

Revell, Lynn, Bryan, Hazel and Elton-Chalcraft, Sally (2018) Counter terrorism law and education: student teachers' induction into UK Prevent duty through the lens of Bauman's liquid modernity. In: Trimmer, Karen, Dixon, Roselyn and Findlay, Yvonne S., (eds.) The Palgrave handbook of education law for schools. Palgrave Macmillan, London, UK, pp. 553-565.

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/3915/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Counter terrorism Law and Education: student teachers' induction into UK Prevent Duty through the lens of Bauman's Liquid Modernity

Prof Hazel Bryan, Professor of Education, University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, UK

Dr Lynn Revell, Reader in Religion and Education, Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury Kent, UK

Dr Sally Elton-Chalcraft, Reader in Education, University of Cumbria, Lancaster, UK

Abstract

This chapter explores the way student teachers understand their professional role in relation to the UK's counter terrorism legislation as it relates to schools. Recent discussions on the nature of teacher professionalism characterise the relationship between the state and teachers whereby teacher' autonomy is increasingly eroded and compromised by policy. Using Bauman's concept of liquid modernity as a theoretical lens we analysed data collected from fifteen interviews with post graduate student teachers and one hundred and fifty questionnaires. Despite a normative attachment to notions of professional objectivity and political detachment in the classroom, most student teachers interpreted their new duties (to prevent radicalisation and promote fundamental British values), as legitimate and were uncritical of legislation and policy that expects them to play an overtly political role in schools. We argue that recent legislation and initiatives around extremism and radicalisation repositions teacher professional identity so that their involvement as part of a counter terrorist strategy is normalised.

Key words: counter terrorism law, liquid modernity, Prevent duty, teacher education, teacher professionalism

Introduction

This chapter is derived from research prompted by the development of counter terrorist legislation in the UK designed to prevent radicalisation and extremism that requires teachers and schools to act in new and different ways. The data discussed in this chapter is part of a larger research project that is exploring the ways schools are responding to the duties placed upon them by the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (HMO 2015). Data generated through the research suggests that student teachers' induction experiences are highly varied in relation to the Prevent Duty. This has significant implications for the ways in which student teachers conceptualise their role in relation to their students, and the ways in which student teachers conceptualise their relationship with subject knowledge relating to radicalisation and extremism. It also has significant implications for student teachers' opportunity to observe, learn about and develop pedagogical practices most appropriate for this new statutory dimension to teacher work.

We use Bauman's (2012) concept of Liquid Modernity as the conceptual framework in this research to cast light upon issues of change in relation to policy initiatives, in order to understand why teachers and student teachers are acting, practicing and developing in

certain ways. Bauman's thesis is helpful to this research as it addresses the consequences of shifting social norms and power relationships in contemporary society.

Context/background

In 2003 the UK Home Office published the first iteration of CONTEST, its counter-terrorism and anti-extremism strategy. Developed in response to the attacks in America in 2001 (referred to as the 9/11 attacks), CONTEST was modified in 2006 following the attacks on the London transport network in 2005 (known as the 7/7 attacks). CONTEST comprises four strands, namely:

- **Pursue:** directly disrupting and preventing terrorist attacks;
 - **Prevent:** stopping people becoming terrorists or from supporting terrorism;
 - **Protect:** strengthening the UK's protection against a terrorist attack;
 - **Prepare:** mitigating the effects of a terrorist attack when it cannot be prevented.
- (Home Office, 2003)

Of these four strands, the second, Prevent, relates directly to education, where education professionals working in schools, colleges and early years childcare settings are required to enact a 'Prevent Duty'. Launched on 1st July 2015, the Prevent Duty is set out in the 'Revised Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales' (2015) in which statutory guidance is articulated under section 29 of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. The Prevent Duty expects that "Schools should be safe spaces in which children and young people can understand and discuss sensitive topics, including terrorism and the extremist ideas that are part of terrorist ideology, and learn how to challenge these ideas. The Prevent Duty is not intended to limit discussion of these issues" (DfE, 2015, p. 11). Schools are required to demonstrate their Prevent Duty through risk assessment (where they should be able to identify pupils at risk of radicalization and have in place 'robust safeguarding policies'), working with other agencies, the training of staff and IT policies and practices (DfE, 2015, p.11).

