

Counter Terrorism Measures in the Classroom: The Importance of Professionalism, Agency and Autonomy when Enacting the Prevent Duty

Max Weedon, Kathy Mansfield Higgins and Ciaran Burke

Abstract

The Prevent policy was singular and “simple”: to prevent individuals from getting drawn into terrorism, to identify and stop this process before it begins. In the context of the global war on terror and the shadow of terrorist attacks in the USA and England, this was an increasingly growing issue within the media and the broader public discourse. A central institution charged with enacting Prevent in the UK were education institutions (schools, colleges and universities). The rationale being that these places of learning house individuals during impressionable and vulnerable times and the Prevent policy can protect these individuals.

This chapter will provide an alternative critical discussion on Prevent by framing it as the securitization of the UK education sector. As such, Prevent is a form of surveillance and a mechanism of power over educators and learners which carry counterproductive consequences for both. In doing so this chapter will question how education professionals balance their professional identity and their new role in supporting and enacting the Prevent duty. Through developing a new multi-level “Critical Realist World Systems Model”, this chapter will provide a conceptual discussion of Prevent policy more broadly and how education professional navigate the friction between their professional values and legal obligations. This chapter draws on a range of theoretical traditions to begin to question a well-established security policy within English and Welsh educational institutions providing a conceptual starting point to examine similar and future policies.

Key words: Prevent, surveillance, Foucault, critical realism, securitisation, professional identity

Introduction

In 2006 the Blair Labour Government introduced the first Prevent policy, Preventing Violent Extremism. The provision was designed to stop individuals becoming radicalised and to stop these individuals becoming terrorists, as such it was intended as a pre-emptive strategy. It was trailed as pilot of only one year during 2007-8 and then expanded until 2011 when it was revised and re-launched by the then Coalition government. In July 2015 the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act came into force which included a statutory duty on specified authorities to have “due regard to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism”.... (HMG,2015:2) Perhaps one of the most significant changes to the original strategy, which had sought to address all forms of terrorism and violent extremism, was the addition of ‘non-violent extremism, which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists can exploit.’ (HMG, 2015: 2). Clearly this addition presents challenges to all required to deliver this policy within any context of civil rights and particularly of the right to hold views that others may find offensive or extreme, but nonetheless are completely legal points of view. The government went on to issue Prevent duty guidance for all institutions in England and Wales, which, Kundnani (2018) argues requires educational, health and social service professionals to implement counter-terrorism measures within their normal duties. Since then, thousands of public servants have undergone compulsory Prevent training, including across the education sector, and OFSTED inspections prioritise how the Prevent duty has been prioritised by staff.

This chapter is a critical, reflective account of research into the impact of the Prevent security policy which mandates a duty of surveillance on educational professionals in England and Wales. It examines how this central government policy affects teachers/lecturers perceptions of their roles and impacts their professional identity and practices. This chapter is based on research from the lead author’s doctorate entitled: ‘Counter-Terrorism Measure in the Classroom: Exploring the Perceptions and Experienced of Educational Professional Enacting the Prevent duty in Bath and Bristol’. Through the research process a unique multilevel conceptual model: the Critical Realist World Systems Model (CReWS) was developed. The research used a form of critical realist methodology and the methods used included a questionnaire and semi-structured follow-up interviews

with education professionals working in primary, tertiary (Further Education) and higher education in the Bath and Bristol areas.

The chapter begins with an examination of the justification for the adoption of the Prevent policy, followed by considerations on whether it is in fact a counter-productive measure in achieving its aspirations. With this background it then describes the research approach detailing the development of the CREWS model and empirical processes. The chapter focuses on one aspect of the broader findings from the research on examining how professionals engage with Prevent policy. The chapter concludes with a discussion concerning how and why individuals engage in a range of actions as they negotiate the friction between professional values and legal obligations.

Safeguarding the Vulnerable: The Epidemiological Justification for Prevent

A central rationale underpinning Prevent is a discourse of safeguarding vulnerable individuals (Coppock and McGovern, 2014; Heath-Kelly, 2017). As such, the policy assumes that all individuals are potentially vulnerable to radicalisation. This vulnerability extends to young people studying in the UK education system. DeMause (2002) and Lifton (2007) frame this vulnerability and the assumption that these young people may harm themselves or harm society based on problematic conceptualisations on mental health crisis and well-being for young people. As such, we have witnessed the justification of a pre-emptive securitising approach in UK education under the guise of 'safeguarding' and risk management.

In their analysis of Prevent policy, Coppock and McGovern (2014) examine documentation providing guidance on identifying and 'safeguarding' 'vulnerable' children and young people in schools from being drawn into terrorism. They report a problematic construction of 'childhood vulnerability' and equally problematic practices for 'child protection' and 'safeguarding' in the Prevent duty. As such, there are questions to be asked concerning how Prevent defines and supports vulnerability. This is further problematised as these definitions fall under Foucault's (2008) concept of a 'regime of truth' termed, effectively a discourse which is understood to be true and therefore protected from critique. There is a clear need for an exploration of how educational professionals understand and apply these concepts

and recommendations for best practices. Such an examination will provide a greatly needed critical account of a powerful discourse.

