Fowler's Faith development theory but will include a look at how "Rock Solid" ties in (or not) with theories of adolescent development.

Why is Fowler Important?

The work of James Fowler is essentially important as he is the first person to approach the idea of human growth and development, in terms of "faith". His concern is not about intellectual development, cognitive development or moral development, although all these 3 have parts to play, but has come out of a desire to engage people in a theological and experiential way, taking account of faith, human formation and transformation (Fowler, 1981) . In this pursuit he has brought together the work of Erikson, Kohlberg and Piaget and developed a discourse between them and such theologians as Niebuhr, Tillich and Smith. It is this coming together of developmental theory and theology which is ground breaking.

Through this new approach to faith development, Fowler seeks to show that faith is a universal

human concern (Fowler, 1981, pg. 5). Just as moral development and cognitive development occur as natural processes (as understood by Kohlberg and Piaget) so too does faith. This faith he defines as:

“ People’s evolved and evolving ways of experiencing self, others and the world (as they construct them) as related to and affected by the ultimate conditions of existence (as they construct them) and of shaping their lives’ purposes and meanings, trusts and loyalties, in the light of the character of being, value and power determining the ultimate conditions of existence (as grasped in their operative images - conscious and unconscious - of them). (Fowler, 1981, pg. 92)

As we shall see in detail later it is this definition of faith that has drawn much of the criticism of Fowler’s work. For many this work should simply be defined as religious development while for others afraid of losing a good theory due to tainting it with religion, the term “development of consciousness” would have been more appropriate. Whatever the case and despite rigorous challenges, this piece of work stands as a key framework to be used by those involved in the development of young people as a means of understanding people and a resource for testing the possible usefulness or otherwise of programmes and strategies. Fowler himself sets out the usefulness of his theory when he says

“The faith stages...are not to be understood as an achievement scale by which to evaluate the worth of persons. Nor do they represent educational or therapeutic goals toward which to hurry people.....Education and nurture should aim at the full realisation of the potential strength of faith at each stage and at keeping the reworking of faith that comes with stage changes current with the parallel transitional work in psychosocial eras.” (Fowler, 1981, Pg114).

Critiques of Fowler:

Since the publication of “Stages of Faith” many individuals have critiqued Fowler’s work from a number of different perspectives ranging from the religious dislike of the use of the word “faith” to scientific challenges to the research technique. As this essay deals with the use of the theory to critique a particular philosophy and program, within an evangelical Christian organisation, I will simply deal with the critiques which are directly relevant to this piece of work.

The main critique is that concerned with Fowler’s definition of faith. Webster is concerned for the understanding of faith within a religion (Webster, 1984, pg. 17). If Fowler’s definition is accepted

then how does it relate to a Christian understanding of a transcendent faith? How should one refer to a conversion experience? Is Growing in faith consolidation within a stage or transition between stages? This essay looks at these issues later on in more detail when considering the difference between Y.F.C. and Fowler's outlooks but it needs to also be noted here as a critique. Marion Smith has written a response to Webster that addresses this very issue. She picks up on what some Christian theologians have written about faith to show that Fowler's understanding of faith is compatible with a Christian view point. She understands this controversy more in terms of the critics own stage of faith as an influencing factor (in Astley et. al, 1992, pg. 89). Similar to Webster, Parks articulates a critique of Fowler's definition of faith and shows how both secular and Christian groups argue against the use of the word for different reasons. Both voices argue that 'faith' is (or should be) only used in close relationship to, and understanding of, God. Hence for the secular this would lessen the scientific impact of the research. They would argue more for the word 'ego' development than that of 'faith' (in Astley and Francis, 1992, pg. 98).

This view is somewhat supported by Slee's findings in various post-Fowler research. In particular she notes that people with atheistic views or less strong affiliation to a religious tradition score higher on the faith scale (in Francis et. al, 1996, pg. 83). This might strengthen Christian concerns for the way the word 'faith' is used i.e. that it exhibits a non-religious bias. Also other research (Broun, 1984), shows that low ego scores equate to low faith scores and high ego scores relate to high faith score. Hence strengthening the secular claims about the use of the term 'faith' (Slee, in Francis et. al, 1996, pg86).