The Prevent Strategy has also, uniquely, informed the development of the most recent set of Teachers' Standards in England. The Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2012) draw upon the Prevent Strategy in requiring teachers to promote 'fundamental British values'. Originally articulated as 'not undermining' fundamental British values, teachers should:

'...uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school by:

- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law' (DfE, 2012).

That a counter terrorism strategy should inform a set of teachers' standards makes clear the degree to which UK government positions teachers as key players in counter-terrorism. This is strengthened by the requirement for teachers to promote fundamental British values both

within and outside of school, that is, within the public and private spheres.

It is within this relatively new policy backdrop that this research has taken place. We were interested to know what the experiences of student teachers were in relation to Prevent whilst on school placement. The research is intended to provide insight into the students' perceptions of what schools are doing in terms of risk assessment, the identification of pupils at risk, working with other agencies and IT policies and practices.

Conceptual Framework

In his thesis on Liquid Modernity, Bauman (2012) argues that contemporary society can be characterised as in a state of transition - a *constant* state of transition. Modernity, Bauman suggests, represents a solid state that has little resonance in contemporary times, where change is the only permanence. Such a state of flux and fluidity has consequences, and Bauman (2012) notes the fragility that characterises all strata of society, from changing geographical boundaries of nation states to the freedom to determine one's own gender. Bauman argues that within such a state of liquidity, power is manipulated in ways that differ from the way power is channelled in times of Modernity. In a state of Modernity, power is exercised by constraint, whereas, Bauman argues, in times of Liquid Modernity, power is wielded through uncertainty (Bauman and Haugaard, 2008).

Liquidity also permeates social norms; Modernity celebrated cultural capital and all that this represents in the form of narratives of stability, artefacts, possession and icons. In times of Liquid Modernity, however, investment in such representations of culture are losing their monopoly, as different narratives of consumption, transition and mobility emerge. A consequence of permanent fluidity is the weakening of social norms, which arguably melt faster than new norms emerge. This in turn results in a society with decreasing frames of reference for actions (Bauman, 2005) and, in such a state of liquefaction, the exercise of human agency is necessarily inhibited. This may at first appear contradictory, but Bauman's thesis highlights the way in which postmodern societies, in exchanging the notion of collective security for maximum individual freedom, arrive at a state of uncertainty and anxiety (Bauman, 2000): there is a particular irony in the way in which increased personal freedom gives rise to a state of heightened anxiety.

Method and methodology

The project began with one hundred and fifty post graduate student teachers from one University in the South of England engaged in a survey that captured their experiences of the ways in which schools are engaging with this new legislation. The student teachers, from a predominantly white background were invited to reflect on their understanding of the role of teachers in relation to the new duties. The questions asked the students to gather information about the execution of aspects of Prevent in their practicum schools, including; the approach to the promotion of fundamental British values, visible signs of Prevent and fundamental British values, the way Prevent and issues relating to radicalisation and extremism were dealt with as part of their induction into the life of the school and the way the school framed the role of the teacher in relation to the radicalisation process.

In the second year of the study fifteen students from a specialised cohort of Citizenship Education students were interviewed and the data analysed using a framework developed from Bauman's (2012) theory of Liquid Modernity. The interviews took the form of dialogic

spaces where both the interviewee and the interviewer were involved in the production of knowledge (Holstein and Gubrium: 1995). This approach meant that the interview was not envisioned as an 'interpersonal drama' but as an interpretative praxis whereby understanding and meaning are crafted as part of the interview process (Holstein and Gubrium: 1995, 16). This type of interview was selected because of the focus of the research and because of the use of Bauman's notion of Liquid Modernity (Bauman 2012). Within Liquid Modernity the individual is adrift in multiple changing narratives and the fluidity of their professional environment means they struggle to make sense of the world in which they live, and their place within it. In a climate where the Prevent Duty and requirement to promote fundamental British values are relatively new, it would have been naïve on our part to undertake interviews which assumed that participants had already developed coherent responses to complex political and professional issues. Our choice of interview type was also influenced by our understanding of the way the professional identity of teachers develops (Day et al: 2006).