Governmentality, Freedom of Speech, and Surveillance: Could Prevent be Counterproductive?

Lemke (2002) writes that 'Governmentality' provides a conceptual lens to understand the techniques and strategies by which a modern society is rendered governable. The concept was first introduced by Foucault (1991) to account for how the state shapes individual identities and practices (Li, 2007, p.5). Foucault applied Bentham's notion of the 'panopticon', this was a form of prison architecture which allowed prison guards to monitor prisoners without their express knowledge of when they were and were not being monitored. The point is that prisoners were disciplined and re-shaped rather than punished (Foucault, 1975). Foucault argues that this form of constant surveillance inculcates a consciousness of being constantly observed/judged; the panopticon is internalized leading to self-regulation, a process Foucault (1975) terms 'panopticism'. This form of surveillance is highly successful as it works on the principle that you do not know when you are being observed, therefore you act like you are always being observed. In this context, Prevent can be conceived of as a form of governmentality practised through counterterrorism measures (Aradau and Van Munster 2007; Mythen and Walklate 2006). Individuals are constantly observed, or feel they are, throughout their educational lives (and elsewhere), to the point where state regulations are internalised and become their own regulations. Such a process is discussed by Elton-Chalcraft et al. (2017), they contend that through Prevent education professionals are transformed into instruments of state surveillance, fundamentally changing their professional roles and identities.

Previously, Bryan (2017) applies the concept of governmentality when demonstrating how Prevent regulates its subjects from a distance, replacing Foucault's prison guards with teachers and other educational professionals. For Bryan, The Prevent policy, is designed to produce 'governmentable subjects' or what Foucault termed 'docile bodies' (1975), importantly not just in terms of students but also of education professionals, who themselves internalise state regulations in the process of applying Prevent duty. O'Donnell

(2016) outlines the broad implications of Prevent for educational professionals. These include shifts in: the curriculum, freedom of speech, critical enquiry, the nature of pedagogical relationships. These are alongside the personal integrity of both students and educational professionals being compromised or questioned. The problematic lack of transparency/confusion regarding the criteria used for Prevent assessments, as discussed above, prevents nuanced understanding and application of the policy. For O'Donnell (2016), what is presented as 'safeguarding' is effectively surveillance leading to pedagogical, testimonial, and epistemic injustices (O'Donnell, 2017).

Revell and Bryan (2016) examine how UK head teachers approach appraisals in light of Prevent. The authors are particularly interested in the policy's requirements for teachers to actively uphold fundamental British values (FBV) (Department for Education, 2011) and to promote them both inside and outside of schools (Department for Education, 2014). Their study reported confusion amongst head teachers concerning how these standards should be achieved which led to anxiety around whether educational professionals were meeting professional demands/standards. Habib (2016) contends that schools provide an opportunity for students to build resilience against radicalisation. However, we argue that schools are not currently providing such a context. Critics maintain that opportunities for Muslim students to express critical thinking against radicalisation are reduced under the Prevent duty (Brown, 2010; Puar, 2007) rendering a 'chilling' effect on academic freedom (McCormack, 2016), with some suggesting this has the potential to radicalise the British Muslim population (Dudenhoefer, 2018).

In 2018, the UK Home Office published statistics relating to the number of individuals referred through Prevent in the past year (April 2017 to March 2018). The data show that approximately 95% of the referrals to Prevent were deemed unnecessary, with only 394 from the 7318 referrals being classified as requiring Channel support, a governmental deradicalization programme (Home Office, 2018). The large amount of unnecessary referrals reported by the Home Office could be read as counterproductive in that the time and resources it takes to process these referrals takes that time and resources away from investigating legitimate threats. In addition, unnecessary referrals risk creating alienation and anger in those falsely referred and their communities. Such consequences demonstrate

the need to talk to educational professionals to account for why these unnecessary referrals are happening, in an effort to avoid them in future and avoid counterproductive consequences of Prevent.

Thinking differently about Prevent

The 'regime of truth' underpinning Prevent is one that arguably exemplifies Foucault's concept of 'power/knowledge' in action. It became clear, however, that the existing research corpus is significantly limited in terms of the relative scarcity of empirical studies of Prevent. This project's research questions, and its methodological approach(es), have been formulated in response to such findings, in order to productively advance, and nuance, extant critical-theoretical work on Prevent by expanding the empirical evidence base for the policy's enactment on the micro/meso levels. There is no standard methodology for research in the field of education policy, as Malen and Knapp (1997, p.419) point out: 'there are multiple metaphors and models but no "grand theories" of public policy generally or education policy more specifically'. As such, this research developed a Critical Realist World Systems (CReWS) model to provide a multi-level heuristic thinking tool to research Prevent. Such conceptual innovation was necessitated due to Prevent's unprecedented nature and impact, in terms of the securitisation of the UK's education sector at a scale never before witnessed.