Webster also critiques Fowler on the basis of research method. Firstly he argues that the sample used was mainly white and Christian hence it would be difficult to conclude the normative / universal application of the theory (Webster, 1984, pg. 16). Secondly, he calls into question the research itself. Unsure of why Fowler settled for just 7 aspects to each stage when others could have been included. Also noting Fowler's dependence on Piaget, Kohlberg and Selman's work he questions whether the fact that he then modifies their ideas is actually acceptable (Webster, 1984, pg. 16). Thirdly, Kohlberg's work was stated as being hierarchical in nature whereas Fowler is at pains to move away from this in his work. With respect to Kohlberg's work generally, he brings into question it's reliability and hence the reliability of Fowler's work. In particular he highlights the issue of Kohlberg seeing moral development as preceding faith development whereas Fowler expresses this the other way round (Webster, 1984, pg. 17). Smith has challenged him on this, as for her Fowler and Kohlberg are expressing the same thing but simply in different terms (in Astley et. al, 1992, pg. 87).

Another attack on the work of Fowler has come in connection with the inadequate attention paid to the unconscious and affective aspects to faith development (Parks in Astley and Francis, 1992, pg.

98 and Fowler et. al,1991, pg. 111). This critique is supported by Slee who comments on studies that link higher faith stages with higher levels of education (in Francis et. al, 1996, pg. 83). However this doesn't take fully into account the development of Fowler's own thinking as he has begun to include the work of Kegan into a more developed later theory (Fowler in Fowler et. al,1991, pg. 30).

Finally, critique of the work comes in the fact that Fowler has put ages alongside the stages of faith. Even in his own work he quotes many examples of adults who fail to progress beyond stage 3. This is a theme he picks up on in later work when dealing with issues of congregations and pastoral care (Fowler, 1987). This is conformed by Slee who claims that the early stages relate well to ages but post adolescent the development is less age related (in Francis et. al, 1996, pg. 82). Certainly it appears that the first 3 stages seem to happen in line with human development in a natural way but when speaking of later transition from one stage to the next Fowler claims that "Development results from efforts to restore balance between subject and environment when some factor...has disturbed a previous equilibrium." (Fowler, 1981, pg. 100).

This is far from an extensive look at the various critiques of Fowler as space does not permit for more detail. Suffice to say that his stage 6 has also been critiqued strongly but has been omitted from this essay on the grounds that it deals with the 11-18 age range who would not be included in that stage. There has also been critiques on the grounds of universal applications especially in terms of other cultures and religions but also gender related. Having said all this, Fowler's 'Stages of Faith development' still stands as an important work on which many people, inc. himself, are still building. As such it stands as a useful tool with which to critique the activities of those involved in developing the faith of others.

Youth For Christ - A perspective on Faith

Having considered the work of Fowler and some of the critiques of his work we now move on to consider Youth For Christ and their perspective on faith on which Rock Solid is based. By doing this, Fowler's perspective and Y.F.C's perspective can be compared and contrasted in such a way that an investigation into a specific program, in this case Rock Solid, can be analysed. The Y.F.C Strategy document, Rock Solid information sheet and a program outline are included in the appendices.

The Mandate for all of Y.F.C's work is taken from the words of Jesus as recorded in the gospel of Matthew chapter 28 verses 18 - 20 and from Acts chapter 1 verse 8. They see the work as a direct response to God's instruction that all the world should hear about his activity in Jesus and should become disciples. Discipleship involves teaching that leads to obedience to God's will and a

personal lifestyle that reflects it. This is not seen as simply the task of the worker but there is an understanding of God's transcendent power, through his Holy Spirit, to assist individuals in this task.

The mission statement developed from this mandate is:

“Taking Good News relevantly to every young person in Britain”

This mission statement is the filter through which all activities of Y.F.C. must pass. Key to this essay are the terms “Good News” and “relevantly”. They are respectively defined within the latest strategy document as :

“The gospel as expressed in the Bible and systematised in the historic Christian creeds.”

