

The Impact of the Prevent Duty on Schools: A Review of the Evidence

Lee Jerome, Alex Elwick and Raza Kazim
Middlesex University, Department of Education

[Accepted (May 2019) for publication in British Educational Research Journal]

Corresponding author

Lee Jerome, Associate Professor of Education, Middlesex University, The Burroughs, London, NW4 4BT.

l.jerome@mdx.ac.uk

Abstract

The UK has emerged as an influential global player in developing policy to counter violent extremism, and therefore it is important to consider the emerging evidence about the impact of this policy in education. The Prevent Duty came into force in the UK in 2015, placing a legal responsibility on schools and teachers to implement anti-terrorist legislation and prevent young people from being drawn into extremism or radicalisation. This article reviews all of the material based on empirical studies in England involving school teachers and students published between 2015 (when the Duty was introduced) and the beginning of 2019 (27 articles and reports in total) to consider the impact of the policy on schools. The key themes emerging from our analysis of this evidence base are related (1) to the ways the policy is interpreted within Islamophobic discourses, (2) the emergence of Britishness as a key feature of fundamental British values, and (3) the implications of framing Prevent as a safeguarding issue. We argue that the evidence gives support to those who have been critical of the Prevent Duty in schools, and that it seems to be generating a number of unintended and negative side effects. However, the evidence also illustrates how teachers have agency in relation to the policy, and may thus be able to enact the policy in ways which reduce some of the most harmful effects.

Keywords

Fundamental British Values, Prevent Duty, Islamophobia, safeguarding

Introduction

The UK government has become influential in the field of countering violent extremism (CVE), and its legislation and policy framework has been exported around the world (Kundnani & Hayes, 2018). But, as Ní Aoláin observes, the actions undertaken by governments in this field have serious repercussions for the rule of law, and it is incumbent on others to understand the processes by which the language of CVE finds its way into new and varied settings, such as education (foreword to Kundnani & Hayes, 2018). This is particularly significant as the regulatory practices associated with CVE move from sanctioning acts of violence to “pre-emptive criminal regulation” (p. 4). The UK’s counter-terrorism policy, CONTEST, has four dimensions: to *prepare* for attacks by building resilient systems; to *protect* against attacks, for example, by strengthening border controls; to *pursue* (potential) attackers; and to *prevent* people from becoming or supporting terrorists. The Prevent dimension combines aspects of specialist security provision with a much wider civil society programme to identify risks and potentially eradicate them. In this article we respond to Ní Aoláin’s call to better understand the movement of security policy into education policy, by examining the empirical evidence about the relationship between CVE policy and education in England.

The development of Prevent policy in education

- 2003 Prevent strategy developed by the UK government, but not widely publicised until 2006.
- 2006 The Education and Inspections Act places a duty on schools to promote ‘community cohesion’ (Phillips *et al.*, 2010).

- 2008 Non-statutory CVE guidance issued for schools under title of Prevent policy (DCSF, 2008).
- 2011 Revised Prevent policy shifts from focus on terrorism to extremism, which is defined more broadly as “vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values” (FBVs) (HMG, 2011). The Department for Education publishes new Teachers’ Standards, which incorporate the FBVs into the definition of professional values (defined as: democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs) (DfE, 2011).
- 2014 In March anonymous allegations were made that Birmingham schools were “being taken over by a hard-line group of Muslim extremists” (Arthur, 2015: 317) triggering one government commissioned investigation and a series of emergency Ofsted re-inspections of individual schools. This became known as ‘The Trojan Horse Affair’ and, although there was no evidence found relating to terrorism, radicalisation or violent extremism, there was some official criticism of ‘conservative religious beliefs’ (p. 319) and several teachers were suspended (all but one of whom was reinstated). In November the Department for Education issued non-statutory advice on the promotion of FBVs as a new element of Social, Moral, Spiritual and Cultural development (SMSC) in schools (DfE, 2014).
- 2015 The UK Counter-Terrorism and Security Act introduced a new legal duty for teachers and other public sector employees to have “due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism”. Prevent guidance from the Department for Education urged schools to “think about what they can do to protect children from the risk of radicalisation” (DfE, 2015: 4) and to use the curriculum to “build pupils’ resilience to radicalisation” (p. 8). In the first year of the new duty over 7000 people were referred to the Channel programme (which assesses individuals to identify risks and provides interventions) “due to concerns they were vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism” with most referrals coming from the education sector (Home Office 2017). Ofsted also confirmed inspectors would look for evidence that children have accepted the FBVs (Ofsted, 2015: 35).

In less than a decade the Prevent policy has extended its reach in two significant ways. Firstly, it has become increasingly concerned with a broader definition of extremism, defined as opposition to the FBVs, rather than being focused on *violent* extremism. This has meant that the Prevent Duty and the promotion of FBVs are now integrally linked. Secondly, in relation to education, it has moved from a form of non-statutory advice to a legal duty which teachers must comply with; the FBVs are incorporated into the definition of teacher professionalism, and the school inspection framework ensures teachers will comply with the guidance or risk an unsatisfactory inspection grade. These policy developments have been widely commented on in academic writing, journalism, in civil society organisations and in social media (see www.preventdigest.co.uk). Much of this material has been critical of the policy and has expressed concern at its unintended side-effects, but there has been relatively little empirical research documenting the effects the policy is having in practice. This article builds on Taylor and Soni’s (2017) “systematic review of literature considering the lived experiences of the UK’s Prevent strategy in educational settings” focusing on material published between 2013-16 (p. 241). That review only identified seven studies of relevance, and these ranged across education sectors, including both schools and universities. The relatively short time between the publication of their review and ours has seen the publication of several additional studies and so in this article we have been able to focus solely on empirical studies related to schools and school teachers, which have been published since the introduction of the Prevent Duty in 2015.

