



UNIVERSITY OF  
GLOUCESTERSHIRE

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

**Bryan, Hazel (2017) Developing the political citizen: how teachers are navigating the statutory demands of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and the Prevent Duty. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 12 (3). pp. 213-226. doi:10.1177/1746197917717841**

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197917717841>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1746197917717841>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/4582>

#### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

## **Developing the political citizen: how teachers are navigating the statutory demands of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and the Prevent Duty.**

*Hazel Bryan, University of Gloucestershire*

### **Abstract**

The 'Revised Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales' (2015) presents statutory guidance under section 29 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. This guidance states that "Schools should be safe spaces in which children and young people can understand and discuss sensitive topics, including terrorism and the extremist ideas that are part of terrorist ideology, and learn how to challenge these ideas. The Prevent Duty is not intended to limit discussion of these issues" (DfE, 2015, p. 11). The Prevent Duty also requires schools to identify pupils at risk of radicalization and have in place "robust safeguarding policies" (DfE, 2015, p.11). Schools that are unable to satisfy OfSTED will be subject to 'intervention' (maintained schools) or 'termination of funding' (academies and free schools).

This article explores the interplay between the statutory requirement to provide opportunity for pupils to debate and explore issues relating to citizenship in the public sphere in the light of religious and political discourses and the statutory requirement to monitor and report potential 'vulnerable' pupils. It asks what measures are employed to judge 'vulnerability' and 'risk' when they are encouraged to promote debate and active political engagement. The article argues that in discharging their Prevent Duty, teachers become self-regulating, 'governmentable subjects' themselves.

**Keywords:** Prevent; Prevent Duty; Counter-Terrorism and Security Act; Governmentality; teachers

### **Introduction**

At the heart of the 'Revised Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales' (2015) is a dilemma: teachers are on the one hand required to provide opportunity for students to debate and explore issues relating to terrorism and extremism. In discharging this Prevent Duty teachers need to establish trust in their classrooms. On the other hand, teachers are required to monitor students and refer them to the Channel programme if a student expresses opinions sympathetic to terrorism or displays evidence of radicalisation. This research explores the tensions faced by three senior teachers, all of whom are responsible for enacting the Prevent Duty in their respective schools. The research employs Foucault's concept of Governmentality to explore the relationship between the teachers and the State, and to understand the ways in which the power of the State is enacted. In seeking to understand the tensions teachers are facing in both monitoring students and encouraging students to explore ideas, the research reveals the means by which the State regulates at a distance, engineering 'governmentable' subjects through the actions of self-regulating teachers.

## **Origins and influences**

The origins of Prevent (and the subsequent Prevent Duty) can be traced back to 2003 (Powell, 2016). Understood to be the brainchild of former Director of the Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) Sir David Ormand, Prevent was an early counter-terrorism response to the terrorist attacks in America in 2001 - to a 'post 9/11' world. Somewhat unformed in 2003 (Thomas, 2015), it was revised in 2006, following the terrorist attacks on London transport networks on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005 (commonly referred to as the '7/7 attacks'). The 2006 iteration was conceived as a 'hearts and minds' approach to countering terrorism (Khaleeli, 2015) whilst the 2011 amendment reformulated the document to include a refusal on the part of Government to engage in dialogue with non-violent extremist ideologies (HM Gov, 2011, p.61). The subsequent 2013 revisions to Prevent place an enhanced focus on ideology as the key factor in the process of radicalisation.

These iterations of Prevent have been revised throughout a period of global terrorist activity. Initiated following the attacks in America in 2001, and reformulated in response to the (7/7) bombings in London, 2006, this period also saw ideas around British-ness begin to be discussed by government. Ruth Kelly, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government from 2006-2007 (also Secretary of State for Education and Skills 2004-2006) called in 2006 for funding allocated to Muslim organisations to reflect 'core British values', respect for the law and freedom of speech. In her Fabian pamphlet co-authored with Immigration Minister Liam Byrne (2006), Kelly also called for a celebration of civic values, local heritage and a 'Britain Day' designed to forge community relations that demonstrate a "commitment to Britain and its people, loyalty to our legal and political institutions, of fairness and open-mindedness, freedom of speech, respect for others and a tradition of tolerance" (2006, p. 7). Kelly and Byrne were explicit in identifying what they believed to be an ideological threat from Islamist extremists, "There is a particular Islamist world view – an intertwining of political and religious identity which, though supported by only a small minority does not allow for any loyalty to any state and instead seeks the restoration of an Islamic Caliphate" (2006, p.8). The distinction between Islam and Islamism was also drawn by Michael Gove (later Secretary of State for Education 2010-2014) in his book *Celsius 7/7*. Gove's charge was that the Muslim Association of Britain was acting in ways associated with Islamism, and had been influential in driving government policy. Ideas around British identity, British characteristics and values were being discussed at the highest level of government during the evolution of the four versions of Prevent.