INSERT Figure_1_Weedon_MansfieldHiggins_Burke HERE

Figure 1: The Critical Realist World Systems Theoretical Model (CReWS)

The Prevent policy can be conceived of as what Foucault (1980) terms a 'dispositif'. In Foucauldian terms a 'dispositif' refers to mechanisms and knowledge structures which maintain and strengthen the exercise of power within society. Prevent can be viewed in these terms as having multidisciplinary roots that stretch into the fields of security, military, politics, criminology, and psychiatry: a dispositif that is bolstered by neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies. Any attempt at understanding Prevent fully thus requires a multidisciplinary, pluralised methodology. This contention sparked the inspiration to

develop a new conceptual model, one fit for the task at hand. The Critical Realist World Systems (CReWS) critical paradigm evolved over the course of the project, with different theoretical 'toolkits' privileged at different times, depending on their relative utility to the analytical task at hand. By locating the research in a stratified critical-realist paradigm, a wide variety of epistemological and methodological approaches are available with which to productively interrogate the focus of the research. At a basic level, the CReWS theoretical model—illustrated in Figure 1—represents a combination of critical-realist meta-theory (incorporating a pluralist approach to theoretical tool-kits) with Wallerstein's (1974) world systems theory.

Wallerstein's world systems theory is a multidisciplinary, macro-scale approach to world history and social change. It posits a capitalist world economic system in which some countries and multinational corporations benefit to the detriment of others. World-systems (and not nation states) should, therefore, form the basis of social analysis as a framework for studying reality. Using world systems theory allows us to contextualise Prevent, a policy which emerged as a direct result of geopolitical events, within the global field of power relations on a systemic (macro) level and bring these insights to bear when analysing Prevent at the individual (micro) and institutional (meso) levels. Critical realism is a meta theory with a meta-ontological approach which allows for a stratified conception of reality that attempts, ultimately, to diffuse the ongoing tension between positivist and interpretivist camps. The critical-realist approach combines ontological realism, where reality is considered intransitive and independent of our perception and knowing, with epistemic relativism; it insists upon a stratified ontology of the social order, with upwards and downwards causality between higher and lower level strata (Archer, 2020). This stratified ontological reality encourages a pluralistic approach to generating knowledge that draws on a range of ontological, epistemological and methodological concepts or 'tool kits'. Deployed in combination, as with the pluralist CReWS model, these 'tool kits' excavate a range of often-interconnected insights that may not be evident in a more traditional, singular approach.

This model outlines the benefits on drawing on a range of theoretical concepts in an effort to provide an opportunity to consider the range of different elements within Prevent. As an

illustrative example, we would like to briefly outline how two such theoretical concepts can work by discussing the synergy between Foucault and Bourdieu. As Bang (2014) argues, Foucault and Bourdieu provide complementary approaches when analysing power. As discussed above, Foucault's unpacking of the mechanisms of power and the consequences leading to docile bodies are central to critically examining Prevent. Where Bourdieu's (1992) concept of habitus as a set of durable dispositions points to the longevity of such attitudes and practices. The habitus can be informed and moulded by relations and power structures which are accepted but also harmful to that individual, through the process of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1992). As such, through examining the subtle mechanisms and power and durable outcomes, combining these two thinkers provides the conceptual account of a "docile habitus". The core argument and rationale for this model has been to begin to critically examine and challenge education policy and subsequent practices, we need to equip ourselves with a wholistic and plural account of the problematique.

Data Collection

The following sections outline the research methods used to collect, analyse, and interpret the data. A mixed-method approach combining mainly qualitative with limited quantitative research (Johnson and Turner, 2003) was determined to be most appropriate to evaluate education professionals' views of the Prevent duty and their reported enactment practices. The mixed methods approach included: an online survey and subsequent in-depth in-person interviews. All research was conducted within the BERA 2018 ethical guidelines and all ethical clearance was sought and secured before data collection began.

Survey

An online survey was designed to measure participant's knowledge, attitudes and behaviours concerning Prevent (Ratray and Jones, 2007). Open questions and Likert-type scale questions were used to collect data to provide an opportunity for participants to elaborate on answers. Employing a random sample, the survey attempted to reach as many participants as possible who met the main selection criteria that they were professional educators who taught in an English school, college or university. The link to the online

survey was disseminated through a combination of advertising in local multi-educational trusts' bulletins and emailing to the lead author's existing professional networks. The intention of this combined access approach was to gain a broad range of attitudes, experiences and practices within the sample. Recruitment resulted in a sample size of 75 education professionals.

