Community Development Journal Advance Access published January 19, 2011

doi:10.1093/cdj/bsq062

Measurement as reflection in faith-based social action

Adam Dinham* and Martha Shaw

Abstract This article reflects upon a process of developing an approach to measuring faith-based contributions to social action, examining the problems and challenges involved. A systematic review of research arising in regional faith-based settings in England [Dinham (2007) *Priceless, Unmeasureable: Faith-based Community Development in England in the 21st Century*, FbRN, London] shows the considerable extent to which faith groups are engaged in social action in communities. It also identifies the diversity of language used to describe those activities, and of research approaches to capturing them. We examine how this poses challenges to demonstrating the value of faith-based activities to funders and policy-makers and argue that more important are the difficulties posed to discussing and comparing faith-based activities in ways which might be helpful to faith groups' own reflective practice. We link this to how power accrues around what is measured and therefore valued and discuss the possibility of broadening measurement by rooting it in community development. We propose balancing in measurement the demands of accountability and demonstrability with the values of community development, to produce a 'bottom up' reflective praxis which can support and empower local faith communities to be heard on their own terms whilst at the same time defining and refining those terms. In these ways, the article is intended both for practitioners engaging in faith-based social action and its evaluation, and for policy-makers and funders wishing to engage with its value and contribution.

**Address for correspondence:* Faiths and Civil Society Unit, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK; email: a.dinham@gold.ac.uk

Introduction

Faiths are re-emerging in the public realm (Dinham *et al.*, 2009) in three arena: as contributors to welfare and social services; as contributors to 'community cohesion' through social capital, or as detractors from it through radicalism and violent extremism; and in extended forms of participatory governance such as neighbourhood management. Policy has created new spaces for faiths' engagement locally, regionally and nationally. Though a 'dark side' is reflected in policies for the prevention of violent extremism these concerns are largely compartmentalized in other government departments. UK Labour governments since 1997 emphasized the contribution of faith communities to a 'communities' agenda, and the Coalition Government since 2010 shows every indication of continuing this. People of faith are seen as good at being citizens, and as strong volunteers: they associate, vote, campaign, participate in governance, provide services, network and contribute through social capital to community cohesion (Home Office, 2005).

Policy constructions and perceptions of public faith have been criticized in several important ways: first, for instrumentalizing faith communities in such a way as to exploit them, possibly with damaging consequences to the communities themselves. Alongside this they have been questioned on grounds of overstating the resources they perceive in the first place; second, for enlisting faith communities to policy goals which narrow their ambitions for social change; third, to reach public positions on policy matters demands processes of deliberation. There are debates about the differing capacities and amenabilities of faith communities to such processes and how difference and dissent affect those communities and are managed within them; fourth, there are differences in organizational and congregational approaches between faith groups and traditions which make it more possible for some than for others to produce and field representatives and leaders in the sorts of neo-liberal policy structures and practices to which they are called. For example, a paid and employed Bishop in the Church of England may be better placed to take a seat on a partnership board than a voluntary Imam. Faith communities' infrastructures affect the 'deliverability' of faith communities to public policy; fifth, some argue that the privileged position awarded to faiths is unwarranted and unfair – if faith groups are invited to the public table, then why not other belief groups and associations. Linked to this are questions about the distinctiveness of the faith contribution. What added value do faiths provide that merits their inclusion in the public realm?; sixth, governments tend to engage with the more visible representatives of the majority faiths, and this risks sidelining smaller groups. The assumption often made at

policy levels of a continuity between the worshipping community, faith leaders and representatives is contested (see Furbey *et al.*, 2006). In particular, within faith communities, women and young people, although active, are less well represented and often have limited power. There are criticisms, too, of faith groups' response to equalities with regard to sexual orientation. It is also the case that some faith-based social action is already far more developed and visible than others and there are differences in power and capacity between traditions. The work of the Salvation Army, Jewish Care and Muslim Hands are examples of influential and powerful bodies. It is the activity going on in neighbourhoods and local communities which can be much harder to 'hear' and this is the focus of this article.

The public role of faiths has proved controversial because it is seen as moving faith from the private sphere back in to the public realm from which, it had been assumed, Enlightenment processes had banished it. This has moved some sociologists to contemplate the 'desecularization' of the West (Berger, 1996).