The literature identified in this review has been compiled following a search of educational databases. We searched for material published between 2015 and March 2019 using terms related to extremism, radicalisation, terrorism and fundamental British values and selected those which were based on primary data collected with teachers and in schools. This meant we screened out those which solely focused on critiquing policy and offering critical interpretations. The summary list was then sent to several other researchers working in this field, to ensure we had not missed

material known to others (this led to the addition of one article published in a non-education journal). Finally the list has been supplemented by a small number of conference papers and research reports, which the authors are aware of, and which are available as proceedings or on-line. This has yielded the following selection of 27 items, which we have described and loosely categorised in table 1.

Table 1: Literature review

<i>Small scale, largely qualitative research</i>	Bryan (2017) interviewed 3 school leaders; Farrell (2016) collected data from 11 RE student teachers; Green (2017) conducted 3 focus groups with 16 16-18 year old British Muslims; Habib (2017) collected data from 25 Art student teachers and observed in two classrooms; Lundie (2017) interviewed 14 Prevent professionals; McGhee & Zhang analysed 3 school websites; Moncrieffe & Moncrieffe (2019) analysed 27 FBV display boards in primary schools; Pal Sian (2015) interviewed 11 adults; Sant & Hanley (2018) collected data from 11 English student teachers; van Krieken Robson (2019) interviewed 18 early years practitioners across 6 providers and conducted an undisclosed number of drawing / visualisation activities with some of the children (2-4 years old); Vanderbeck & Johnson (2016) analysed 17 Ofsted reports.
<i>Larger scale mixed methods research</i>	Busher <i>et al.</i> (2017) collected survey data from 225 school and college staff, conducted 70 interviews and ran a series of focus groups; Elton-Chalcraft <i>et al.</i> (2017) interviewed 20 teachers and collected questionnaire data from 88 student teachers; Jerome & Elwick (2016, 2017, 2019) and Elwick & Jerome (forthcoming) collected data from 232 student questionnaires, 10 student focus groups and 13 staff interviews; Panjwani (2016) collected survey data from 39 Muslim teachers.
<i>Larger scale qualitative research</i>	Bamber <i>et al.</i> (2018) combined a survey of 95 Primary student teachers and six school case studies drawing on interviews, observations and document analysis; Lockley-Scott (2016) has conducted 3 in-depth school case studies, including interviews and questionnaires with students and teachers; Quartermaine (2016) has conducted 6 in-depth school case studies based on 264 student questionnaires, group discussions with 73 students and 11 teacher interviews; Revell & Bryan (2016) interviewed 60 senior leaders in primary and secondary schools; Smith (2016) collected data from 91 student teachers; Vincent (2018a, 2018b) has conducted 9 school case studies, based on 55 staff interviews, 44 observations, attendance at 4 conferences and 18 additional interviews.
<i>Research re-analysing older data</i>	Janmaat (2018) re-analysed data from 420 young people collected through secondary education up to the age of 22 for evidence of FBV knowledge / support; Maylor (2016) analysed data from 6 case study schools (collected around 2007) including 9 staff interviews and focus groups with 45 students to explore attitudes towards teaching FBVs.

Following Taylor and Soni's (2017) original review, we have focused our discussion on the themes arising from the research rather than focusing on the methodology adopted in each article. However, as they noted in their synthesis, much of the research in this area is conducted by practitioners who are sometimes reporting studies undertaken with their own student teachers, or with colleagues in schools in partnership with their universities. Such research inevitably reflects the

context, for example Farrell (2016) focused on RE student teachers on a course he runs and was particularly concerned to explore FBVs in relation to religious diversity; Bamber et al. (2018) worked with their own student teachers and a selection of schools offering placements to those students, and were particularly focused on the relationship between FBVs and global citizenship – a key focus of their module. However, some of the larger scale research moves beyond these restrictions and draws on a wider sample, such as Busher et al's (2017) survey across 225 institutions and Vincent's (2018a, 2018b) selection of nine case study schools. In both these cases the researchers were not only collecting data from beyond their own working contexts, they were also working solely as researchers, not explicitly as researcher-practitioners. We have outlined the evidence base and methods used in table 1 and simply note here that readers should bear in mind the different traditions of research represented by these different authors. Our view is that their use of empirical data makes them all useful to some extent, as they all provide glimpses into aspects of practice. By drawing out some of the recurrent themes, we hope to move beyond the constraints of each individual project and highlight where issues appear to emerge as more common concerns (evident in the focus of the researchers) and where aspects of practice seem to recur in their data. This does not enable us to treat these studies as part of one coherent data set, nor does it prove that the policy is working in one way or another, but it does help to clarify how the policy is being enacted in different contexts.

Theme 1: Islamophobia

Whilst the text of the Prevent duty avoids specifying Islamic groups as the object of the policy, it is impossible in practice to separate preventing violent extremism from the high profile terrorist groups claiming to be rooted in Islamic beliefs (Thomas, 2016). In part this reflects the fact that earlier iterations of the Prevent strategy did indeed focus exclusively on Muslims (Busher et al. 2017), and in part this reflects the general discourse in the media and politics relating the two (Kundnani, 2014). There is some evidence that Muslim young people, and staff, therefore feel the impact of the Prevent duty disproportionately. Busher *et al.* (2017) conducted research with several hundred staff members in schools and colleges and reported that:

Concerns that the Prevent duty might fuel feelings among Muslim students of being stigmatised emerged as a strong and recurring theme in the interview data (p. 54)

Over half of their survey respondents (and three quarters of their black and minority ethnic (BME) respondents) said that the Prevent duty had made Muslim students more likely to feel stigmatised. BME respondents were also much more likely (than their white British counterparts) to consider that the Prevent duty had made it more difficult to create an environment in which students from different backgrounds got on well together (p.55). Vincent (2018) similarly reported that teachers in schools with Muslim majorities were concerned that "Muslim pupils felt stigmatised" (p. 6) and the head teacher of a Muslim faith school reported that they felt compelled to take Prevent requirements more seriously than other local head teachers because of the school's faith commitment. Whilst Busher *et al.*'s respondents discussed a variety of strategies to address and minimize such problems, other research indicates that these may be difficult to resolve in practice.