“ In a style and form that communicates effectively with the given audience. This demands flexibility in approach. This reflects the original commitment of Y.F.C.:

“Geared to the times, Anchored to the Rock””

Coupled with the mission statement are Y.F.C.'s core values. These are set out as Dignity, Empowerment and Partnership. In terms of the impact these core values have in Y.F.C.'s dealing with young people, the first 2 are of most significance. Dignity acknowledges the uniqueness of the individual who “bears the imprint of God” and hence relationships between Y.F.C. and young people should be compassionate, respectful and with thought to the integrity of the individual. Empowerment seeks to involve young people in the mission of Y.F.C., discover their place in society and the world and to “enable them to explore the truth and impact of the Gospel in their cultural context.” (Appendix 1, pg. 5).

The framework Y.F.C. sets out for evangelism is, in many ways, a “stages” theory. Explicitly, it is to do with what should be included within the ministry of a Y.F.C. centre or project. For a centre or project to be holistic in its outworking of the mission statement these 4 activities should occur. Demonstration, Declaration, Decision and Discipleship. Implicit to this is an understanding that people are at different “stages” with regard to the gospel and hence different content will be applicable. The idea of development is clearly in Y.F.C. thinking and is shown by the definition of the decision stage where it says “As part of the faith journey..” (Appendix 1, pg. 5). The mention of “journey” clearly shows that development is understood and reinforces the implicit idea that here is a “stage theory” albeit implicit and not well developed. Although these 4 “stages” are not hierarchical but should be considered “cyclical” there is a stated belief that “...Biblical Christianity

*demand*s the process of discipleship as an *essential* part of any faith *decision*.” (Appendix 1, pg. 10. Emphasis mine). Hence the fourth stage of discipleship could be seen as the “goal” to which work with an individual is heading. It is also clear in the definitions of these stages that the faith development is clearly in regard to a Christian framework whereby relationship to Jesus Christ is the key component.

Further understanding is gained of Y.F.C.’s perspective by a reading of their strategy, especially a section entitled “Evangelism” (Appendix 1, pg. 10). This word has been used throughout the above section but now there is the opportunity to get a clear understanding of what Y.F.C. understands by the term. Here evangelism is about “presenting...the claims of Christ.” (Ibid). Although the means of doing this is openly up for development and in fact Y.F.C. are actively seeking to develop ways that make these claims “resonate” with young people, the central expectancy in terms of individual faith development, is that of hearing, accepting and growing in confidence of these “claims”.

Before moving on to analyse the specific program of “Rock Solid” we will look at the above to compare and contrast Y.F.C.’s ideas with those of Fowler.

Fowler Verses Y.F.C.

Y.F.C. work within the 8-25 year old age range (Fowler stages 2-4), although their work is predominately with 11-18’s (Fowler stage 3). We will be specifically looking at Y.F.C.’s work within this stage later on when we consider their “Rock Solid” program. What follows here is a general comparison of Fowler’s outlook on faith development and that of Y.F.C.’s as outlined above.

As has been mentioned in the general critique of Fowler’s theory, the main issue of contention between Fowler and Y.F.C. is clearly on their understanding of Faith. Beginning with the Y.F.C. mandate, and then throughout the strategy document, Y.F.C.’s standpoint on faith is clear. Faith is plainly set out in relationship to the revelation of Jesus Christ. The language of the document is one of exclusivity. Even within the core values only that of dignity is afforded to all people, but empowerment and partnership is only in relation to others who share a common Christian commitment.

The temptation here is to be simplistic and to compare this exclusivity with Fowler’s inclusive understanding of faith as a human universal concern (Fowler, 1981, Pg5). In some ways there would be merit in that. For Fowler, faith development is common to all people and hence his stages are equally accessible or achievable whether you are Christian, Hindu or Atheists. Faith development set out by Y.F.C.’s 4D’s is clearly only fully accessible once one has acceded to the

Christian faith. With the Y.F.C. framework, moving young people into stage 4 is the prime goal as it is only here that empowerment and hence discovery of ones place in society, and a sense of belonging is discovered. Although the other 3 stages never cease to be applicable, they only serve in the process of discipleship. However, a closer look at both Fowler and Y.F.C. will move one away from such a simplistic comparison.