More generally, there is criticism, too, of 'community' having been hijacked as a vehicle of policy. Clarke and Newman (1997) have written, in this context, of 'the colonization of radical language'. In the case of 'community', it has been argued, this means the rejection of Freireian 'conscientization' in favour of Etzioni's 'communitarianism' (Etzioni, 1993) which recasts 'empowerment' in public policy terms which call for a prescribed, rather than empowered, form of 'citizenship' behaviour. In turn, the idea of the 'faith community' is itself criticized for colluding with a critical assumption that a homogenous 'sector' exists or can exist.

Nevertheless, faiths have a long tradition of working in communities (see Prochaska, 2006; Bowpitt, 2007) and there is now a highly developed policy agenda which recognizes and seeks to work with this (CLG, 2009), which is likely to expand still further in the context of the Coalition Government's emphasis on the 'Big Society'. This poses some challenges and opportunities to that long tradition. Key amongst these is how the faith contribution is understood, valued, used and demonstrated: in short, how it is measured.

Measurers need to know what they value before they measure it. The challenge is to decide what that will be, and why. It is inevitable that faith groups, local partners and policy-makers will emphasize different aspects, which can be expressed as three different 'narratives' of faith-based participation in the public sphere (see Dinham and Lowndes, 2008): while civil servants and their local counterparts might see religions as top–down pyramids, with faith leaders able to mobilize followers and release resources, the religions themselves would see themselves as webs of goals and relationships, among which some but not all would be directed towards public service.

A third model, derived from the Labour government's idea of a Stakeholder Democracy, sees 'faith' as a sector within the voluntary sector, more like a segment of an orange, and needing to demonstrate the same sorts of professionalisms and expertise. From each perspective differing motivations, values, goals and aspirations are enjoined. The relationship between what is valued and what is measured reflects the differences in power which inhere. The measurements that get made will be the ones with the most power. Yet 'value' is often least recognized where it occurs in its smallest units, in local community settings. For this reason what is measured in faith-based contexts must, at least in part, arise from the reflections and values of their own participants and narratives, at local level. This ought to serve as a process of reflection for faith-based actors themselves, as well as simply a process to prove to others their legitimacy as public actors.

Faith-based social action

There is a considerable amount of grey literature on faiths and social action. *Flourishing Communities* (Musgrave, 1999) examines churches' engagement with the UK Government's New Deal for Communities programme for neighbourhood renewal. *Challenging Communities* (Finneron *et al.*, 2001) uses practical examples to analyse church-related community development. *Faiths, Hope and Participation,* (Lewis, 2001) identifies faith groups' holisticism of view, their theological and practical motivations for change, their hopefulness and their wide reach as crucial factors in such work. *A Toolkit for Faith-Based Regeneration Practitioners* (Ahmed *et al.*, 2004), intended for theorists and practitioners, analyses the methods and thinking behind effective faith-based regeneration and practice.

Other resources seek to inform strategic development, including *Neighbourhood Renewal in London: The Role of Faith Communities* (GLE/LCG, 2002), *Faith and Community: A Good Practice Guide for local Authorities* (LGA Publications, 2002), *Faith Makes Communities Work* (Smith and Randolph-Horne, 2000) and *Angels and Advocates: Church Social Action in Yorkshire and the Humber* (CRCYH, 2002).

In the South East, *Beyond Belief* (March 2004) claims that there at least two community action projects for each faith centre in the region. In the East, *Faith in the East of England* (July 2005) identifies 180,000 beneficiaries of faith-based community development. In London, *Neighbourhood Renewal in London: the role of faith communities* (May 2002) identifies 7000 projects and 2200 faith buildings in wider community use. In the West Midlands, *Believing in the Region* (May 2006) reports that 80% of faith groups deliver some kind of service to the wider community. In the North West, *Faith in England's North West* (November 2003) shows that faith communities are running

more than 5000 social action projects. In Yorkshire and the Humber, *Count Us In* (2000) shows that in Hull 90% of churches are involved in social action and *Angels and Advocates* (November 2002) reports that there are 6500 social action projects in churches. In the South West, *Faith in Action* (Patel, 2006) demonstrates that 165,000 people are supported by faith groups in the region by 4762 activities. In the East Midlands, *Faith in Derbyshire (May 2006)* claims that, on average, churches run nine community activities.