Panjwani (2016) collected data from Muslim teachers and found that whilst his respondents were largely happy to endorse the values described in FBV policy, nevertheless they experienced conflict between the proclaimed values and the way in which these were used in the context of the Prevent Duty. Many respondents felt the policy failed to address the ways in which Muslims were becoming a suspect community. This was also reflected in Green's (2017) work with British Muslim young people who identified with Britishness and FBVs but felt this was often ignored by others who refused to recognise this aspect of their identities.

[Muslim] individuals were fighting to maintain their open and accessible understanding of and connection with British identity in the face of external messages undermining this understanding and, therefore, this connection (p. 251).

Similarly, Lockley-Scott's (2016) data documents Muslim students feeling that others perceived them as a threat, or as members of a suspect community. Vincent (2018) argues that this reflects an "acute anxiety around Islam and extremism" within the broader political and social context (p. 1). Revell & Bryan (2018) argue that FBVs function as proxy concepts, which means that whilst they appear to be neutral statements about culture, in fact they signal a hostility to difference (p. 55). The limited evidence available lends support to the idea that FBVs and the Prevent Duty more generally seem to be fuelling the stigmatisation of Muslims regardless of their willingness to endorse them. These findings within schools reflects the concerns of parliament's Joint Committee on Human Rights (JCHR 2016), and of the independent reviewers of terrorism legislation – David Anderson QC (2017) and Max Hill QC. After a series of discussions around the country Hill reported encountering the "general view often expressed to me, namely that there is 'one law for Muslims, and another for the rest'" (Hill, 2017: 7).

As noted above, there is evidence that Muslim teachers and young people experience the Prevent Duty as particularly problematic. This may be partly due to their interpretation of the national policy itself, and may also be a result of the policy they experience as it is enacted by the majority of non-Muslim professionals within schools. In simple terms, whilst the Prevent Duty avoids naming Muslims as the main object of attention, many teachers put Islam back into their interpretations of the policy. In Vincent's research she reports an interview with a senior school leader who notes:

People are wary because when you talk about Prevent actually to people's mind-set what that is about is making sure you don't have Muslim extremism (Vincent, 2018b: 12).

Busher *et al.* (2017) found similar assumptions in their interview with a head of department in a London school:

If you'd have asked me before any discussions in the school I would've had a very, very clear view that it was primarily, if not exclusively, around anti-radicalisation in terms of Islamic groups (p. 25).

Similarly, one of Pal Sian's (2015) interviewees stated:

Her school is across the road from my school... Her school has got loads more Muslim children because they offer halal meals... We have a lower average of children from different ethnic backgrounds, our kids are mainly white British... We have had nothing about extremism at all (p. 192).

These extracts indicate that the Prevent Duty is being interpreted within dominant discourses connecting terrorism, extremism and Islam. In this regard, Busher *et al.* conclude that:

while respondents engaged in principle with the idea that the Prevent duty is about all forms of extremism, there was an often more or less explicit acknowledgement, and in some cases concern, that Muslim students and communities may still continue to be a particular and disproportionate focus of attention (p. 26).

Sometimes these connections can be unconscious and potentially harmful, for example a senior leader interviewed in Elwick & Jerome (forthcoming) described an incident in which a child had been reported for a Prevent interview with the head teacher after asking where he could buy small electronic switches, which had been used in a design and technology lesson. Justifying the referral the teacher said:

The staff are aware that these things are happening out there and that [our area] is very multicultural and not all our students will be safe from being radicalised (p. 9).

This makes a very clear link between multiculturalism, which in this context actually meant a large local Muslim population, and the risk of radicalisation. By contrast, some teachers recognise the connections between Islam and extremism in more critical and conscious ways. For example, a head of department in a secondary school interviewed in Elwick & Jerome (forthcoming) put his discussion of Islam in a political context:

I think the biggest help it's had for our Muslim children is that within a classroom it's allowed them to say, this is IS [Islamic State], this is Islam. These people say they are Muslim but they are going against beliefs that we hold (p.20).

This addresses one of Quartermaine's (2016) findings that students wanted opportunities to address areas of confusion and clarify their understanding of Islam and extremism. In this second case the teacher makes the Islamophobic assumptions the object of their teaching, in the previous case, the teacher replicates such assumptions in their teaching practice.

This form of unconscious bias is discussed in Pal Sian (2015) who questions how such harmful and discriminatory assumptions can be seen as unproblematic in schools where anti-racism and equal opportunities have received so much attention in recent years. Vincent (2018a) argues this reflects the strength of those broader social discourses "in which the signifier of 'Muslim' has become a potential hazard, a warning of possible, perhaps even probable, illiberality" (p.238). Both Vincent (2018b) and Jerome & Elwick (2017) note that some teachers tend to construct blunt characterisations of their local communities, and interpret the Prevent policy to address the perceived problems. In this process, the conservative Muslim community can be seen as a problem to be addressed, as is the white working class (in some areas), as both groups are perceived as potentially undermining the FBVs or being more likely to espouse extremist views.