Neo-conservative think tanks have also arguably played an influential role in the evolution of Prevent, and in some cases, in promoting the position that radicalization is primarily a result of religious ideology (Powell, 2016). The Policy Exchange, founded by a group that included Michael Gove (who acted as the Exchange's first Chairman) challenged the way in which non-violent extremism was absent from counter-terrorist policy and as a consequence this it is now included alongside violent extremism in the 2011 Prevent iteration. Similarly, the Policy Exchange was

critical of engagement with extremist groups and Government has now stated that there will be no such engagement (HM Gov 2011, p. 60). Gove himself has also long argued for the promotion of British values (Gove, 2006) and 'fundamental British values' are now to be promoted by all state employed teachers (DfE, 2012).

Further influence on the evolution of Prevent has come from the Director of the Centre for Social Cohesion, Douglas Murray, who also called for British values to be taught as a counter narrative: the latest iteration of Prevent now proposes this. These suggestions are further advanced by the Quilliam Foundation, who argue that there are four key contributors to radicalization, including a range of perceived grievances, crisis of (British) identity, the existence of a legitimising ideology and exposure to those who advocate such an ideology" (Quilliam Foundation, 2016). There is now a statutory requirement for teachers to promote fundamental British values within and outside of school (DfE, 2012), and in line with the Quilliam position, non-violent extremism is now included in Prevent policy.

Whilst there is clear synergy between many themes proposed by government and influential think tanks, the evolution of Prevent has also generated tensions.

### **Tensions**

Prevent has been widely questioned as a counter - terrorism strategy. Some have suggested that rather than a counter-terrorism strategy, it is more akin to a counter-insurgency strategy (Miller and Sabir, 2012). Baroness Eliza Manningham-Buller, former Head of M15, expressed her concern that Prevent is 'not working', and that Government is poorly placed to counter terrorist ideology, "I am not convinced of the value of putting Prevent on a statutory footing...I cannot see how legislation can really govern hearts, minds and free speech" (Manningham-Buller, 2015). Giving evidence at the Joint Commission on Human Rights in March 2016, Lord Carlisle of Berriew suggested that the key problem with enacting Prevent had been inconsistency of approach. Also giving evidence at the same meeting, David Anderson QC (reviewer of UK anti-terrorism laws) suggested that there is an "acute crisis of confidence about the Prevent Duty in schools". He drew attention to the vulnerability teachers are feeling, citing the example of a teacher in the North West of England who had previously discussed ISIS with her students, "she says that if that happens now, you absolutely choke off the discussion because the teachers are watching their backs and do not want to be reported". Anderson goes on to ask why these issues are not being 'ventilated', "in a controlled manner in a space where ideas can be challenged in the way ideas have to be challenged if they are going to be dismissed". Anderson refers also to the fear experienced by Muslim parents who feel unable to discuss terrorism with their children for fear that the child will misrepresent the discussion at school and "some half-trained teacher misrepresents that and thinks they had better be safe and make a Prevent referral...the whole family could be in trouble". In this Anderson invokes Article 9 of the European Convention (the right to express ones religion).

The monitoring of pupils on line, in-class discussions and pupils' general demeanour is also explored by Anderson in relation to Article 8 of the European Convention (the

right to a private life), “just how far is this monitoring expected to go...sounds a bit like profiling”. This aspect of Prevent has also been raised by Elshimi (2015) who suggests that Prevent has become essentially a programme of surveillance and intelligence-gathering. At the same time Prevent is presented as a battle of ideas (Powell, 2016).

A further criticism of Prevent is that it articulates a limited understanding of the processes of radicalisation. The factors that contribute to radicalisation have been mapped by Crenshaw (1981) to include:

1. individual motivation and belief system
2. decision making and strategy within terrorist movement
3. wider political and social context within which terrorist movements interact.

A key criticism of Prevent is that it engages only with stage one of Crenshaw’s model, focusing solely on the individual and their belief system, expressed as ‘ideology’ in the text; as a consequence, attention to political and social grievances is not embedded within Prevent (Hussan, 2016). Whilst Hussan makes a well-founded point in relation to belief systems, Prevent engages with none of the models of radicalisation in a systematic fashion. Similarly, the role of context (social and political) is not addressed in Prevent and Gunning and Jackson (2011) argue that this, and the role of belief in the process of radicalisation should be more fully analysed. As Powell suggests, “one must look at the socio-political and economic contexts in which religious actors refer to ethnical constructs” (Powell, 2016, p.58). Radicalisation is contested as a concept and has shown to be unstable and deeply politicised, shrouded in a complexity that is arguably absent in Prevent.

A more complex portrayal of the process of radicalization is articulated by the Quilliam Foundation: “radicalisation of all varieties (Islamist, far right, violent, non-violent) is made more likely where an individual is exposed to an ideology, often justified in reference to a fabricated narrative about recent history and current affairs; where the individual encounters an individual or group (either in real life or virtually) who can articulate that ideology and relate it to the individual’s personal circumstances and context; where an individual doubts their British identity or sense of belonging in this country; and, fourthly, where an individual perceives a grievance (real, imagined or exaggerated) to which there seems to be no suitable response”(Quilliam Foundation, 2016).