Data

Approaches to the promotion of fundamental British values

Data from the questionnaires suggests that all schools were aware of their duties under the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, Prevent and the Teacher's Standards (DfE, 2012) in the two academic years that the data was collected (2015-2106 and 2016-2017). This finding confirmed conclusions from the small number of other projects that have examined the impact of Prevent in education (Bryan 2012, Bryan and Revell 2016, Farrel 2016, Panjwani 2016, Elton-Chalcraft et al 2017, Bryan 2017). However, the nature of that engagement differed between schools. A minority of schools did not address any aspect of Prevent in lessons or whole school activities but in those that did the most common strategy was through PSHE, Citizenship lessons and assemblies. The approach taken by schools was varied and ranged from dedicating a term within Citizenship Education for issues relating to extremism and radicalisation to using existing schemes within the school. One school integrated their approach to radicalisation through its Growth Mind-set Education programme and another located it with their Behaviour Watch initiative.

Visible signs of fundamental British values and the Prevent Duty

In response to the question 'Did you identify any visual evidence of Prevent in your school?' ninety two per cent of students reported that their schools displayed visual signs of compliance with the law, and these included posters about extremism, the promotion of fundamental British values, displays of pupil work and lessons on aspects of extremism, fundamental British values and radicalisation. A minority of students reported that the visual presence of Prevent was minimal. One student commented that there 'was one small poster in a school of 2, 300' and another that there were 'a few posters on fundamental British values but very little else'. Primary schools were more likely to display posters on aspects of Britishness, and these were often accompanied by artefacts relating to popular British icons (bunting, flags, scones).

Induction and Prevent

Student experience of induction into their role in executing Prevent was mixed. Sixty per cent of all students said that at no point in their practicum did their mentors or other

teachers explain how the school was responding to Prevent – this did not feature in their induction programme. Neither did these schools indicate how the student teachers would be expected to address relevant issues or questions in any part of the curriculum. Of the forty per cent that did receive some input this was part of their general induction to the life of the school or as part of a series of introductory sessions about aspects of the professional responsibility of the teacher. The most common approach to fulfilling the Prevent Duty appeared to be through the promotion fundamental British values with only 27 per cent of schools directly addressing the issues of radicalisation or extremism.

Framing the role of the teacher in relation to radicalisation; the view from the student teacher perspective

When asked to describe what other teachers thought about the Prevent Duty eighty per cent (120) said ‘Most teachers thought that it was a good idea’ and in answer to the question about how they understood the role of the teacher in relation to Prevent eighty eight per cent agreed that ‘Teachers should do everything they can to support government initiatives in relation to countering radicalisation and promoting fundamental British values’. Students were also asked to give two examples of what they thought might constitute active or vocal opposition to fundamental British values in the context of schools. Most respondents described incidents or views that could be categorised as ‘intolerance of those of other cultures and religions’ or of showing lack of respect to ‘minority groups and those of other faiths or no faith’. A minority of students gave examples that related to ‘the rule of law’ or ‘democracy’. Examples included ‘acting as though the law didn’t apply to them and thinking they had a right to impose their views on others’ and ‘believing that other people’s views weren’t important even when they were in the minority’.

It was in this section of the questionnaire that students were more likely to express some criticism of aspects of Prevent in the form of comments about the nature of fundamental British values. Just under a quarter of students included comments about the scope and nature of the values:

‘It’s ridiculous that they’re called British, why not human values?’

‘Calling them British is just short sighted, anyone that isn’t British is going to feel excluded, it tells them that their values aren’t as important.’

‘What does calling them British even mean, every single thing is covered by the ethos of the school anyway’.

‘In my experience it’s the British who don’t have these values, they’re an insult to everyone else in the world who has had these values for a lot longer!’