These demonstrate a tendency to emphasize economic impacts. A 2005 study commissioned by the North West Development Agency estimates that faith communities in the Northwest generate between £90.7 million and £94.9 million per annum to civil society in the region (North West Regional Development Agency, 2005; see also NWRDA, 2009). Borrowing from economic analyses, others have sought to understand faiths' contribution in terms of social capital. Faith groups are often seen as being 'good at community' (see Furbey *et al*., 2006, for example).

Problems of measurement

A review of the research (Dinham, 2007) observed a wide diversity of terms and language used to describe the activities of faith groups, and a lack of agreement and consensus about what they are actually describing (Table 1).

This lack of definition and shared language inhibits understanding and comparability and, in turn, negatively affects the possibility of measuring and demonstrating value. This diminishes capacity for showing policy-makers and funders the significance of faith-based work. Further, a growing emphasis on economic impact studies risks collusion with the instrumentalization of faiths and an over-emphasis on a narrow canvas of concerns at the same time as implying, by their absence, that where economic impact accounts have not been put forward there is no economic impact (Table 2).

Whilst the evidence affirms the invaluable contribution of faith groups, wide-scale analysis of the breadth and depth of their impact is more problematic. Faith groups are often acutely aware of the need to express what it is they do, to demonstrate their value and increase their visibility. It is important to their power and influence that they can identify, demonstrate, discuss and develop nationally and, for that matter, internationally, the services they provide and the community activities they deliver in a coherent and widely communicable way. The identification of best practice goes some way to explaining and interpreting faith-based contributions. It can also form the basis of a reflective practice which takes account of a broader canvas of concerns than economic or policy evaluations might on

Table 1. Categories of faith-based engagement in England

Advice and counselling
Alcohol abuse
Anti-Racism
Arts and Music
Cafes and drop-ins
Campaigning
Child related
Children, young people and families
Community support (credit unions, drop-ins, counselling, education, drugs, homelessness, crime prevention, ex-offenders)
Crime Prevention
Disability
Drug abuse
Economics/shops/sales
Education and training
Employment and training
Employment/social enterprise
Enterprise
Environment
Faith buildings
Family support
Finance, debt counselling
Governance
Hard to reach groups
Health
Health and Fitness
Health and sport
Homelessness and deprivation
Housing
Local forums of faith
Local issues
Lunch clubs and coffee mornings
Meeting places
Neighbourhood projects
Older people
Partnerships (services)
Partnerships (strategic)
Refugees
Religious-based groups
Social activities
Social capital
Social enterprise
Substance abuse
Support groups (prison/hospital)
Support network
Uniformed
Vulnerable groups
Women
Young people

Table 2. Numbers of faith-based social action activities, UK-wide

Type of social action	Number of initiatives
Child, family, young people	1681
Community support	1595
Education and training	1126
Arts and music	1032
Health	671
Homelessness and housing	525
Campaigning	506
Employment and training	406
Older people	372
Social activities	305
Alcohol related	297
Drugs	292
Crime prevention	274
Social enterprise	240
Advice and counselling	239
Anti racism	227
Support groups	222
Environment	196
Finance, debt and legal	193
Economic activity	163
Cafes, drop ins, coffee mornings, lunch clubs	161
Women	104
Transport	99
Local issues	52
Refugees	44
Men	42
Disability	21

Source: These data are derived from a range of regional sources reviewed in Dinham (2007) *Priceless, Unmeasureable: faith and community development in 21st century England* (FbRN). They are aggregated to give an overall indication of the frequency of the range of activities. They are not exhaustive. The aggregation is crude because there are currently no national data sets nor modes for achieving them which can ensure comparability.

their own achieve. With regards to an overarching analysis, our review highlights several methodological obstacles.

Language

First, many faith communities are doing similar activities but calling them different things. In particular many are conducting community development work without necessarily calling it that. As Table 1 (above) shows, our review found at least forty-eight categories of activities in which faith communities are engaged, revealing the inconsistency of usage across the regions. For example, London reports 31% of projects are youth clubs or play groups and a further 6% deal with family support, whilst the report

for the North East has the categories 'children' (7%) and 'youth' (15%), and no 'family support' category, but reports 41% of the projects fall into the very general category of 'community support', which includes credit union, drop-ins, counselling, education, drugs, homelessness, crime prevention and ex-offenders, some of which is presumably support for families. This makes it difficult for projects to potentialize opportunities for partnership, linking and sharing best practice. It also inhibits the engagement of wider public bodies and agencies.