The latest Prevent document states that there will be no platform for views that differ from British values (HM Gov 2015, c7). As Powell points out, there is an irony in Government policy that advocates liberty, tolerance and respect and yet closes down discussion of views that differ from those articulated in Government policy.

In seeking to counter the narrative of terrorism, Prevent offers a counter narrative of ‘British values’ as a means by which citizens can articulate belonging. This counter narrative has come under scrutiny and criticism. The Quilliam Foundation suggests that the narrative of British values is “ambiguous and contentious” (2015, p.4), and that it has “all the makings of a selective legal ambiguity that we absolutely cannot

afford to base policy on” (2015), offering instead a counter-narrative of human rights. Quilliam notes that although a lacuna exists in knowledge of the processes of radicalisation, they nevertheless propose a conceptual framework to address the process and at the heart of this is a human rights narrative.

Nevertheless, the latest version of Prevent stresses the role of ideology in the process of radicalisation. Raised first by former Prime Minister David Cameron at the Munich Security Conference in 2011, ideology was presented as a central problem, ‘We have got to get to the root of the problem, and we need to be absolutely clear on where the origins of these terrorist attacks lie. That is the existence of an ideology, Islamist extremism... the ideology of extremism is the problem’ (Cameron, 2011). This position has been interrogated by Powell who holds the view that people are not exploited by radical ideology, but rather ‘it is about how people see the world because of how they have experienced the world’ (Powell, 2016, p.57). Some argue that there is no evidence of a link between radicalisation and ideology (Bjorgo and Horgan, 2009) and others argue that the focus on ideology is ill informed (Armstrong (2015). A more balanced view is presented by the European Commission supporting the prevention of radicalisation leading to violent extremism, when they argue that “ideological and religious factors are one of many possible drivers of radicalisation” (European Commission, 2016).

A further contested dimension of Prevent is the proposal to have no engagement with violent or non-violent extremists. This was articulated in former Prime Minister David Cameron’s Munich Security Conference speech of 2011 where he proposed that organisations should be judged on their record of human rights (including for women and people of other faiths), democracy and integration: “Fail these tests and the presumption should be not to engage with organisations - so, no public money, no sharing of platforms with ministers at home” (Cameron, 2011). In contrast, others have argued that non-engagement with such groups is a flawed strategy (Esposito, 2011; Macleod, 2016).

Prevent then, has been criticised for being a counter-insurgency strategy rather than a counter terrorism strategy, for its inconsistency, for the crisis of confidence it has wrought on teachers in schools and the insecurity it has created in some families. It has been criticised for operating as a system of surveillance and profiling, and for its arguably limited portrayal of the processes of radicalisation. Some have argued that it has failed to address political and social contextual issues, for offering a weak, poorly defined counter-narrative of ‘British values’, for foregrounding ideology erroneously and for offering no platform for dialogue with some organisations. Within this complex and contested context, teachers are required to act out their Prevent Duty, to ensure pupils in their care do not become radicalised. They must promote fundamental British values within and outside of the classroom (DfE, 2012), be able to identify the signs of radicalisation and know when to refer a pupil to the Channel programme.

## **The role of education**

The training of teachers in their Prevent Duty includes an on-line course, the successful completion of which is recognised with a Training Course Certificate. These normally remain valid for two years, and the range of providers includes government and other child protection organisations, some of which charge for the course. The UK government requires teachers to undergo Prevent Duty training but schools are permitted to organise the Prevent requirements in ways that suit them – there is no particular organisational requirement. In addition to on-line training, in-service sessions on teachers' Prevent Duty are locally determined. In terms of the management of the Prevent Duty, many schools include the Prevent Duty under their Safeguarding policies and in some schools a pastoral manager assumes frontline responsibility for this relatively new area of Safeguarding. In terms of providing spaces for students to explore and debate ideas, schools are free to address this in a variety of ways. However, there is a sense that this is a UK-centric approach, where schools are inward looking rather than networking to share practice. In March 2015 education ministers and the European Commission adopted the "declaration on promoting c12 and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education" (EU, 2015). This declaration proposed that schools have a key role to play as they are deeply situated within communities. The European Commission is developing a network across member states to engage young people in order that they can discuss and debate their experiences and views. Teachers have been identified as particularly important in this endeavour, and there is an intention to promote teacher exchanges across Europe. The European Commission into the prevention of radicalization leading to violent extremism held in Brussels in June 2016 reported that, in response to intelligence on new trends in radicalisation across Europe, the EU had funded a range of projects to better understand the processes of radicalisation. It concluded "in the long run, high quality education from pre-school onwards remains the best safety net against social exclusion, what can be for some a factor in radicalisation" (2016, p. 9). A review of current practice across EU member states shows some similarities with the Prevent training. In France, for example, teachers must now teach the values of the Republic, and students will have 300 hours of education in ethics, morals and French values between the ages of 6-18 years. A citizen's army has been recruited, the 'National Education Citizen Reserve' and President Francois Hollande has promised to strengthen the values of the Republic in schools. Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, Minister for National Education, Higher Education and Research announced the 'Great Mobilisation of the School for Values of the Republic', which will teach community spirit, a culture of commitment and social interaction. The 'parcours citoyen' programme will involve teachers, school managers and staff leading activities on discipline (the regulation of individual and collective behaviour), freedom (diversity of opinion and beliefs) and community (social and political relationships). In contrast, a de-radicalization programme entitled Hayat (translated as 'life' in Arabic) is available to all members of German society and Islam is now taught in schools in such a way as to counter prejudice: German teachers now have specific training in the teaching of Islam. In contrast again, the Flemish training centre Arktos was awarded 100,000 Euros by the Belgian education ministry to develop 'Connect', a programme that is available to school managers and teachers