Semi-structured interviews: gaining insights into professional identity

In order to elicit the desired rich data concerning education professionals' perceptions and experiences of enacting Prevent individual semi-structured interviews were employed. Prospective interview participants who indicated they were interested in a follow up interview were contacted via the email address they supplied when completing the survey. An additional selection criteria was included requiring all potential participants to work in the Bristol or Bath area. This decision was taken for a range of reasons. The study was limited in terms of financial resources and timescales, as interviews were conducted face-to-face geographical proximity ensured access. Including participants from two larger South West urban centres increased levels of anonymity for participants. This felt particularly important given the focus of the research. In addition, it created an opportunity for a wider exploration of the 'Prevent' experience across the sector, rather than privileging responses to a particular set of institutions in one sub-sector. Eighteen participants met the geographic criteria of the study indicated when completing the online survey that they would be interested in a follow-up interview, resulting in an interview sample of n=17 (with one having moved out of the area). Interview participants were from a range of 10 different educational institutions. All schools in the study (by chance outcome) were academies or independent state-funded schools. This was not a deliberate choice and unsuccessful efforts were made to try and gain representation from the private sector and non-academised state schools.

Counter-terrorism and counter-extremism are sensitive, highly charged areas of investigation. As such, participants likely held substantive concerns around privacy. To address this, individual interviews were favoured above focus groups. The individual interview provided a level of privacy to participants which created an atmosphere for more

frank, authentic responses, offering the researcher a deeper understanding of the sensitive issues at hand and leading to more reliable research findings. In contrast to asynchronous data collection methods such as surveys, interviews are an interactive experience between the interviewer and participant and offered a greater insight into the participant's subjective attitudes, experiences and practices (Flick, 2009). Interviewees were thus encouraged to discuss subjects related to the Prevent duty—their own perceptions, experiences, meanings, and ultimately the 'reality' of the policy for them—on their own terms supported by the flexibility of the semi-structured interview format.

Participants were also given the opportunity to review their interview transcript accuracy. Along adding to levels of trustworthiness through member checks (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) this process provided participants with an increased level of trust and confidence in the research process. Reviewing their transcripts reduced the chance of their words being misunderstood or misrepresented. A degree of follow-up was possible, with participants providing clarification on particular points or inaudible moments on the recordings, when necessary, thus strengthening the reliability of the data.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved a hybrid approach, combining deductive and inductive reasoning as 'complementary processes' (Gravetter and Forzano, 2015, p.46), with an open attitude towards new theories emerging from the raw data. This corresponds to the critical-realist analytical method, which encourages the combination of deductive and inductive modes of inquiry and theorising. Initially Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis was employed. The data was first grouped according to the research questions, and the themes identified in the literature review. Interview responses were reviewed iteratively to identify data relevant to the research questions and to look for insights and patterns. This approach supported the creation of a typology of education professionals' policy work and policy positions towards Prevent. Thematic analysis fits into the critical-realist paradigm as an approach that allows theoretical flexibility (Clarke and Braun, 2006), which can help to bridge the quantitative (positivist) and qualitative (interpretative) divide (Boyatzis, 1998). It is 'open' in that it allows for the incorporation of other qualitative approaches (Willig, 2013),

such as critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA) which were further applied within this study.

Findings and Discussion

This study focuses on attitudes, experiences and practices of teaching staff who are tasked with enacting the Prevent duty within their own teaching space. Through the expansion of Prevent in 2015, there was a significant broadening of criteria beyond violent terrorism to include civil disobedience and membership of a range of social justice groups. Research participants viewed this expansion as problematic as it directly impacted their role and practice if they were to meet their professional obligations within the Prevent duty. This new responsibility was misaligned to many participants understanding of their professional identity and reasonable autonomy they had previously enjoyed within their own classroom. A review of the relevant literature suggests that Prevent does not face significant opposition among those tasked to enact it (Busher et al., 2017). However, we contend that this depiction of either agreement or acquiescence leading to unproblematic enactment stems from a relatively lack of empirical studies examining experiences and practices of front-line educational professionals. To address these issues, this study focuses entirely on the experiences and views of a sample of these professionals, revealing a range of more nuanced responses and positions than has previously been presented.

Four key findings emerge from an analysis of the study data:

- Educational professionals are not monolithic in their enactment of Prevent. Rather, professionals adopt a fluid and diverse range of positions in fulfilling their legal duty.
- Educational professionals deploy 'Prevent-friendly' strategies, avoiding controversial subjects to comply with the 'hidden curriculum' of Prevent.
- Educational professionals are subject to 'soft coercion': oppressive managerial and performativity techniques which are understood as perceived threats to livelihood.

- Students are subject to a permanent socio-technical surveillance infrastructure that exists beyond the control of the teacher in the classroom and extends into the world beyond the school gates.