Fowler's understanding of faith is based on W.C. Smith's work around the development of language and the change in understanding of the word "faith". From Smith, Fowler differentiates between the words belief and faith. In antiquity the word translated belief held in it the sense of aligning ones life around a certain accepted reality. However, by the nineteenth century it had come to mean a mental ascent to a proposition. The change is best summed up by Smith himself:

“ there was a time when ‘I believe’ as a ceremonial declaration of faith meant, and was heard as meaning: “Given the reality of God, as a fact of the universe, I hereby proclaim that I align my life accordingly, pledging love and loyalty.” A statement about a person’s believing has now come to mean, rather, something of this sort: “Given the uncertainty of God, as a fact of modern life, so and so reports that the idea of God is part of the furniture of his mind.””

(Smith in Fowler, 1981, Pg. 13)

In the light of this change, Fowler's understanding of faith becomes most pertinent. He is not dealing in development of belief systems but on the development of how one “aligns” their life. Now at once we see the simplistic nature of any direct contrast between Y.F.C's outlook and that of Fowler. Although alignment of a young persons life is of importance within Y.F.C's work, it is exclusively in relation to the revelation of Jesus Christ. Hence, there is a focus in Y.F.C's work in developing belief in the Christian gospel as being relevant to young people and therefore worthy of making ones ‘centre of value and power’. The comparison should be made not on the basis of faith but on an understanding of conversion.

Fowler defines conversion as “a significant re-centring of one's previous conscious or unconscious images of value and power, and the conscious adoption of a new set of master stories in the commitment to reshape one's life in a new community of interpretation and action” (Fowler, 1981, pg. 282). This is surely what is at the heart of Y.F.C's understanding of their mandate, mission statement, evangelism framework etc. The 4 D's, when worked through are a means by which young people can take a journey to the point of knowing enough about and having confidence in, the master story of Christianity, so that it becomes to them the centre of power and value. The stage of faith that they are in will not necessarily change but the centre of power has. The work of discipleship now becomes not so much a matter of encouraging young people to move in their

stages of faith, but to challenge the idolatry of more parochial communities and centring values. It becomes a drive for radical monotheism (Fowler, 1981, pg. 23).

There are hints within the Y.F.C. strategy document of the understanding of Fowler's concern that radical monotheism in reality is hard to sustain and that lesser centres of value and power often end up dominating. This is mainly seen within sections that talk about 'flexibility of approach' (Appendix 1, pg. 4) and 'their cultural context' (Appendix 1, pg. 5 and 6). Y.F.C. demonstrates an understanding that in everyone's lives there are many pressures and drives (Fowler's centres of value and power), not all of which are inherently wrong or damaging. Hence, although Y.F.C. is concerned with conversion, it would be wrong to assume that once this took place, the young person would need to simply ditch all previous centres of value and power and hold on to this one master story as the fixed, unquestionable external authority, to which they must now defer. On the contrary, once conversion has taken place, Y.F.C.'s commitment to discipleship, can be seen as a commitment to encourage the development of the individual's faith. As in many things, the out working of this ends up being beyond the control of Y.F.C. as an organisation. Discipleship involves individual Christians alongside young people. The extent to which a young person develops in their faith will largely depend on the faith stage of the disciple or faith community (Fowler, 1981, Pg161).

A further difference between the approach to faith development within Fowler's thinking and that of Y.F.C. is the openness to the transcendent activity of God. In Y.F.C. understanding, as shown most significantly in their mandate for the work, there is the expectation of the activity of God's Holy Spirit within the lives of individual believers, faith communities and even in the lives of young people who have not yet 'converted'. In Fowler, there is little that happens developmentally outside of that caused by general development or crises / disequilibrium that act as transition points from one stage to another. It is not until the final pages that there is a glimpse of Fowler's acceptance of the fact that an Ultimate Being may intervene in extraordinary ways, outside of the neat models and patterns that humans develop (Fowler, 1981, pg. 302). This is however expressed only as a possibility and with little to make one think that such occurrences might be frequent and normal. This would be the expected norm within the thinking of Y.F.C..

Having now completed an overall comparison between Y.F.C.'s outlook and that expressed by Fowler, it is time to consider a specific program developed by Y.F.C.. The program is called 'Rock Solid' (R.S.) and is a weekly event that is currently run in over 200 locations. The target age for the event are 11 to 14 year olds. Rock Solid will be critiqued by Fowler's principles of faith development with the above discussion in mind. Ideas of adolescent development will also be used in the critique.

What is Rock Solid?