to assist with individual cases of radicalisation. It is available to any Dutch-speaking school in Flanders and Brussels.

An analysis of these four countries' approaches indicates that the state has led each respective initiative. In Belgium the state has funded the Connect programme but has empowered teachers to initiate contact should they require assistance. In Germany, teachers are required to undertake specific training but beyond this, there is little intervention. France and the UK, however, have state control threading through their respective approaches: in the UK this is sealed by the inspection framework enacted through the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). In Britain, the model of state control of the Prevent Duty has enshrined this in policy - it is a statutory requirement, and particular practice is ensured as it is subject to inspection. That said, there are lacunae in knowledge relating to the process of radicalisation and conflicts are writ throughout the Prevent strategy as evidenced above. There is also little research into teachers' practice in relation to the Prevent Duty, in how schools are generating their own knowledge and discourses in relation to radicalisation, and how they are evolving practices designed to ensure their Prevent Duty is discharged. These are issues of state control, and of what Foucault referred to as 'governmentality'.

### **Governmentality**

Foucault's concept of Governmentality, developed through a series of lectures at the College de France between 1977-1984, articulates liberal democratic governments' attempts to "shape human conduct by calculated means" (Murray Li, 2007, p. 275). Foucault argued that the purpose of government was to ensure the "welfare of the population, the improvement of its condition, the increase of its wealth, longevity, health et cetera" (Foucault, 1991, p.100). Whilst it would be impossible to bring this about through coercion within a liberal democracy, Governmentality demonstrates how the conduct of a given population is nevertheless determined: "When power operates at a distance, people are not necessarily aware of how their conduct is being conducted or why, so the question of consent does not arise" (Murray Li, 2007, p. 275). At the heart of Governmentality is the concept of Technologies of Power. These are the processes that influence and normalise a population's behavior (Rose, 1999). Enacted via institutions such as schools, Technologies of Power determine social mores and, perforce, conduct. In this way, they engineer a 'governmentable' subject. Foucault makes the case for Governmentality as a particular form of power in the West where policy is modelled and enacted within given institutions; the practices of government are acted out and thus reinforced. In this way the state becomes 'governmentalised' and individuals permit the state to govern them. Foucault suggests that a consequence of this institutional influence is self-regulation. The individual takes on the role of the state in self-governance and in this way the state regulates conduct at a distance. And so, whilst sovereign power has a concern with territory, and disciplinary power has a concern with coercion and



preventative measures, Governmentality has concern with the willing participation of the governed who enjoy free conduct and exercise self-limitation. Freedom, though, requires “the management and organization of the conditions in which one can be free” (Foucault, 2008, p. 63).

Governmentality, then, encompasses on the one hand an awareness of the processes of government that bring about desired conduct of the population, but also a focus on the rationality that underpins these processes: as such, it is interested in the ‘conduire des conduits’ (Foucault, 1994) – the conduct of conduct.

### **Methodology**

In policy, in the literature and in documentation from think tanks the terrorist act and the process of radicalisation are potentially countered by narrative – whether this is the narrative of British values proposed by the UK government, or a human rights narrative advanced, for example, by the Quilliam Foundation. It seems important, then, to use a methodological approach that employs narrative to explore “human practice, shaped by power (and) dominant interests” (Merrill and West, 2009). Narrative Enquiry will enable teachers’ experiences and beliefs to be captured alongside their personal, practical knowledge (Clandinnin and Connelly, 2000) and this will be valuable when exploring the ways in which Prevent and the Prevent Duty are enacted in schools. Narrative enquiry provides the frame within which participants can articulate their identity (personal and professional) in relation to the past, the present and possible future practice. In this, narrative enquiry affords a ‘metaphorical three dimensional narrative enquiry space’ (Clandinnin and Connelly, 2000, p. 50). It seems important to privilege participant’s voices in relation to the Prevent strategy, to enable them to connect with their values in relation to fundamental British values. This emancipatory interview process is complex as it is a narrative owned by the participant, constructed in negotiation with the interviewer (Goodley et al, 2004), and necessarily shaped by powerful political discourses.