Theme 2: Britishness

Revell & Bryan (2018) document the history of teaching about Britishness, and trace how it has developed since simple celebrations of Empire Day at the beginning of the twentieth century, to a more nuanced and ambiguous form of mid-century patriotism, and then a resurgent interest in national history from the 1980s. Under New Labour, in the wake of the London bombings and Mill Town riots, Gordon Brown championed attempts to find a centre-left approach to promoting Britishness and British values, embedded within the project of community cohesion (Jerome & Clemitshaw, 2012). The search for Britishness is invoked in relation to the end of multiculturalism (McGhee, 2008) and the need for a commitment to develop a shared British identity underpins calls for 'muscular liberalism' (Cameron, 2011). As Michael Gove, the former Secretary of State for Education argued about one of the FBVs:

In order to safeguard tolerance, we occasionally have to be intolerant of those who wish to impose their intolerance on us (Gove, 2014 quoted in Revell & Bryan, 2018: 54).

The introduction of FBVs in education policy, discussed in the opening section of this article, must be seen in this wider political context, and it represents two significant changes: first it makes the teaching of British values statutory, and secondly it places this topic firmly in the context of preventing violent extremism. As a consequence, this is an aspect of the Prevent policy which has attracted a fair amount of attention. The first observation to make in relation to this evolving discourse is, as we noted in theme one, the political project to create a shared sense of British identity is now embedded within politicians' responses to security concerns. Therefore, as the data we discussed in theme 1 demonstrates, this policy is often experienced as discriminatory or exclusionary by Muslims and other minority communities who are deemed to be part of the security problem.

Elton-Chalcraft *et al.* (2017) report that about half of their respondents were relatively happy to offer apparently superficial or trivial responses about the nature of Britishness such as the British tradition of taking tea, supporting the monarchy or queuing politely. Maylor's (2016) interviews with teachers found similarly 'naïve' ideas about Britishness perceived as cultural identity, as did Smith's (2016) surveys with student teachers. Moncrieffe & Moncrieffe's (2019) analysis of FBV display boards in schools also identified a tendency to portray simplistic and caricatured images of tea, red buses, cricket etc. promoting a narrow set of cultural icons and an exclusionary cultural identity. This use of display boards was also noted by van Krieken Robson (2019) in early years settings.

However, there is also evidence that some teachers go beyond these narrow interpretations. For example the other half of Elton-Chalcraft *et al.*'s respondents did not think there were particular values associated with being British, with one student teacher arguing:

I don't personally believe it is possible to identify British people as having specific values, as "British" is an umbrella term for many different classes, communities and sub-cultures that preside within Britain... (p. 38).

Sant & Hanley (2018) conducted research with 11 English student teachers and noted a variety of responses with some doing their best to avoid the topic and others problematizing the very notion of Britishness. They argued that their student teachers' responses reflected their political beliefs about nationhood and national identity. Habib (2017) noted that the student art teachers with whom she worked felt anxious about teaching in this area and tended to open up their teaching to consider multiple and personal ways of identifying with Britishness. Farrell's (2016) RE students were concerned that FBVs might marginalise some pupils and thus tended to focus their discussions on identity rather than the values. Like Sant & Hanley, Farrell argues that student teachers bring their own experiences and beliefs to bear on their interpretation of this agenda:

Britishness emerges as a contested plural signifier with a multiplicity of meanings, but the meaning attributed by participants is contingent upon their raced, classed and ethnic life histories (p. 289).

McGhee & Zhang's (2017) discussion of school websites indicated that there was evidence that the FBVs were being depoliticised and integrated into existing school frameworks for multiculturalism, rather than being interpreted through the frame of muscular liberalism. Van Krieken Robson (2019) found a similar process of reinterpretation in the early years, with FBVs re-cast as being 'nice', and Bamber *et al.* (2018) report an example of FBVs being reinterpreted through the Ten Commandments. Similarly, Vanderbeck & Johnson's (2016) review of Ofsted inspection reports indicated that inspectors were recognising schools' ability to devise their own interpretations of the FBVs, for example by devising ways to promote tolerance of homosexuality, whilst upholding traditional religious teaching in relation to sexual morality.

One conclusion to be drawn from this mixed evidence is that teachers are adopting different positions, with some avoiding the direct promotion of FBVs, some reinterpreting this as the promotion of British identity, some de-politicising FBVs in order to promote school values, and others using the policy to create space for open reflection and discussion about identity (Bamber *et al.*, 2018; Bryan, 2017; Vincent, 2018b). Perhaps the most minimal response came from one of Vincent's respondents who summarised a conversation with a colleague in the following terms:

I don't know why you are fussing about this... we have laminated all the key words from the British values document, put them up round the corridors and we are done (Vincent, 2018: 232).

But, as we have already indicated above, such responses are unlikely to be adopted by teachers in majority Muslim schools, or by Muslim teachers. Busher *et al.*'s (2017: 29) survey data indicates that those staff in schools with more than 10% Muslim students were much less likely to think that Prevent was about promoting FBVs (39% as opposed to 62% in schools with fewer than 10% Muslim students). This indicates that, in addition to personal beliefs, school context may influence teachers' attitudes towards FBVs.

By contrast Janmaat's (2018) research takes a rather different approach and re-analyses a longitudinal data set for 420 young people collected throughout their secondary education until they were 22 years of age. He builds a measure of support for the FBVs by compiling items from an international civics survey. He concludes there are generally high levels of support for the FBVs and that this is consistent for white and BME young people. This research article is the only one which

seeks to establish whether young people can be encouraged to adopt the FBVs, albeit through the promotion of citizenship education rather than through the implementation of FBV policy.