This chapter concentrates on the first finding examining the fluid and diverse range of positions that professionals adopt in fulfilling their legal duty to unpack how practice can challenge policy. The data demonstrated that the Prevent duty was routinely perceived to be in contrast with professionals' values, especially in terms of ethical relationships with students, therefore risking individuals' own professional identity:

*I think the role of the teacher is becoming the role of the teacher brackets counsellor, and police officer [...] my job title is 'teacher', it's not 'teacher of deradicalisation strategies'.
(Participant Q)*

In response, professionals established strategies to navigate their legal responsibility of enacting Prevent whilst maintaining professional values and standards. Professionals challenged Prevent's 'top-down' policy by becoming policy actors, using translation processes in order to create and protect space within the legal framework to retain as much of their professional agency and classroom autonomy as possible. Stemming from this range of professional responses this research developed a new taxonomy of policy enactment work, derived from respondents' real-life experiences with three distinct categories of policy actors identifiable: *legitimators*, *assimilators* and *doubters*.

A new taxonomy of policy enactment work

Due to the agentic response and application of professionals to the Prevent duty, the effective dual role of 'both receivers and agents of policy' (Saunders, 1987, p.108), this research went beyond previous representations of academic identity (Whitchurch, 2008; 2009; Fanghanel, 2007). Instead this research built on Ball et al's (2011) conception of 'policy actors', those who reinterpret, translate or ignore elements of policy to resist perceived or expected negative outcomes. In the context of this study, professionals cited 'good teaching' and 'common-sense' as the rationale for their pedagogical choices that

potentially stood at odds with their Prevent duty responsibilities. This study develops Ball et al.'s typology, modulating it for the education sector and the Prevent policy specifically, based on the empirical data collected.

Within each conceptual group (legitimator, assimilators, doubters), educators demonstrated professionalism and an autonomous response to enacting Prevent. Individual attitudes and practices were driven by a combination of institutional context and individual/professional and personal identity. The three groups map a spectrum of most to least supportive of the Prevent duty: *legitimators* view the policy most positively and *doubters* most negatively. Membership of groups was not mutually exclusive but rather professionals shifted between groups. Participants could behave outwardly assuming a pro-Prevent (*legitimator*) position 'defensively' in terms of workplace behaviours—to ensure job security, for example—whilst simultaneously espousing viewpoints more typically ascribed to *assimilators* and *doubters*. Strategies for Prevent enactment are marked by high levels of contextual agility and contingent flexibility.

Legitimators

Legitimators expressed the least doubts concerning the Prevent policy seeing it as a legitimate outcome from national security concerns. They follow the official regulations and guidance. As such, they legitimate the official narrative. *Legitimators* were often in leadership roles and displayed a 'common-sense' attitude toward combating terrorism. A key element of the legitimator discourse is they acknowledge and accept the narrative of the ever-present threat of terrorism. The head of a primary school offers an archetypal legitimator perspective:

'the whole Middle East politics have been part of our thinking for twenty or thirty years so when Prevent came in it wasn't a new risk' (Participant O)

Legitimators expressed few concerns about the securitisation of education but this was minimal compared to participants in other groups. However, as noted above, a single individual may adopt multiple, even competing, strategies at the same time. This can be

demonstrated through the testimony of one interviewee, a line manager of thirty lecturers. On the one hand, this participant testified that he had implemented Prevent scrupulously, having made ten referrals thus far—identifying him as a *legitimator*. Yet in the same interview, he presented a performative element of enacting Prevent policy in order to support his career progression, or at the least be shielded from job loss. Further than this subtle criticism of Prevent, he was also critical of Prevent for politicising educational roles and enforcing what he viewed as illiberal surveillance practices. We can see here how individuals can occupy more than one conceptual group, importantly we maintain that his reluctant membership as a *legitimator* stems from perceived coercion from his institution and ultimately, the state. However, even enthusiastic *legitimators* disclosed substantial doubts about Prevent in terms of policy design and application, if not rationale. As one *legitimator* remarked:

Prevent has the potential to be applied to four-year-olds and 30-year-olds and that's too wide a spectrum for one strategy to be managed properly without problems. [...] I looked at what it could do for children and I thought it could do good stuff for children, but I could see if you were 25 and at university and exploring that you could feel pressurised[.] (Participant A).

Assimilators

Members of this group presented the most diverse set of strategies to address their perceived issues with Prevent. In Ball et al.'s (2011) typology, they could be described as:

- Policy 'narrators'— making meaning from the official Prevent discourse through reinterpreting and recontextualising the policy.
- Policy 'translators', putting their professional autonomy into practice by subtly altering aspects of Prevent where they deem this to benefit students are more appropriately align to their professional identity.
- Policy 'critics' sought to preserve a counter-discourse. In these ways, educators attempted to transform the enactment of Prevent into practices that were more congruent with their values and professional identity.

The findings presented numerous examples of creative resistance toward the policy and ethos of Prevent. Participants emphasised using a range of reflexive pedagogical approaches: teaching critical-thinking skills; open debating in a nurturing classroom atmosphere; modelling behaviour, and so on. One participant emphasised the need for teachers to demonstrate agency and act as role models rather than simply reacting to trigger words or behaviours in a punitive, Prevent-led response:

I will model a good way of being a collaborative human being, in an equitable society [...] having a sensible conversation with the child about why they hold that belief [...] sorting it out on a relatively ad hoc basis just using wisdom and sensitivity[.] (Participant J).