Narrative interviews took place with three senior school leaders. One was an assistant principal of a secondary academy in the South East of England (known from herein as the ‘first interviewee’), one an assistant principal of a comprehensive school in the South West of England (known from herein as the ‘second interviewee’) and one a Key Stage Leader in a primary school on the outskirts of London (known from herein as the ‘third interviewee’). The sample selected was a blend of criterion sampling in that “all individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon. All individuals meet this criterion” (Creswell, 1998, p. 118). In the case of this research all teachers have a statutory duty to enact their Prevent Duty. This is also an opportunistic sample (Miles and Huberman, 1994) as the three senior leaders’ schools were known to me professionally and we had previously engaged in conversation about Prevent; when the opportunity arose in discussion it seemed wise to request an interview. In biographical and narrative research, the ‘inter’ aspect of the interview is celebrated: the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee should create a “creative space between

people, requiring attention to their emotional qualities as well as conceptual insights” (Merrill and West, 2009, p.114).

All three interviewees had some responsibility for oversight of the Prevent strategy in their respective school, although only two were in fact directly involved in teaching aspects of the strategy. The participants were approached because they were senior leaders and therefore were likely to have some strategic responsibility for Prevent. Each participant was invited to take part in a semi-structured interview that lasted, on average, 40 minutes and in each case the approach was designed to facilitate ‘empowering narratives’ (Goodley et al, 2004, p. 99). It was essential to assure anonymity and confidentiality, not least because the participants were dealing with sensitive issues relating to terrorism and radicalisation, as well as potentially opposing (although enacting) statutory requirements enshrined in the Teachers’ Standards (DfE 2012) and the Counter Terrorism and Security Act, 2015. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and stored securely within the University.

### **The interviews**

In the spirit of Narrative Enquiry each interview will be considered for emergent themes holistically before a discussion of themes that weave throughout all three interviews. In this way the data will not be ‘fractured’ as it is important to retain the individual voices of the participants. The “overall form, the gestalt of lives” (Merrill and West, 2009, p. 136) is best understood through this approach that draws on the work of the German biographical-interpretive school in seeking patterns, life stories and meaning in data.

The first interviewee described the approach to the Prevent Duty as a ‘team approach’. She explained that all members of the Senior Leadership Team, all pastoral managers and all ‘ground floor managers’ had undertaken the on-line training. She also explained that the school had set up an internal IT system so that key words were triggered: on-line safety was of particular concern at this school.

The first interviewee explained that opportunities for students to debate and discuss ideas took place during Tutor Time as there are no Citizenship lessons in the school, although she felt that the approach was “information – based rather than exploration based”. The school also addresses radicalisation in assemblies, but again, the first interviewee felt that, on reflection, the approach adopted was “this is what it is...watch out”. She made it very clear that the senior leadership team was reviewing how this is approached, although they were satisfied with their ‘cautious and reactive’ approach to student comments and behaviours, “we take a clear line with racist comments...we always exclude for that kind of thing”. This interviewee was adamant that the school was under-resourced in relation to Prevent: she felt that they stood “no chance” of addressing the root problems that for her emerged from within the community because although the school sees itself as ‘of’ the community, there is no resource to address this complex issue. When asked about the promotion of fundamental British values, the first interviewee responded, “oh well we do but my heart is not in it. I don’t like the term. Values are deeper than the country you live in - that is why the International Baccalaureate is such a good thing”.

This interviewee linked her feelings back to her views on the local community, “The trouble with any narrative is it’s not relevant if it’s not from the community”. She explained that she had tried to weave ideas of British-ness into the tutor programme, but that it felt like just another initiative, “for me it’s another one of the pom-poms you throw at a Velcro board: some things will stick”. When invited to elaborate on teaching British values she laughed, “I haven’t been hanging up Union Jack bunting!”

When asked if she had a stronger narrative than fundamental British values, this interviewee replied, “...it’s like the parable of the wind and the sun. We put on another shackle – we draw ourselves in tighter. We should be throwing ourselves open and we are closing ourselves off. It’s just more rules to follow”.

She went on to express how this made her feel, “ You can never arm yourself enough...it’s an Achilles – you can put on as much armour but someone will get through”.

In terms of the statutory requirement to promote debate, this school has limited time dedicated for pupils to explore ideas in relation to radicalisation and terrorism: the focus was rather more on information - giving. In terms of the statutory requirement to monitor vulnerable students, this was conceptualised in terms of racist comments, for which exclusion was the solution. There was no discernable tension between either statutory requirement (opening up debate whilst monitoring and referring students) in this first school, largely because the students had scarce opportunity to discuss in any depth their personal views. Ergo, these teachers had limited opportunity to get to know what their students views were or to shape their thinking, to judge vulnerability or risk. In terms of student experiences, interviewee one described her school as one where students were on the receiving end of facts about radicalisation or terrorism, and teachers had limited opportunity to discuss ideas with their students, resulting in a scenario where the ‘vulnerable’ or those at risk are determined by racist comments. Teachers in this school were not compromised by the statutory requirements as they were not immersed with their students in developing ideas.