Theme 3: Safeguarding

For many schools the Prevent duty is primarily associated with their safeguarding work, which is reflected in Busher *et al.*'s (2017) research but not in many of the small-scale research articles reviewed in the previous section. As noted in our introductory comments, this omission may reflect the different concerns (and therefore research focus) adopted by the practitioner-researchers whose work we have reviewed. Safeguarding refers to a wide range of activities schools have to undertake to ensure students avoid harm and maximize their chances of achieving successful outcomes. Safeguarding policy includes taking care of students with disabilities and additional needs; supporting those with responsibility as young carers; intervening where young people are being drawn into antisocial or criminal behaviour; providing support if a young person goes missing; taking actions to reduce the risk of modern slavery, forced marriage and female genital mutilation; monitoring students who live in families experiencing drug or alcohol misuse, mental health problems or domestic abuse; and intervening where young people are misusing drugs or alcohol, or where they are at risk of grooming or sexual exploitation. Safeguarding activities include direct teaching through the pastoral curriculum; individual case work; and liaison with other relevant agencies (DfE, 2018). The Prevent Duty, with its emphasis on schools having due regard to protect young people from being drawn into radicalisation and extremism, has been added to this already extensive list of safeguarding responsibilities.

For many of the critics of this policy, the controversial aspect of the Prevent Duty is that it introduces a security-led role for educational establishments, and thus potentially confuses the role of the teacher, and re-shapes the relationship between the teacher and their students, and their students' families (Lundie, 2017). However, Busher *et al.*'s (2017) findings indicate that the interpretation of the Prevent Duty within the framework of safeguarding renders it more recognisable for schools, without necessarily raising these political and ethical concerns. One of their respondents said:

I think perhaps when the conversation about Prevent first began it sounded like something which was a little bit obscure perhaps for some people, but I think as soon as people said 'it's a type of safeguarding' then it kind of clicked into place in terms of what our response should be (p. 23).

Their survey data indicates that staff in schools with more than 10% Muslim students were more likely to consider the Prevent policy to relate to safeguarding (than teachers in schools with fewer Muslim students), and they were much more likely to frame the policy as a safeguarding one than draw connections to extremism or British values (Busher *et al.*, 2017: 29).

This framing of Prevent as a safeguarding issue has also contributed to generally high levels of teachers saying they feel confident to implement the policy (76%), which Busher *et al.* argue is partly due to the training which accompanied the policy and partly due to the reassurance provided by situating the Prevent Duty within existing safeguarding frameworks. However, Revell & Bryan's (2016) research into the incorporation of the FBVs into the Teaching Standards demonstrated that being aware of policy change and adapting one's school policies "does not necessarily translate into altered practices and behaviour" (p. 348). They demonstrate that many schools simply map new policy frameworks onto existing processes, which at least suggests the possibility that staff in schools may be happy to add Prevent to their safeguarding policies without adapting their practice or engaging with the deeper challenges.

There is not much data in the existing research that speaks to this problem, but it notable that, alongside the high numbers of teachers expressing confidence in their ability to understand and implement the policy in Busher *et al.*, those teachers reporting difficulties seem not to mention

safeguarding issues but raise their lack of awareness of foreign policy, international conflicts, Islamist extremist organisations, and fears about appearing insensitive or Islamophobic (p. 34). Similarly, whilst most primary headteachers interviewed by Revell & Bryan (2016) seemed confident in their implementation of the policy, they also became cautious about whether or not it would be acceptable for a teacher to express lack of support for the monarchy or to attend an anti-war rally (pp.349-50). In other words, their certainty around implementation within the safeguarding context turns to uncertainty, confusion or misinformation in other contexts. Bryan's (2017) research is so limited in scope that it can only hint at issues that are worthy of further exploration, but she does make the point that none of her three respondents were able to explain the process of radicalization, even though they were confident they could safeguard students from radicalization.

This final point raises the possibility that some of the concerns of commentators like Kundnani (2014) and Kundnani & Hayes (2018) will have space to play out in reality. They argue that the idea of safeguarding individuals from radicalisation implies that there is a process of radicalisation that can be known, but in fact this is a false assumption. Here there has been a notable shift in the guidance to teachers. In the early guidance (DCSF, 2008) the examples of school intervention were all actual examples of students undertaking or openly promoting violence against others. In subsequent guidance teachers are encouraged to look for signs of radicalisation, for example, the on-line training module endorsed by the DfE lists 'engagement factors' that might reveal someone's vulnerability to radicalisation as including: "a need for identity, meaning and belonging... a desire for status... a desire for political or moral change" (CPMPS, 2014). These indicators are so vague that they only become operational if one imports other assumptions about who becomes an extremist. Kundnani and Hayes argue this reduces the space for young people (especially from suspect communities) to espouse radical political positions, and thus searching for radical change becomes a marker of a young person's risk to others, and of their vulnerability to extremists.

Some of these tensions are discussed in Lundie's (2017) research into the various forms of advice and guidance available to teachers:

Those in the policing and security sector often wished to locate Prevent as a safeguarding concern, with a focus on identifying and referring the small number of young people who may become drawn into violent extremism. While this is clearly the stated goal of the policy, it may be legitimate to question whether such sweeping curricular and legislative remedies are required across the country, if the goal is only to address a numerically tiny group on the threshold of criminality (p.10).

Whilst several of Lundie's respondents argued that "safeguarding is a curriculum issue" (p. 12), Quartermaine (2016) argues that schools should devise a three part programme which clearly deals with safeguarding, but complements this with approaches more consciously constructed to tackle extremist ideologies and promote community cohesion, so that Prevent does not simply become associated with a safeguarding agenda alone. This resonates with Jerome & Elwick's (2019) findings that young people want to learn about extremism, terrorism, the media and Islamophobia to enable them to understand the world around them, rather than as a form of narrow personal safeguarding.