Comparability

This problem of language and categorization leads to a problem of comparability. For example, what one faith group may describe broadly as 'elderly' projects, another may describe as 'social', 'luncheon club' or 'health related'. Because the terms differ so much from place to place, and from study to study, it is very unlikely that the same things are meant from one conversation to another. This makes it impossible to identify quantitatively the level of projects of particular types, and the needs they reflect. Likewise, it is hard to identify qualitatively what is meant by the type of activity described and, comparatively, how activities are distributed between regions, towns, cities and rural areas. This also inhibits the possibilities of comparing faith-based activities to community needs as identified in indices of deprivation.

Analysis

This problem leads to an analysis challenge. Since data are analysed in highly differentiated ways from place to place, comparison and generalizability are very difficult. This resides in part in numerical differences. In the East of England, for example, data were gathered as percentages of numbers of projects reporting doing work in a number of pre-set categories (EEFC, 2005). Many respondents indicated positively to more than one category for the same work and this has resulted in a percentage total of many more than 100 in some cases. This makes numerical reading of faith-based community activity problematic. This can obscure the facts as well as damage the credibility of impact claims.

Sampling

As well as differences in counting and presenting commonly, sampling methods vary drastically from one region to the next, too. For example, mirroring representation at strategic levels and in participative governance,

Anglican and Catholic groups are more likely to have the resources and time to ensure their participation in research than smaller faith groups. In some cases sampling has been highly pinpointed. Elsewhere, it has been conducted following random, purposive, snowballing and accidental methods. We found studies which accessed samples through one or two 'gateway' faith communities which is likely to have circumscribed the reach of the sample. Elsewhere research was conducted within particular traditions, reflecting administrative boundaries which are different to those which would be recognized by public policy.

Together and variously, these issues inhibit shared understandings for comparability, reflective learning, and demonstration of the contribution to funders and policy-makers. They also inhibit communication between faith-based practitioners and their public partners in wider society. They can forestall ways of relating activities to needs through the correlation of independent needs analyses to action. These are compelling reasons for re-thinking the ways in which faith-based activity in communities is measured. We embarked upon a process of thinking about this in 2008. In the next section, we consider this process, which is ongoing at the time of writing.

Developing a measurement tool as a process of conscientization

Any deeply shared understanding of the value of faith-based social action needs to embrace the concepts of participation and social justice that inform and motivate the social actions in question. Rather than an external evaluation of faith-based activity, we argue for a 'bottom up' process rooted in a community development approach. A genuine shared understanding of the 'faith contribution' and its measurement can be best arrived at through a process akin to Freireian 'conscientizing' in community contexts (Freire, 1985). This refers to a bringing to the surface through participatory processes of what is being done, what to call it, what motivates it and what is valuable about it. This is inspired by Freireian thinking, following the values he espouses of empowering participation as a basis for learning and understanding one's aspirations, talents and skills for meeting them, and the political context which determines the degree of power held over their exercise. This would, we propose, form the basis of what to measure or look for and how to account for that in a publicly transparent way. A research process rooted in critical reflective appraisal thus seeks to help faith communities themselves to sharpen their understanding of their own work, to reflect constructively on their usefulness and effectiveness, what the challenges are and how things might need to change or develop.

This focus on conscientization sets the issue of measurability firmly in the context of a broad interpretation of 'value' to consider not only economic benefit, but other benefits too. At the centre of such an approach is the desire to capture the value of the 'faith contribution' from more than an instrumental perspective, to examine what faiths do as they see it themselves. It is to assert the power to be heard on terms other than those determined by policy-makers and funders, and at local level. Such a measurement tool looks beyond the confines of the public services provided by faith groups to enhance the critical edge of faith groups by bringing into focus what they do more widely for the individuals and communities around them. As well as articulating what faith groups contribute to public life, such a process should seek to understand what additional resources, infrastructure and relationships they require to maintain and expand their work. Thus, the 'conscientization' process is much more than a mere evaluation and demonstration of activity for the benefit of funders and policy-makers. Neither is it merely a process of navel-gazing by people of faith fantasizing about a policy milieu which embraces their beliefs. Rather, measurement and evaluation are recast as a community process of value to faith communities and the reflective evolution of their practices, values and contributions more widely.