The agency and autonomy a teacher had to question Prevent was dependent on their experience and expertise. Often, *assimilators* discussed avoiding any immediate labelling of students because of ‘trigger’ remarks they made or views they held. One experienced respondent explained:

If I take the word of a 14-year-old, and then say ‘I am concerned about what this kid has said’ am I not potentially criminalising that kid? [...] as soon as someone puts a label on you it changes the landscapes of your beliefs...as someone puts a label to it [...] it adds some kind of kudos to your belief[.](Participant J).

This teacher said he used ‘common-sense’ and inclusive strategies, engaging respectfully with students to encourage trust in the classroom, to understand context and possible motivation for ‘referrable’ remarks, instead of escalating the situation by making a referral. This approach stands in contrast to that of the *legitiminator* discussed above, who disclosed that he had made ten referrals whilst being subtly/internally critical of the policy. In an attempt to avoid formal referrals if at all possible, *assimilators* routinely expressed a commitment to upholding the rights of the young people in their care, and their families.

Beside re-framing the policy requirements to different degrees, other respondents reported the ‘chilling effect’ Prevent has on frank discussion of so-called ‘risky’ topics (Coppock and

McGovern, 2014). In particular, self-regulation is an assimilator response to the perceived panoptic gaze of Prevent:

I was avoiding certain areas, not many, but one or two debates that might have come up in a course where you are talking about the civil rights movement, and the sort of movements where people are protesting, protest music, that sort of stuff [...] I definitely had to change that and rethink it when Prevent came out[.] (Participant D)

Despite classroom autonomy and agency, educational professionals cannot escape, nor actively dismantle, the oppressive surveillance culture instantiated by Prevent in the classroom.

Doubters

This final group of respondents was the most outspoken concerning their unease at enacting the policy. Importantly their presence offers a rebuttal to the current critical consensus that the Prevent policy has been adopted without significant resistance from education professionals. This research demonstrates that a critical mass of educators carry significant doubts about the policy and the primary role they play in being required to enact it.

Doubters spoke openly discussed their thoughts on the issues within Prevent and declared themselves reluctant to become part of the securitised educational landscape the duty instantiates. They presented Prevent as coercive to professionals in that they risked their job security if they did not comply with the expectations of the policy. As one interviewee explained:

'It's like an obligation that I have to do this training and this training means I am now trained to identify extreme people, and I'm in a position where I can't say no, if I say no, I'm not going to have a job[.] (Participant C)

The requirement to teach Fundamental British Values (FBV) is a mainstay of the Prevent curriculum. Though this element was an issue for all participants, it was a particular issue for *doubters*. Indeed, for some, the issue of FBV compelled a reactive shift to adopting the *doubter* stance. One secondary headteacher, generally an *assimilator* with *legitiminator* responsibilities incumbent to their managerial role, stated that they embedded FBV into the Personal, Social, Health and Economic (PSHE) education programme, thus allowing ‘opt outs’ by students who might be offended by certain topics. This headteacher, met their obligation to enact and by extension legitimate the Prevent policy but also found a way to protect students from the risk of potential Prevent referral in the controversial area of ‘British’ values, thus by implication displaying *doubter* values.

Another approach from who could be described as an “overt” *doubter* was to engage in a performative acknowledgment. This participant commented that in the context of being reviewed by OFSTED he ‘*would probably have to do some crazy “nod” to the requirement to teach British ‘values’*’. Compliance here was entirely performative and acknowledged as such. In addition, *doubters* asserted their own agency based on values and pedagogical practices developed through their professional experience over the years. Members of this group reinterpreted the requirements of Prevent initially speaking to the child and their family rather than making immediate referrals if a child made ‘suspect’ opinions known.

Conclusion

As it stands, existing literature on the Prevent duty appears to offer a consensus that there is little opposition from professionals to the policy or its implementation. The CReWS model outlined above demonstrates the need to embrace complexity and question assumptions, particularly those which reinforce existing power relations and fail to problematise policy. The empirical findings offer a compelling counterpoint to this assumption pointing to the need for further research. Crucially, the existing ‘consensus’ does not take into account the opinions of front-line educators, professionals tasked with enforcing Prevent nor the strategies staff employ to curtail the negative impact of the policy while meeting the legal duty. This research demonstrates that their voices must be heard in order to provide a more nuanced assessment of the duty in practice.

This study supports the existence of the widespread belief that education professionals' job security is directly tied to their compliance with Prevent, even as enactment of the policy is perceived by many as a direct challenge to professional values and standards. Maintaining professional values is of utmost importance to the educators interviewed in this study. Despite the potential risk to their livelihoods, many educators act to counter the harmful effects that they believe that Prevent can have on their students. Though at the macro-level, the organisation itself had no choice but to be Prevent-compliant, it also supported the officers' condemnation of the policy. Similarly, educational professionals tread a fine line in balancing their legal duties and professional ethics, with many offering a 'soft' challenge to the Prevent policy whilst formally obeying its mandate.