The second interviewee explained that this academic year is the first year “it’s been made a thing of...this year I’ve heard Prevent mentioned by name”. He explained that the staff had engaged in in-service training and on-line training. In discussion with this interviewee he focused more on his students, and on the ways in which he makes personal decisions about ‘The Line’ and when it is crossed: “quite often students say controversial things, politically incorrect things. It’s probably due to ignorance or because of their parent’s (news) paper. My personal line is, if I could read it in a newspaper I read. If they were explicitly racist, not just poorly educated at home...if they are with a new group of friends. It’s these things in concert”.

This interviewee explained that in his school there was a ‘safeguarding curriculum’ in which there are “lessons on extremism’. In addition, there are two other lessons (not identified to retain anonymity) in which the Prevent Duty is enacted. He explained that teachers give lessons on extremism, and ask students what is meant by extremism. They address Islamic extremism and far-right extremism. They also work with their students to consider how Islam is portrayed in the media.

This interviewee explained that fundamental British values are explored in Citizenship lessons where students are immersed in discussions around British-ness and democracy.

When asked if teachers were nervous tackling such potentially controversial issues, he replied “It’s our job to show these views and give the students the tools to understand why they don’t work – that there is a misaligned view of the world. We see it as part of our job to challenge that”.

This participant felt that it was not incorrect to suggest that radicalisation takes place as a result of ideology, “It’s not wrong to set it up as an ideology: it’s not a fully formed ideology though”. He went on to suggest that “if grievances flourish they get traction ...you might pick up on some EDL ideas (in class from some students) but the ideology gains the traction”.

When asked about fundamental British values, the second interviewee replied “this is a 21<sup>st</sup> Century multi cultural society – our values are quite plastic. You can’t just give a list...people don’t separate legitimate concerns about foreign policy ...they focus on the behaviours of a group that has committed a terrorist act. It’s very complex. Fundamental British values lacks nuance”. In terms of who should lead Prevent, this participant felt it would make more sense if it were to be led by Social Services rather than the Police. In contrast to school one, debate is foregrounded and students are afforded varied opportunities to develop their personal ideas. The monitoring of the vulnerable in this school is constructed as a complex undertaking, where each case is considered individually and ‘the line’ that pupils might cross is troubled over by the teachers. In this school there was a tension between the requirement to open up debate and the requirement to monitor all students and refer vulnerable students to Channel. The measures employed to judge vulnerability and risk centre on the relationships between students and staff and the varied opportunities for discussion afforded to students.

Participant Three explained that in her primary school, enacting the Prevent Duty took place in Social, Moral and Citizenship classes. During assemblies there was a focus on famous British people across a range of professions, classrooms were named after famous British people and at the start of each term pupils learn about famous British monuments.

In terms of Prevent Duty, the school bought in a facilitator and in addition all staff took the on-line course. The interviewee explained that in relation to promoting fundamental British values, “...at first we didn’t know what it was so X went on courses to find out what it was and what we had to do about it”.

This interviewee now felt very comfortable promoting fundamental British values, “ I have the same attitude as the French: come here and live here but we shouldn’t be bending. These are our values. You follow our law and you speak this language because it’s the language of the country. You should accommodate to the language we have”.

Interviewee Three felt confident that she would be able to identify a child who had become radicalised but that ‘The Line’ (when a pupil would be referred to Channel)

would be determined by the Head Teacher. This interviewee went on to explain her concerns, “There are ghettos in this country, groups causing problems for others. I don’t live in that sort of area but I don’t think it’s right that there are groups like that”. In terms of the statutory requirement to provide opportunity for students to discuss and debate ideas in relation to radicalisation and terrorism and the statutory requirement for teachers to refer vulnerable students to Channel, this teacher positioned herself clearly. She articulated a view that her role was to promote fundamental British values – she stressed this clearly – rather than opening up opportunities to debate differing ideas or values. In this she was defining the statutory requirement in her own terms. As a consequence, there was no tension for this teacher between the two statutory requirements as she was not likely to find herself on the one hand encouraging students to explore ideas around radicalisation and terrorism and on the other, monitoring them or referring them to Channel: any referral decision was made by the Head Teacher.

### **Discussion**

Prevent has been criticised for its inconsistency of approach in schools (Berriew, 2016). This research reveals that in terms of teachers discharging their Prevent Duty, there was consistency in terms of training (in fact two schools had exceeded requirements, one primary and one secondary school). There was inconsistency, however, in the opportunity pupils had to debate and explore ideas. The secondary comprehensive school had prioritised opportunities for pupils to immerse themselves in discussion. The secondary academy took a different approach, providing students with factual information but allocating less time to discussion and exploration – there was little opportunity for students to immerse themselves in the issues or find a personal perspective. The primary school had a very different approach, with a focus on the delivery of facts regarding British people and landmarks. This school ‘taught’ and modelled British values throughout the curriculum via areas such as the anti-bullying policy and in this way the promotion of values was integrated into the curriculum.