“...a main aim of Rock Solid is to put God on the agenda for those who have little knowledge of the Christian faith” (Appendix 2, Pg. 1)

The above quote sums up the aim of R.S. very well. However what actually goes on each week ? Does this help in faith development? Is it appropriate to the developmental stage for which it caters? All very important questions that will be discussed now.

In order to fulfil it's aim each evening is based around a particular issue or theme. This is done using games, discussions, video, role play etc. including thoughts about how God might fit in to the situation. The basic structure doesn't change from week to week. It begins with an energetic game, moves into life skills, then a look at where God fits in, ending off with another game and refreshments.

Although R.S. is about 'putting God on the agenda', there are some core principles which operate in R.S. These are (1) that young people get the chance to take part in activities and games within an atmosphere that they wouldn't normally experience elsewhere. Fun and excitement at being there is hence very important. (2) It is about giving young people the chance to interact socially and build relationships with their peers as well as with the leaders. The relationship to leaders is key not only in developing good attendance but also in communicating ideas of God. Apart from the 'ordinary' club nights as described, R.S. has small group nights. This is where leaders take smaller numbers out to other entertaining activities such as 10 pin bowling, the cinema etc. These are designed to help strengthen the trust and relationship between young person and leader. (3) Each R.S. meeting looks at an issue that is relevant to the young people. Developing lifeskills to help them to relate to others and function well at home and in society is also key to R.S. (4) The Christian gospel and communicating it to young people flows out of all that Y.F.C. seeks to do and is an integral part of the R.S. program. It seeks to link the lifeskill section to what God, through the bible, has to say on the issue (Appendix 2, Pg. 2).

How well does it stand up?

The above gives a brief outline of the workings and ethos of R.S. which should be sufficient to allow for a reasonably thorough critique of the program to take place. It must be remembered that R.S. is a 3 year program which corresponds to a large number of individual meetings. There is insufficient time and space to critique each meeting, so the basic principles will have to suffice.

In general then, how does the Rock Solid ethos stand up to interrogation? In many ways it stands up well. The development of the program shows good understanding of the world of 11-14 year olds. The activities and emphasis on fun, a place where they want to be, taps into their developmental

desire for belonging and peer acceptance. A consistent structure produces a sense of safety in amongst their changing worlds. The use of life skills and role play allow young people to explore the issues they face within a safe environment. They are allowed to take on different perspectives helping them to discover who they are, or what feels most comfortable for them at the time. Including a section for a presentation of the Christian perspective helps to do a number of things. Firstly, it challenges their worldview and hence could help bring about disequilibrium and hence stage change. Secondly, it introduces information about a God which may have only had an unconscious awareness of until then. Thirdly, it touches their urge for a God who knows them and confirms their self deeply (Fowler, 1981, pg. 153). All of this can and should be seen as positive contributions to the young persons development. It is however not without it's shortcomings.

One of the strongest emphases in R.S. is that on the relationship between leader and young person. As it is aimed at young people for whom God is not yet on the agenda, there is an underlying expectation that relationship with a leader for whom God is real, might assist in the process of accepting God for themselves. However, Fowler points out that in stage 3 development young people do not have a good understanding of systems. hence they will accept individuals without accepting the cultural background that has formed them (Fowler, 1981, pg. 162).

The program allows for much interaction to take place throughout the evening until it comes to bringing God explicitly into the issue. Suddenly, the expectation is that the young people will sit quietly and listen to what a leader has to say. This becomes a time where what the leader says could be seen as being an external authority simply to be accepted or rebelled against. For this to play a better part in faith development space should be given for some critical reflection and interaction between opposing worldviews to take place (Fowler, 1981, pg. 173).

The above could be seen as merely being shortcomings, but what of actual dangers?

In the section concerning stage 3 faith Fowler writes:

“ In each sphere of influence there are peers and adults who are potentially significant others.....those persons whose ‘mirroring’ of the young person has the power to contribute positively or negatively to the set of images of self and of accompanying meanings that must be drawn together in a forming identity and faith.” (Fowler, 1981, pg. 154)

This quote sets the foundation of what is the greatest danger within this program. With such a heavy emphasis on relationship between young person and adult the possible “power to contribute ...negatively” to the young persons development of identity must not be missed. Of course Y.F.C.

operates within guidelines for the protection of children but the danger isn't about recognisable abuse but possibility of 'lateral conversion' (Mosley, 1978) at best or foreclosed identity (Head, 1997) at worst.