Study respondents were unanimous on one crucial point: Prevent has the potential to encourage classroom practices that are detrimental to educators and to their charges. Almost all study participants expressed concerns about harm as a potential result of enforcement. This included, for example, fears that students could perceive implementation of the policy as discriminatory, generating distrust and leading to the breakdown of friendships, fracturing wider societal bonds and causing alienation. This could increase the risk of anomie and radicalisation that the policy seeks to avoid.

Whilst each of the three groupings agreed on this point, the corresponding arguments for this position varied. *Doubters*, for example, staunchly believed that existing practices were sufficiently robust to monitor and protect their students, and opined on this at length. *Assimilators* reinterpreted and translated Prevent policy to blend its requirements into their practices, equating to a model of harm reduction. *Legitimizers* tended to emphasise that, although Prevent could be harmful in a general sense, this was not the case in their own organisations which, in their view, used a 'light touch' approach to what they saw as legitimate enactment of policy.

In summary, Prevent has become an unavoidable part of life in the education sector, an addition to the regulatory landscape of top-down policies and requirements made of educational professionals. Folded into this formal, authoritarian environment Prevent has

added a layer of securitisation to education where navigating Prevent “effectively” (i.e. to minimize its potential harms) perhaps becomes a foundational element of professional values. This chapter focused on the combination of professionalism, agency and autonomy in the context of professionals meeting their legal obligations under Prevent. These findings demonstrate that individuals straddle different positions (responses and practice) based on a range of factors. In terms of future practice and a new generation of educators, it is clear that these individuals need to retain criticality to construct a response to policy, that aligns to their values, and also meets statutory responsibilities.

Post-script... what does this mean for doctoral researchers?

This is a challenging section for us as authors to write as sadly Max, our first author passed away before this section was written. As such we are forced to consider what Max learned through the process and what other doctoral researchers can learn from this chapter and the broader work on which it is based. There are two areas I think that future researchers can learn especially within the theme of this final section in the edited collection:

- If a theory or conceptual framework does not adequately meet your needs then one may need to be developed. The CReWS model provides an innovative account of social space in which to examine Prevent. Here we can see the combination of a range of theorists and theoretical frameworks which work together to provide a more critical tool in which to conduct social inquiry. Importantly figure 1 outlining the CReWS is not finished, it tells the reader to add conceptual tools as required. This is very much in the spirit of this model in that it was developed because current tools were not up to the task but also no-one is saying that this model is the end of the conversation, it is a heuristic device and one which can and hopefully will be developed by others. At the doctoral stage, researchers are fledgling academics but such innovative ways of examining the social world are welcome and needed.
- The other area is to embrace complexity and nosiness of real life. The findings outlining the three “types” of participant could have been presented in neat categories but in reality we are often more than one thing and so while it is challenging to empirically demonstrate this, such endeavour provides a richer and

more nuanced glimpse into the social world. Yes it makes it messy and challenging to articulate at times on the page or in a viva exam but it is also when we look at these nuances that we understand power and resistance to power – in this it was Prevent but there are many, many instances where this equally as true and needed.

References

- Aradau, C. and Van Munster, R. (2007) Governing Terrorism Through Risk: Taking Precautions, (un)Knowing the Future. *European journal of international relations*, 13(1), 89-115.
- Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., Braun, A. and Hoskins, K. (2011) Policy actors: Doing policy work in schools. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 32(4), 625-639.
- BERA British Education Research Association. (2018) Ethical guidelines for educational research. London, BERA. Available from: https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research_4thEdn_2018.pdf [Accessed 18 July 2010].
- Bourdieu, P. (1992) "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology", In: Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (eds) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. London: Polity. pp. 61 – 217.
- Boyatzis, R. (1998) Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brown, K. E. (2010) Contesting the securitization of British Muslims: Citizenship and resistance. *Interventions*, 12(2), 171-182.
- Bryan, H. (2017) Developing the political citizen: How teachers are navigating the statutory demands of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2005 and the Prevent Duty. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 12(3), 213-226.

Busher, J., Choudhury, T., Thomas, P. and Harris, G. (2017) What the Prevent duty means for schools and colleges in England: An analysis of educationalists' experiences. University of Huddersfield Repository. Available from: <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/32349/> [Accessed: 24 July 2019].

Colley, L. (2010) *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600-1850*. New York: Random House.

Coppock, V. and McGovern, M. (2014) 'Dangerous minds'? Deconstructing counter-terrorism discourse, radicalisation and the 'psychological vulnerability' of Muslim children and young people in Britain. *Children & Society*, 28(3), 242-256.

de Jong, S. (2016) *Confuse, Divide and Rule-How Russia Drives Europe Apart*. IES Policy Brief Issue 2016/2 • March 2016. Institute for European Studies. Brussels. Available from: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/163084681.pdf> [Accessed: July 12, 2020].