Theme 4: Teacher Agency

These studies all shed light on the fact that policy has to be interpreted and enacted to have an impact on young people and that teachers and school leaders have choices (albeit constrained) because the evidence shows a range of responses. In this final section we briefly summarise how the research illustrates this constrained agency at work, and identify some of the factors that influence those decisions. This section illustrates not only how individuals can make a difference to the implementation of the Prevent policy, but how their agency in this regard is related to the context in which they work. Factors such as school population and local context; agenda of advisors and

managers; and availability of resources all influence the extent to which teachers' agency emerges (Priestley *et al.*, 2015).

Previous research in child-protection policy enactment has drawn attention to the work of 'mid-level policy actors' who function as intermediaries between national policy texts and teachers (Singh *et al.*, 2013). This research stresses how such policy actors translate and re-interpret policy as it moves from one context to another, which seems particularly relevant to the Prevent Duty's recontextualisation from security policy to education policy. Lundie's (2017) research explicitly focused on the private consultants who have emerged as specialists in this area. He argues their views on Prevent reflect their professional backgrounds, which include teaching but also the police service, local government, the third sector and faith based organisations. He found that "many professionals held nuanced and critical views about aspects of the current policy settlement" (p23), and that those with a teaching background seemed more concerned by the development of a "pre-criminal' surveillance space" in schools, whilst those with policing backgrounds seemed more concerned by the challenge of combining the principle of policing by consent with the requirements of compulsory schooling (p.7-8). He argues that the type of consultant delivering training and guidance to a school therefore influences the way the policy is framed and implemented. But even here there are opportunities for teachers to exercise agency, as is illustrated in Elwick & Jerome's (forthcoming) interview with one senior leader who was concerned after a training session led by a policing specialist was perceived to be problematic, and so he organised a second training session led by a local authority member of staff in order to better reflect the inclusive ethos of the school. Thus, even where schools feel the need to use external expertise, staff may have scope to exercise agency over what forms of expertise to access to inform their decisions. Lundie makes the same point when discussing what materials schools select to teach, as teachers exercise their discretion when choosing between different organisations producing resources which reflect their own priorities and world views (p. 16).

But, of course, not all teachers perceive their potential agency and some largely defer to the expert opinions on offer, or seek to comply in as straightforward a way as possible with DfE guidance or Ofsted requirements. Bryan's (2017) interviewees did not express concern about the political framing of the Prevent policy and chose instead to present the policy as though their "conduct was determined by the State and they in turn sought to determine the conduct of their students" (p. 224). This reflects some of the small-scale research discussed in theme 2 which identifies the importance of teachers' own political world-view as the starting point for their interpretations of Prevent policy (Habib, 2017; Farrell, 2016; Sant & Hanley, 2018). It also raises the prospect that those who fail to problematize the policy may slip into reproducing widely held negative views about extremism and Muslims (see for example Kaur-Ballagan *et al.*, 2018, which outlines consistently negative attitudes towards Muslims). This is illustrated by an interview in Busher *et al.*'s (2017) research:

If you're being realistic, the demographic of our teaching staff is white, and so any extremism from the far right, although it might be uncomfortable, it's more within your experience, and you feel better placed to judge how extreme you feel that is and whether you need to report on it... I feel that if a white child made extremist comments about Muslims, black people, they would be less likely to be reported than a Muslim student... Because the right wing extremism seems more commonplace (p. 26)

This vividly outlines the potential problem, which is possibly exacerbated by the variability of interpretations and guidance available to schools in what Lundie describes as a "post-institutional and post-regulatory space" (2017: 9) with consultants and freelance experts from a variety of backgrounds offering their own take on policy.

In addition, teachers are often limited by the kinds of choices made by their senior leadership and so if Prevent activity has been simply added to a very crowded pastoral curriculum, it is likely to have “low status and limited lesson time available for discussion and debate with pupils” (Vincent 2018a: 233). Similarly, teachers wishing to engage in conversations about their experience of complying with FBVs as part of their professional responsibilities, would likely find the space closed down by those head teachers interviewed in Revell & Bryan (2016) who had adopted a minimal strategy of integrating new requirements with existing appraisal processes. In these examples, compliance effectively ensures people can “tick the right box” (Vincent, 2018: 7) and move on.

Conclusion

It is clear from this review that the evidence base is still fairly restricted, and many of the studies are very small. However, it is possible to combine the overview provided by Busher *et al.*'s (2017) research, with the qualitative insights from other research, to identify some emergent themes. The educational debate about whether the security threat posed by the relatively small number of young people likely to engage in acts of terrorism is best met through a universal policy implemented through the curriculum (Lundie, 2017) reflects the more general debate in government. This broader debate is about whether the Prevent policy itself may be at risk of creating more problems than it solves, by alienating Muslim communities from state services (Anderson, 2017; JCHR, 2016; Hill, 2017). In educational terms there are concerns that the Prevent Duty may be having unintended effects that threaten community cohesion and inclusion in schools (Busher *et al.*, 2017; Pal Sian, 2015) and our review finds there is some evidence that white British teachers are more likely to focus their attention on Muslim students, and that Muslim students and staff feel this surveillance and suspicion. This is not surprising given the prevailing social discourse around Muslims and extremism (Green, 2017; Hoque, 2015), and seems to be exacerbated where staff do not feel knowledgeable or confident to engage with these issues, where they do not teach many Muslim students, or where their own world-view concurs with these widely held beliefs. In this context, the introduction of FBVs is open to misinterpretation, and can function as another mechanism for ‘othering’ minority students who do not see themselves reflected in narrow accounts of Britishness (Farrell, 2016; Green, 2017; Habib, 2017; Moncrieffe & Moncrieffe, 2017; Smith, 2016; Sant & Hanley, 2018). Whilst some teachers create spaces for critical reflection and dialogue about Britishness and the FBVs, there is evidence to suggest that some do not (Bamber *et al.*, 2018; Vincent, 2018a, 2018b).