In his study of conversion Mosley identified two distinct types structural and lateral. By lateral conversion he means a conversion experience which appears to be 'genuine' as in structural conversion but when no repatterning of ones life take place (Slee in Francis et. al, 1996, pg. 77). He discovered that this was predominately the case when religious affiliation was changed so as to establish 'an affective bond with a significant other.'(Ibid). As the Rock Solid program places such an emphasis on relationships, such that leaders can become significant adults to these young people, then lateral conversions are likely to occur. This undermines Y.F.C's core value of dignity as there is a hint, albeit unintentional, that manipulation has occurred. Also, in terms of the working through in discipleship, if lateral conversion has taken place then the non-aligning of the young persons lifestyle could develop into real tension between youth and leader.

But what of the more serious charge of foreclosure? Head bases his understanding of identity formation on the work of Marcia, which suggests that adolescent identity formation is the negotiating of the need to explore (Experiencing crisis) and the need to make decisions (Commitment). Foreclosure occurs when a solution is settled upon without personal testing or scrutiny (Head, 1997, pg. 14). Such a person can be distinguished by the fact that commitment is made without crisis and hence it is difficult to see what are his own determined goals and that of others. 'He is becoming what others prepared or intended him to become...' (Marcia in Head,1997, pg. 15). The danger in such a situation may only become visible later on in life with a struggle to cope with change. Depending on the life crisis the individual experiences this could be significantly damaging (Head, 1997, pg. 96).

These issues must not be trivialised. We have already mentioned Fowler's assertion that stage transition can be largely influenced by the modal faith stage of the surrounding community, which should make us even more careful. Obviously at the best these relationships formed at R.S. end up being supportive and encourage exploration of faith (albeit within a Christian framework) that helps to develop the young person. However, if the leaders are themselves at stage 3, then there is a great chance of foreclosure occurring. This is a serious issue when considering the practical situation of many youth workers who are under great pressure to produce 'Christian' kids as a measure of their effectiveness.

Conclusion

Fowler's theory of faith development has been shown to be of great significance for those working

to develop others faith. This essay has outlined Fowler's importance and offered a critique of his work. It has then sought to use the theory to critique Y.F.C's principles and especially the practical outworking of Rock Solid.

Y.F.C. is unashamedly interested in evangelism and mission. This can be understood in terms of conversion as developed by Fowler. However, as the core of its work is done with those between the ages of 11-18 (Stage 3 faith), great care needs to be taken to avoid possible lateral conversion or foreclosure. Despite Y.F.C's core values, there is much room for inappropriate and damaging evangelism to occur. This is especially true within the context of a Rock Solid club. In it is great potential but also great danger. Its greatest strengths are also its points of possible problems. The key to realising its potential is in the leaders who run these clubs week in and week out. Support, training and accountability are key issues which need to be addressed to ensure the best possible outcomes.

The implications of this essay extend beyond a single organisation to the Church as a whole. With a clearer understanding of adolescent development, as well as Fowler's faith stages, the church could do much to help in the forming of identity while still helping young people to seriously consider the Christian master story as a plausible centre of value and power in their lives.

Bibliography

- Astley, J. & Francis, L.J. (ed.) (1992) Christian Perspectives on Faith Development, Leominster: Gracewing.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968) Identity: Youth and Crisis, New York: Norton.
- Fowler, J.W. (1981) Stages of Faith: the psychology of human development and the quest for meaning, San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Fowler, J.W., Nipkow, K.E. & Schweitzer, F. (1992) Stages of Faith and Religious Development, London: SCM.
- Francis, L.J., Kay, W.K. & Campbell, W.S. (ed.) (1996) Research in Religious Education, Leominster: Gracewing.
- Head, J. (1997) Working with Adolescents, London: Falmer Press.
- Parker, M.S. (1985) "Identity and the Development of Religious Thinking" in Waterman, A.S. (ed.) **Identity in adolescence, processes and content**, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 43-62.
- Webster, D.H. (1984) "James Fowler's Theory of Faith Development", British Journal of Religious Education, 7:1, pp.14-18.