Our expectation was that neither economic nor social capital analyses alone would capture the whole value. We began to seek to explore this with a broad-based consultative workshop in summer 2008 in which we used participatory techniques to draw together a basis for measurement. We wanted to 'induce' an approach which came from the bottom up and reflected and took account of those things which are valued by faith groups in community and social action settings, as well as to explore ways of achieving 'measurement' which are reflective as well as demonstrative. We report on this here to highlight the range of measurements which could be made. We hope to draw attention to how measurements reflect landscapes of power. We hope this will help measurers move towards a methodology, but we recognize that this is not yet a method. That is the next step.

The process involved a day-long workshop in summer 2008, followed by consultation via the nine English regional faith forums. We invited twenty participants: faith-based community practitioners, community development workers in non-faith-based settings, academics in community development and social policy, and policy-makers from the relevant central government department Communities and Local Government). They were a purposive sample, invited because of their expertise and experience. The workshop was facilitated by a community development worker trained in participatory techniques. In the first session we focused on eliciting key ways in which faith-based activity contributes in community settings

generally. Practices were organized thematically by the group and each theme was organized in to a smaller number of 'domains'. These were subsequently ascribed narratives, with indicative examples, to set out what they meant and what they might look like. These domains, with narratives, were shared with members of each of the nine English regional faiths forums, which work with faith-based community initiatives in their areas, via the forum directors. This should be understood as a process of research to understand what faith communities think should be measured and what values should underpin measurement approaches. It is hoped that this will form a basis for translating this in to a method itself subsequently.

The process identified five key domains, in which faith-based activities should be measured: Building community; Spirituality and well-being; Reach; Networks, reciprocity and trust; and Economic contribution. Each domain highlights a range of concerns relating to faith-based practice, and a possible menu for measurement.

Building community

This domain was identified as needing a broad interpretation of 'community' rooted in the community development principles of empowerment, participation and inclusion. Participants in the workshop felt that only a measurement tool which explored 'community building' in these broad terms would either capture the faith contribution or be useful to the faith communities' own reflective learning and development. The group resolved to identify concrete indicators of 'community building' and wanted to consider the contribution that faith groups make to building community in the following specific ways: their contribution would be in neighbourhoods where people from a diversity of backgrounds participate; there would be a focus on how power and wealth is distributed, in keeping with social justice, through the organization and provision of good services; people would have a voice that could be regularly heard and acted upon; needs would be known and met; there would be environmental awareness and responsibility; and people would feel happy and safe. Examples of indicators of these having been achieved include: the provision of services and support to all the present faith communities and to people not of faith; faith groups are leading activities in the community which help people gain the knowledge, skills and confidence to participate in community activity; running groups that are led by faith community members (as opposed to clergy and leaders) or organizing advice or training on skills for community leadership; providing occasions for people from different faith, cultural or ethnic backgrounds to meet and get to know about each others' ideas and

traditions; running local environmental projects focused on action as well as on motivations; and looking at the community's level of engagement with local agencies and bodies and how that is received and experienced.

Spirituality and well-being

Participants in the workshop saw faith communities as playing a particular role in promoting awareness of some of their most important ideas about being human together: for example, love, neighbourliness, generosity, forgiveness. In this sense they felt that they can contribute to an ethos, awareness or sense of meaning and significance in life, our responsibilities to each other and to the world. They identified the following as likely indicators: there are educational activities which teach the stories, wisdom, values and moralities of faith such as Sunday school or workshops and seminars; there are activities which give a voice to the moral and ethical issues that concern faith communities and their connection to concerns articulated in secular settings; they try to influence what happens in the area by participating in formal bodies connected with government, consultation events or research; faith groups are challenging, through consultation or campaigning, decisions and actions which affect community members, both faith and non-faith, for example in health, transport, planning or education; they are visibly present through prison or hospital visits, social events and befriending schemes; they provide a focus for community celebration, grief and the marking of the life cycle.