Both David Anderson QC and Lord Berriew expressed concern about a crisis of teachers’ confidence in relation to Prevent (2016) however no teachers in this study expressed such concerns. Prevent has also been criticised for putting pupils under surveillance and profiling them. The responses of teachers in this study suggested that teachers in the second school took a rather more nurturing approach, where they worked in teams to discuss their students. Teachers in the academy had little opportunity to work closely with their students and were not therefore in a position to profile or monitor behaviours in the way suggested in the literature, and whilst teachers in the primary school were able to monitor and profile, their approach was rather more on the promotion and delivery of all things ‘British’. Worryingly, no teacher interviewed could articulate a process of radicalisation – one asked if she could have a few minutes to go and read her notes in order to answer the question. All three participants suggested that pupils might appear dishevelled or have a new circle of friends, but beyond this there was little factual understanding of radicalisation. In terms of a counter narrative, one teacher identified very strongly with British values, one teacher felt it was a narrative that closed down

opportunities for discussion and one felt it was too 'plastic' for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century multi cultural society.

Foucault's notion of governmentality is helpful here in terms of understanding state control and the consequence for professional educators. It was evident in all three schools that senior leaders had ensured that staff underwent, and in fact exceeded, the Prevent training. In this, the senior leaders were taking on the role of the State and, in turn, ensuring that their staff were taking on the role of the State, seeking to normalise their schools' population behaviours. The promotion of a given set of British values is designed to normalise students' behaviours: in school one, students were provided with information on unacceptable behaviours ("this is it...watch out"); in school two, students were supported in exploring ideas but the interviewee had a clear yardstick by which he measured acceptable views and behaviours; in school three a canon of favoured and famous British people, landmarks and behaviours was promoted. In these endeavours, each school was determining social mores – to a greater or lesser extent – and the conduct of their students in relation to Prevent. Interestingly, whilst all senior leaders in school one were trained and in a position to identify vulnerable, at risk students or 'unacceptable' behaviours, there was in fact less opportunity to determine and/or measure the social mores of its students as the structure of the curriculum afforded little opportunity for teachers to work with students in this. School two was in a stronger position to determine the conduct and shape of the social mores of its students by virtue of the curriculum, as was school three.

None of the participating teachers contested the legitimacy of the Prevent Duty requirements: all three adopted the Duty without question. At no time did they question whether it should be they who are charged with preventing young people from being drawn into radicalisation or the role of the educator in relation to counter-terrorism, and at no time did any one of them query the statutory requirements to open up debate whilst monitoring and potentially referring students to Channel. In this, Foucault's notion of State power operating at a distance is evident; the teachers were self-regulating (Foucault, 1991) and permitting themselves to be both governed and govern. The participating teachers were entirely compliant in their Prevent training, unquestioning in their belief that the role of the teacher is to determine particular social mores and conduct and in this way they are engineering 'governmentable' subjects through their actions in the classroom. It is clear from these teachers that the powerful discourses presented in Prevent have taken on a momentum of their own. It is unlikely that as students they had entered the teaching profession to assume responsibility for preventing pupils from being drawn into radicalisation and yet none of them questioned the authority of the state to require this of them. The most training the participating teachers had received was an online course and an inset session. They had little understanding of the process of radicalisation or terrorism, and yet, again, they did not question the legitimacy of the Prevent Duty to require this of them. As professional educators each one has undergone an Initial Teacher Education programme within which they undertook subject and professional studies. In addition they would have had to pass a practicum. Such rigorous requirements, followed by a probationary year

eventually qualified them to teach their subjects as experts: the state would require no less of professionals entrusted to teach its young people. And yet in the case of Prevent, although only minimum training has been provided and they articulated little understanding of the process of radicalisation, the participating teachers at no time questioned whether this was sufficient to enable them to enact their Prevent Duty.

### **Conclusion**

By employing Foucault's notion of Governmentality to explore the tensions teachers are potentially facing in the contradictory requirements to both open up debate and monitor students, the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and the Prevent Duty therein can be viewed as a Technology of Power. There are two observations to make here.

Firstly, the three participating teachers are leaders in their respective schools. Their professional identity is forged upon three foundations, namely their specialist knowledge and skills, the nature of their work that assumes civic duty and their occupational strength as a group. From these three interviews, no participant questioned the counter-terrorism role they have been given by government. They did not express concern that the enactment of their civic duty was framed in relation to counter-terrorism or question whether they should be promoting a specific set of values in a liberal democracy. Rather, they presented as self-regulating, where their conduct was determined by the State and they in turn sought to determine the conduct of their students; the *conduire de conduit*. Whilst the Prevent strategy has undergone a number of iterations and is in itself deeply contested, the participating teachers articulated no knowledge of this policy context, articulating instead a need for greater resource to more fully enact their Prevent Duty.