Locating the Prevent Duty within the safeguarding framework has undoubtedly enabled many schools and teachers to engage with the policy on familiar territory. Schools have an infrastructure for safeguarding, including dedicated staff, training, multi-agency support networks, established policy and processes for monitoring and referral. It is common for schools to engage with external agencies (such as social workers, local authority representatives, or health professionals) over concerns about criminality, gang involvement etc. which may also be referred to local police officers. As with the Prevent Duty, some of these safeguarding issues may simultaneously concern the child as being vulnerable to exploitation by others, and also as a potential threat to others. However, this structural reassurance may be misleading as the data shows that teachers can simultaneously be confident in their ability to safeguard children from radicalisation without being confident that they understand the process of radicalisation (Busher *et al.*, 2017). This is ultimately because the ‘conveyor belt model’ of grooming, radicalisation, extremism and ultimately terrorism is a common trope in mainstream discourse (and even in some security services) but is widely discredited on evidential terms (Kundnani, 2014; Kundnani & Hayes, 2018). There may be scope for confusion here, especially as the Prevent policy has slipped from a focus on those expressing overt support for terrorism, to detecting signs of radicalisation (defined as dissent from the FBVs rather than support for terrorism or violence). It seems to us from our review of the research that the ways in which ‘safeguarding’ functions as a pastoral system, a security surveillance system, and a pre-criminal

space for intervention is worthy of further research in this area. We have been struck that safeguarding seems to operate as a mechanism for removing the politics from a process which is fundamentally about evaluating young people's emerging political views, and as such this emerges as an important area for further empirical investigation, although we also recognise that access and ethics are likely to be operating as prohibitive factors.

Ultimately, given that students are already very likely to support the government's list of fundamental British values (Janmaat, 2018) and exceedingly unlikely to support political violence for any reason (Jerome & Elwick, 2016) our review of the research indicates that the Prevent Duty may well be having a series of unnecessary and unintended effects, which are threatening long-established policies tackling racism, promoting equalities, and supporting community cohesion. There is evidence that teachers and school leaders may exercise their agency to challenge or minimise these negative side-effects, but with approximately half a million teachers in England, it seems unlikely that we can rely on them individually to respond to this challenge. Our reading of the evidence to date suggests very strongly that schools can implement the Prevent Duty satisfactorily (i.e. pass an Ofsted inspection) without ensuring that young people actually learn about extremism and terrorism, and without therefore being helped to understand the harrowing incidents that unfold around the world, and which are easily accessible to them via ubiquitous media and social media. As one of the secondary school students said in Jerome & Elwick (2017) "I knew what was going on the news, but I didn't know how to understand it" (p.9). Building young people's understanding seems to us to be one of the paramount obligations for teachers, and from our reading of the research evidence, it remains somewhat marginal to the Prevent Duty and to schools' responses.

References

- Arthur, J. (2015) Extremism and Neo-Liberal Education Policy: A Contextual Critique of the Trojan Horse Affair in Birmingham Schools, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 63(3), 311-328.
- Anderson, D. (2017, February 15) David Anderson QC: Prevent strategy can work against radicalisation... if it is trusted, *Evening Standard*.
- Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A. & Lundie, D. (2018) Educating Global Britain: Perils and Possibilities Promoting 'National' Values through Critical Global Citizenship Education, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 66(4), 433-453.
- Bryan, H. (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), 213-226.
- Busher, J., Choudhury, T., Thomas, P. & Harris, G. (2017) *What the Prevent duty means for schools and colleges in England: An analysis of educationalists' experiences*.
www.coventry.ac.uk/research/research-directories/research-news/2017/what-the-prevent-duty-means/ (accessed 10 September 2019).
- Cameron, D. (2011) *PM's speech to Munich Security Conference*.
www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference (accessed 10 September 2018).
- CPMPS. (2014) *Channel General Awareness*. On-line training module from the College of Policing and Metropolitan Police Service.
http://course.ncalt.com/Channel_General_Awareness/01/index.html (accessed 10 September 2018).
- DCSF. (2008) *Learning together to be safe: A toolkit to help schools contribute to the prevention of violent extremism* (DCSF-00804-2008) (Nottingham, Department for Children, Schools and Families).
- DfE. (2018) *Keeping children safe in education: Statutory guidance for schools and colleges* (DFE-00248-2018) (London, Department for Education).