Reach

Participants in the workshop felt that faith communities are sometimes the only point of contact for some people in need. They said that in many areas there are groups of people that mainstream services and organizations have abandoned, forgotten or find 'hard to reach'. In particular it was felt likely that some constituencies may not reach, or want to reach, services and initiatives in any other way than through a faith community. This raises important debates about whether, for example, single faith services, or services for women only, should be valued (and positively measured) where faith groups ask for them as a condition of accessing them. This in turn poses challenges for faith-based and other community workers whose concern remains to develop a close and relational community rather than facilitating 'pockets' of parallel experience.

Networks, reciprocity and trust

This domain emphasizes the relationships in a community. Workshop participants were concerned with measuring the things people of faith do that

help build those relationships. The key elements identified as valued by faith groups themselves are trust and reciprocity – knowing that people can be depended upon and that the contributions everybody makes will be shared for the wider good. As well as registering the relationships a faith group has with other bodies and networks, a reflective process should help groups to evaluate the level of trust and support generated within their community and in their wider networks.

Economic contribution

Faith in England's Northwest: Economic Impact Assessment (NWRDA, 2005) found that the typical resources which faith groups can offer are local networks, leadership and management capacity, buildings with potential community use and volunteers. Effective measurement of this contribution must include volunteer time as well as numbers of paid staff, use of buildings by the wider community (including that which is given free of charge) and the value created by tourism and heritage. The workshop we convened concluded that it is probably of value to measure and demonstrate the economic contribution but with two important caveats: first, that the measurement would be open to criticism for being somewhat contrived, speculative and inaccurate; second, that it risks overemphasizing the financial contribution made by faith groups in such a way as to obscure the relational dimensions which are at least as important.

This reflective process led us to a number of conclusions. First, measuring or identifying what faiths do in communities can help them to demonstrate their value – and their needs – to the people they work with. This may include partners, funders, practitioners and policy-makers. This in itself might augment their power as public partners and actors. Second, it can help faith communities themselves to sharpen their understanding of their own work, to reflect constructively on their usefulness and effectiveness, what the challenges are and how things might need to change or develop.

However, we also found that there are significant reasons why such an exercise should be embarked upon with caution. First, why is it important that faith communities 'demonstrate' their contribution at all? Should we not simply accept that their role is valuable and additional on the basis of the differential evidence already available?

Second, while it might provide faith communities with evidence to support their requests for funding and support, for some this could seem like 'selling out' – focusing only on the economic value, turning faiths into little more than deliverers of public services and, in turn, blunting their critical edge by providing money or contracts with strings attached. On the other

hand, such a tool, rooted in the values of conscientization, should enhance critical edge by bringing in to focus what faith communities do.

Third, we could wonder how this tool might reflect all sorts of assumptions and normativities. If we measure certain things, and forget to look at others, what will we miss and how will that disadvantage those whose work is valuable but invisible to the usual research tools? This reflects the power of measurement. It is also important in relation to the ways in which different faith communities are organized. Some are very structured with clergy, officers or leaders who can be identified as the person to respond to research enquiries and evaluations. But for others it may be much more difficult to say who is the appropriate person to work with on research, and what the organizational context is that is being measured. The relationship between the 'voice' and the 'voiced' will not always be clear. Measurement research should be clear about who participates in the sample and how they will be reached, and what this might mean for the sorts of data built up.

Fourth, there is a danger that a research process of this kind might emphasize the 'samenesses' at the expense of difference. By using standardized words and definitions is there a danger that we miss some subtlety and complexity? In seeking to empower, such a process might inadvertently disempower by blunting stories.

These questions boil down to the basic question: why seek shared language and methods at all? There are two main reasons and this is reflected in the fact that a subtle tool would look in two directions. In one direction, it should be focused on providing evidence to government, funding bodies and other partners of what faiths contribute. In the other it supports faiths to think about their contributions systematically, helping them tell powerful stories and identify gaps and needs. In recognition of their situatedness and contingency from setting to setting, the 'domains' approach we have highlighted would provide a framework for use in particular contexts. The core shared basics could be used in many contexts. But within that, it could be modified from the bottom up, sections missed out and questions added which make sense locally. This could produce data which can be compared and shared across many contexts, but also used in ways which are specific to settings.