Secondly, no participant articulated specialist knowledge in relation to terrorism or the process of radicalisation, and nor did they express a view that this might be needed. It is clear from the literature that the processes of radicalisation are multi-layered and that the model presented in Prevent is challenged. Participating teachers in this study articulated little knowledge of these processes or indeed, a need to understand more fully what the processes are. Whilst teachers and students are networking across Europe, the teachers in this study had no knowledge of this European picture.

The findings from this narrative enquiry research indicate that teachers should have opportunity to understand more fully the contested nature of Prevent as an approach, based on a deeper understanding of the processes of radicalisation. Findings also highlight the ways teachers and students in other countries network. Whilst this would empower teachers as professionals, it would of course, potentially compromise the teacher as governmentable subject.

## References

Anderson, D. (2016). Home Affairs Committee: Oral evidence: Countering extremism, HC 428, 19 January. Available at: <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/homeaffairs-committee/countering-extremism/oral/27257.pdf>. (Accessed November 2016).

Armstrong, K. 2015 in Verkeik, R. (2015). Government deradicalisation plan will brand Muslims with beards as terrorists, say academics. Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/government-deradicalisation-plan-will-brandmuslims-with-beards-as-terrorists-say-academics-10381796.html>. (Accessed November 10 2016).

Bjorgo, T., & Horgan, J. (2009). *Leaving Terrorism Behind: Individual and collective disengagement Political Violence*. Oxon: Routledge

Cameron, D. (2011) Munich Security Conference available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>. Accessed 10 November 2016

Clandinin, D.J and Connelly, F.M. (2000) *Narrative Enquiry*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Crenshaw, M. (1981) The Causes of Terrorism in *Comparative Politics* Vol. 13, No. 4 (Jul., 1981), pp. 379-399

Creswell, J.W. (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Department for Education (DfE) (2012). *The new Teachers' Standards*. London: DfE

Elshimi, M. (2015). Prevent 2011 and counter-radicalisation: What is de-radicalisation? In, Baker-Beall, C., Heath-Kelly, C., and Jarvis, L. Eds. *Counter-Radicalisation: Critical Perspectives*. Oxon: Routledge.

Esposito, J. L. (2011). The Future of Islam and U.S.-Muslim Relations. *Political Science Quarterly*, 126(3), 365-401.

Foucault, M. (1991). 'Governmentality', trans. Rosi Braidotti and revised by Colin Gordon, in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 87–104. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1994) *Dits et Ecrits IV*. Paris: Gallimard



- Foucault, M. (2008) *Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978 - 79*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Clough, P. and Moore, M. (2004) *Researching Life Stories: Method, Theory and Analysis in a Biographical Age*. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Gove, M. (2006) *Celcius 7/7*. London: Phoenix
- Gunning, J. and Jackson, R. (2011). What so 'religious' about 'religious terrorism'? *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 4(3), 369-388.
- Home Office (2011) *Prevent Strategy*. London: The Stationery Office (TSO)
- Home Office (2011) *Counter - Terrorism and Security Act 2015*. London: The Stationery Office (TSO)
- HM Government (2015). *Revised Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales*. London: Home Office.
- Hussain, D. (2016). The serious way forward to 'prevent' terror in Britain. Available at: <http://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/beginning-end-prevent-716599408>. (Accessed November 20 2016).
- Kelly, R., and Byrne, L. (2007) *A Common Place*. London: The Fabian Society
- Khaleeli, H. (2015). 'You worry they could take your kids': is the Prevent strategy demonising Muslim schoolchildren? Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/uknews/2015/sep/23/prevent-counter-terrorism-strategy-schools-demonising-muslim-children>. (Accessed November 20 2016).
- Macleod, A. (2016). If it becomes Islam versus the West after the Brussels attacks, we'll make an enemy of 1.6 billion people. Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/if-it-becomes-islam-versus-the-west-after-the-brussels-attacks-we-ll-make-an-enemy-of-16-billion-a6945996.html>. (Accessed November 2016).
- Manningham-Buller, E. (2015). House of Lords Debate, March 25, (2014-2015) vol. 758, col. 752.
- Merrill, B. and West, L. (2009) *Biographical Methods in Social Research*. London: Sage
- Miles, M.B and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: a sourcebook of new methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Miller, D. and Sabir, R. (2012). Counter-terrorism as counterinsurgency in the UK 'war on terror'. London: Routledge.

Murray Li, T. (2007) Governmentality. In *Anthropoliga*. Vol 49, No 2, pp. 275-281

Powell, L. (2016) Counter-Productive Counter-Terrorism: how is the dysfunctional discourse of Prevent failing to restrain radicalisation? *Journal for Deradicalization*. Fall 2016 No. 8 ISSN 2363 9849

Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, P. (2015). Britain's Prevent Program: An end in sight? In, Jarvis, L. and Lister, M. (Eds.) *Critical Perspectives on Counter-terrorism*. Oxon: Routledge.