DeMause L. (2002) The Childhood Origins of Terrorism. *Journal of Psychohistory*. 29: 340-348.

DfE Department for Education. (2011) *Teacher's standards: Guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies*. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/665520/Teachers__Standards.pdf (p. 14) [Accessed: 24 July 2019].

DfE Department for Education. (2014) *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools*. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/380595/SMSC_Guidance_Maintained_Schools.pdf (p.5) [Accessed: 24 July 2019].

Dudenhoefer, A. (2018) Resisting radicalisation: A critical analysis of the UK Prevent duty. *Journal for Deradicalisation*, 14, 153-191.

Elton-Chalcraft, S., Lander, V., Revell, L., Warner, D. and Whitworth, L. (2017) To promote, or not to promote fundamental British values? Teachers' standards, diversity and teacher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(1), 29-48.

- Fanghanel, J. (2007) Local responses to institutional policy: a discursive approach to positioning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(2), 187-205.
- Flick, U. (Ed.). (2009) *The sage qualitative research kit: Collection*. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Truth and Power, Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972–1977* (Gordon C. Ed.) Translated from the French by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall John Mepham and Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991) 'Governmentality'. Translated from the French by Rosi Braidotti and revised by Colin Gordon. In: Burchell, G., Gordon, C., and Peter Miller, P., (eds.), (2011) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. pp. 87–104. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2008) *The History of Sexuality (1976–2018)*. Translated from the French by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gravetter, F. J. and Forzano, L. A. B. (2015) *Research Methods for The Behavioural Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- H. M. Government. (2015a) *Counter-Terrorism and Security Act*. London: HMSO. Available from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/6/pdfs/ukpga_20150006_en.pdf?view=extent [Accessed: 24 July 2019].
- Habib, S. (2016) *Teaching & Learning Britishness: Encountering and negotiating discourses of identities and belongings through critical pedagogy*. PhD, Goldsmiths, University of London
- Heath-Kelly, C. (2017) The geography of pre-criminal space: epidemiological imaginations of radicalisation risk in the UK Prevent Strategy, 2007–2017. *Critical studies on terrorism*, 10(2), 297-319.

Home Office (2018) Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, April 2017 to March 2018. Assessed from:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/763254/individuals-referred-supported-prevent-programme-apr2017-mar2018-hosb3118.pdf [Accessed: 24 July 2019].

Johnson, B. and Turner, L. A. (2003) Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In: Tashakkori, A., and C. Teddlie, C., Eds., (2010) Sage Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Karlsen, G. H. (2019) Divide and rule: ten lessons about Russian political influence activities in Europe. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1), 1-14.

Kundnani, A. (2012) Radicalisation: the journey of a concept. *Race & Class*, 54(2), 3-25.

Lemke, D. (2002) *Regions of War and Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, T. M. (2007) *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lifton E. J. (2007) A Clinical Psychology Perspective on Radical Islamic Youth. In: Abbas, T. (Ed.). (2007) *Islamic Political Radicalism: A European Perspective*. p.25-41. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: SAGE Publications.

Malen, B. and Knapp, M. (1997) Rethinking the multiple perspectives approach to education policy analysis: implications for policy-practice connections. *Journal of Education Policy*, 12(5), 419-445.

McCormack, T. (2016) Academic Freedom in an Age of Terror?. In: Hudson, C. and Williams, J., eds., (2016) *Why academic freedom matters: A response to current challenges*. London: Civitas.

Mythen, G., and Walklate, S. (2006) Criminology and terrorism: Which thesis? Risk society or governmentality?. *British journal of criminology*, 46(3), 379-398.

- O'Donnell, A. (2016) Securitisation, counterterrorism and the silencing of dissent: The educational implications of prevent. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64(1), 53-76.
- O'Donnell, A. (2017) Pedagogical injustice and counter-terrorist education. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 12(2), 177-193
- Parry-Giles, S. J. and Parry-Giles, T. (1999) Meta-imaging, The War Room, and the hyperreality of US politics. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 28-45.
- Puar, J.K. (2017) *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Duke University Press.
- Rattray, J. and Jones, M. C. (2007) Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of clinical nursing*, 16(2), 234-243.
- Saunders, M. (1987). Perceptions on TRIST: Implications for INSET. *Research Papers in Education*, 2(2), 106-125.
- Thomas, P. (2017) Changing experiences of responsabilisation and contestation within counter-terrorism policies: the British Prevent experience. *Policy & Politics*, 45(3), 305-321.
- Virilio, P. (2005) *Desert Screen: War at the Speed of Light*. London: Athlone.
- Wallerstein, I.M. (1974) *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008) Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of third space professionals in UK higher education. *Higher education quarterly*, 62(4), 377-396.
- Whitchurch, C. (2009) The rise of the blended professional in higher education: a comparison between the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, 58(3), 407-418.
- Willig, C. (2013) *Introducing qualitative research in psychology (3rd Edition)*. Maidenhead: Open University Press