Conclusion

The process we have explored is one which recognizes the normativities inherent in didactic research processes with single tools and modes of analysis. It also surfaces the power dynamics and risks inherent in the impetus to 'measure'. We recognize the potential value of a shared language

and approach which builds understanding from the grass roots up, demonstrating value on the way, but sharing round learning and, in the process, generating reflection and evaluation of existing practices in community settings. This reflects the values of community development, broadening the terms of measurability, rebalancing the financial emphasis and promoting its ownership and generation by local actors. It promises findings which demonstrate value clearly and comparably and on terms set by faith groups themselves. But it also leads to findings which can form the basis of active reflection in a continuous process of conscientization. The challenge next is to move from methodology to method, and to imbue measurement with the recognition that it is in itself an act of power.

Adam Dinham is Director of the Faiths and Civil Society Unit, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK.

Martha Shaw is Researcher in the Faiths and Civil Society Unit, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK.

References

Ahmed, R., Finneron, D. and Singh, H. (2004) *A Toolkit for Faith-Based Regeneration Practitioners*, GLE, London.

Berger, P. (1996) Secularism in Retreat, *National Interest*, **46**, Winter, 3–12.

Bowpitt, G. (2007) 'Faith & Public Services: historical dimensions', paper presented at an ESRC Seminar at DeMontfort University, Leicester, UK, 26 February 2007.

Clarke, J. and Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State: power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare*, Sage, London.

Communities & Local Government (2009) *Face to Face, Side by Side: A framework for Partnership in Our Multifaith Society*, CLG, London.

Dinham, A. (2007) *Priceless, Unmeasureable: Faith-based Community Development in England in the 21st Century*, FbRN, London.

Dinham, A., Furbey, R. and Lowndes, V., eds. (2009) *Faith in the Public Realm: Controversies, Policies and Practices*, Policy Press, Bristol.

Dinham, A. and Lowndes, V. (2008) Religion, resources, and representation: three narratives of faith engagement *in British Urban Governance*. *Urban Affairs Review*, **43** (6), 817–845.

East of England Faiths Council (EEFC) and the University of Cambridge (2005) *Faith in the East of England: A Research Study on the Vital Role Played by Faith Communities in the Social, Economic and Spiritual Life of a Region*.

Etzioni, A. (1993) *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda*, Crown Publishers, NY.

Faith in Derbyshire (May 2006). *West Midlands Faiths Forum*.

Finneron, D., Green, L., Harley, S. and Robertson, J. (2001) *Challenging Communities: Church Related Community Development & Neighbourhood Renewal*, CUF/CCWA, London.

Freire, P. (1985) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Furbey, R., Dinham, A., Farnell, R. and Finneron, D. (2006) *Faith as Social Capital: Connecting or Dividing?*, Policy Press & Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Bristol.

Greater London Enterprise (GLE) & London Churches Group (LCG) (2002). *Neighbourhood Renewal in London: The Role of Faith Communities, LCG for Social Action/GLE*.

Home Office (2005) *Citizenship Survey*, Home Office, London.

Lewis, J. with Randolph-Horne, E. (2001) *Faiths, Hope and Participation: Celebrating Faith Groups' Role in Neighbourhood Renewal*, New Economics Foundation/CUF, London.

Local Government Association (2002) *Faith and Community: A Good Practice Guide for local Authorities*, LGA Publications.

Musgrave, P. (1999) *Flourishing Communities*, CUF, London.

North West Regional Development Agency (2005) *Faith in England's North West; Economic Impact Assessment*.

North West Regional Development Agency (2009) *Faith in England's North West; How Faith Communities Contribute to Social and Economic Well-being*.

Patel, P. (2006) *Faith in Action in the South West – A Survey of Social and Community Action by Faith Groups in the SouthWest of England*, DCLG.

Prochaska, F. (2006) *Christianity and Social Service in modern Britain: the disinherited spirit*, OUP, Oxford.

Smith and Randolph-Horne, D. (2000) *Faith Makes Communities Work*, GLE, London.

Yorkshire & the Humber Churches Regional Commission (2002) *Angels and Advocates: Church Social Action in Yorkshire and the Humber.*