- DfE. (2015) *The Prevent Duty. Departmental advice for schools and childcare providers* (London: Department for Education).
- DfE. (2014) *Promoting Fundamental British Values as part of SMSC in schools. Departmental advice for maintained schools* (DFE-00679-2014) (London, Department for Education).
- DfE (2011) *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies* (DFE-00066-2011) (London, Department for Education).
- Elton-Chalcraft, S., Lander, V., Revell, L., Warner, D. & 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.
- Elwick, A. & Jerome, L. (forthcoming) Balancing securitization and education in schools: Teachers' agency in implementing the Prevent duty, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*.
- Farrell, F. (2016) 'Why all of a sudden do we need to teach fundamental British values?' A critical investigation of religious education student teacher positioning within a policy discourse of discipline and control, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 280-297.
- Green, F. (2017) British values and identity among young British Muslims in Tower Hamlets: understandings and connections, *Journal of Children's Services*, 12(4), 239-256.
- Habib, S. (2017) *Learning and Teaching British Values: Policies and Perspectives on British Identities* (Cham, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan).
- Hill, M. (2017) Foreword, in: Forward Thinking. (Ed) *UK 'Building Bridges' Programme. Community Roundtables: A report on the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in London and Manchester* (London, Forward Thinking)
- HMG. (2011) *The Prevent Strategy* (London, The Stationary Office).
- Home Office. (2017) *Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent Programme, April 2015 to March 2016* (London, The Stationery Office).
- Hoque, A. (2015) *British-Islamic Identity: Third-Generation Bangladeshis from East London* (London, Institute of Education Press).
- Janmaat, J. (2018) Educational influences on young people's support for fundamental British values, *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(2), 251-273.
- JCHR. (2016) *Counter-Extremism. Second Report of Session 2016-17* (HL Paper 39, HC 105) (London, House of Lords and House of Commons Joint Committee on Human Rights).
- Jerome, L. & Elwick, A. (2019) Identifying an Educational Response to the Prevent Policy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 67(1), 97-114.
- Jerome, L. & Elwick, A. (2017) Teaching about Prevent as a Controversial Issue: Developing pedagogy in context, paper presented at the *BERA Annual Conference 2017*, University of Sussex, September.
- Jerome, L. & Elwick, A. (2016) *Evaluation report on the ACT Building Resilience Project* (London, Association for Citizenship Teaching).
- Jerome, L. & Clemitshaw, G. (2012) Teaching (about) Britishness? An investigation into trainee teachers' understanding of Britishness in relation to citizenship and the discourse of civic nationalism, *The Curriculum Journal*, 23(1), 19–41.
- Kaur-Kallagan, K., Mortimore, R. & Gottfried, G. (2018) *A review of survey research on Muslims in Britain*. (London, Ipsos MORI).
- Kundnani, A. (2014) *The Muslims are Coming! Islamophobia, extremism and the domestic war on terror* (London, Verso).
- Kundnani, A. & Hayes, B. (2018) *The globalisation of countering violent extremism policies: undermining human rights, instrumentalising civil society* (Amsterdam, Transnational Institute).
- Lockley-Scott, A. (2016) *What is the Impact of UK Government Strategies Preventing Non-Violent Extremism on Muslim Pupils in School?*, paper presented at the *University of Birmingham Education Conference*, 26th November.

- Lundie, D. (2017) *Security, Safeguarding and the Curriculum: Recommendations for effective multi-agency Prevent work in schools*. <http://cepa.hope.ac.uk/safetysecuritycurriculum/> (accessed 10 September 2018).
- Maylor, U. (2016) 'I'd worry about how to teach it': British values in English classrooms, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 314-328.
- McGhee, D. (2008) *The end of multiculturalism? Terrorism, integration and human rights* (Maidenhead, Open University Press).
- McGhee D. & Zhang S. (2017) Nurturing resilient future citizens through value consistency vs. the retreat from multiculturalism and securitisation in the promotion of British values in schools in the UK, *Citizenship Studies*, 21, 937-950.
- Moncrieffe, A. & Moncrieffe, M.L. (2019) An examination of imagery used to represent fundamental British values and British identity on primary school display boards, *London Review of Education*, 17(1), 52-69.
- Ofsted. (2015) *School inspection handbook. Handbook for inspecting schools in England under section 5 of the Education Act 2005 (120101)* (London, Ofsted).
- Pal Sian, K. (2015) Spies, surveillance and stakeouts: monitoring Muslim moves in British state schools, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 18(2), 183-201.
- Panjwani, F. (2016) Towards an overlapping consensus: Muslim teachers' views on fundamental British values, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 329-340.
- Phillips, C., Tse, D. & Johnson, F. (2010) *Community cohesion and PREVENT: how have schools responded?* Research Report DFE-RR085. London: Department for Education.
- Priestley, M., Biesta, G. & Robinson, S. (2015) *Teacher Agency: An Ecological Approach* (London, Bloomsbury).
- Quartermaine, A. (2016) Discussing terrorism: a pupil-inspired guide to UK counter-terrorism policy implementation in religious education classrooms in England, *British Journal of Religious Education*, 38 (1), 13-29.
- Revell, L. & Bryan, H. (2018) *Fundamental British Values in Education: Radicalisation, National Identity and Britishness* (Bingley, Emerald Publishing).
- Revell, L. & Bryan, H. (2016) Calibrating fundamental British values: how head teachers are approaching appraisal in the light of the Teachers' Standards 2012, Prevent and the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act, 2015, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 341-353.
- Sant, E. & Hanley, C. (2018) Political assumptions underlying pedagogies of national education: The case of student teachers teaching 'British values' in England, *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(2), 319-337.
- Singh, P., Harris, J., & Thomas, S. (2013) Recontextualising Policy Discourses: A Bernsteinian Perspective on Policy Interpretation, Translation, Enactment, *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(4), 465-480.
- Smith, H.J (2016) Britishness as racist nativism: a case of the unnamed 'other', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 298-313.
- Taylor, L. & Soni, A. (2017) Preventing radicalisation: a systematic review of literature considering the lived experiences of the UK's Prevent strategy in educational settings, *Pastoral Care in Education*, 35(4), 241-252.
- Thomas, P. (2016) Youth, terrorism and education: Britain's Prevent programme, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 35(2), 171-187.
- van Krieken Robson, J. (2019) How do practitioners in early years provision promote Fundamental British Values?, *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 27(1), 95-110.
- Vanderbeck, R. & Jonhson, P. (2016) The Promotion of British Values: Sexual Orientation Equality, Religion, and England's Schools, *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 30(3), 292-321.
- Vincent, C. (2018a) Civic virtues and values teaching in a 'post-secular' world, *Theory and Research in Education* doi.org/10.1177/1477878518774128

Vincent, C. (2018b) Cohesion, citizenship and coherence: Schools' responses to the British values policy, *British Journal of Sociology of Education* doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2018.1496011