During their interviews the Citizenship Education students confirmed that they were aware of Prevent and that the purpose of legislation and policy was to stop radicalisation. All students knew that they were now expected to identify pupils at risk from radicalisation and that even where they did not know the details they knew that in schools there would be protocols about how their suspicions should be dealt with. All students were certain about how they would identify pupils at risk from radicalisation and most were able to cite the markers given in Prevent.

Where students were less certain was how they would distinguish between pupils who legitimately displayed signs of alienation, changed behaviour and students who were genuinely at risk from radicalisation. Only two of the fifteen students thought that 'there might be issues' caused by their lack of expertise in areas to do with radicalisation and extremism. The thirteen students who thought that there were no significant issues in relation to identifying pupils at risk from radicalisation gave similar reasons for their confidence in this area, including:

- They were aware, or assumed that there were, senior members of staff in the school who would take responsibility for the process of monitoring at risk pupils and coordinating with Channel (reporting procedure for potentially radicalised).
- They considered pupils who might be at risk from radicalisation to be similar to other at risk pupils. This meant that even though pupils displayed warning signs that might not mean they were at risk from radicalisation - they were probably still vulnerable and therefore in need of observation.
- They were aware that mistakes could be made (and that mistakes had been made) but that it was safer to be too vigilant than to be negligent.

Students were asked about their political views at the start of the interview. They all identified as individuals to whom politics was interesting and of personal importance. They were able to talk about their political beliefs eloquently and many said that one of the attractions of training to be a teacher of Citizenship Education was the expectation that the discussion of political issues would be a routine part of the curriculum. Students were then asked whether they thought it was, or ever would be appropriate for them to talk about their own political views in the classroom and whether they thought it would be appropriate for them as teachers to try to influence the views of pupils. All students thought it would be inappropriate for a teacher to deliberately attempt to influence the views of pupils even when they thought that pupils' views were unacceptable. While they were all shocked at the idea that it would ever be acceptable for them to bring their own views into the classroom they all believed that it was a legitimate part of their professional role to encourage debate where pupils could 'come to understand' or 'realise that there are other ways of seeing the world'.

Discussion

Our findings are taken from 150 questionnaires and interviews with 15 students from a predominantly white background, and as such it would be illegitimate to make generalisations from such a small number. However the data from the questionnaires did confirm some findings that are emerging from the growing literature on Prevent in schools. Most schools are engaged in some way with the Prevent agenda. Our findings indicate that schools are displaying concepts, artefacts and icons of Britishness: primary schools in particular have engaged in notably elaborate displays. All student teachers in the study were aware of the new legal duties placed upon them and were familiar with the narrative of fundamental British values that underpins counter terrorism legislation. The data presented by the National Police Chiefs' Council showing that since 2012 there have been 2,422 referrals to Channel from schools alone, demonstrates the rapidity with which new social forms - in this case a Prevent Duty - are introduced. The notion of transition from a solid to

a liquid form of modernity is expressed here in relation to the rapidity of change (Bauman, 2005). The number of referrals is also a reflection of the impact Prevent is having on teacher work, where teachers know that there are serious consequences if Prevent is not enacted in school, and where all teachers in our research assumed their Duty without question. The idea that teachers are referring pupils to Channel to be 'on the safe side' is in itself an expression of insecurity.

The speed with which forms change in society results in a state of constant anxiety (Bauman, 2012). Indeed, the various iterations of Prevent reflect this very process, where subsequent alterations in terms of the nature of the Prevent document can be read as an exercise in uncertainty.

Similarly, student teachers reported that all teachers with whom they came into contact during their practicum believed it was appropriate for them to have a Prevent Duty; this was not questioned. The students reported that teachers however, did not have a depth of knowledge of the processes of radicalisation that would enable them to prevent their pupils from becoming radicalised, and no student teacher heard a teacher expressing concern about their lack of subject knowledge in this area. There are a number of reasons why this may be the case, and Bauman's notion of constant transition (2008) is helpful here in terms of understanding the continuous shifts in policy that shape education. Teachers are enacting their statutory Duty with no frame of reference for this work (Bauman, 2005); as professionals they would normally attend subject knowledge enhancement courses, training days and join Subject Associations to ensure their subject knowledge is secure. In the case of Prevent, teachers are unquestioningly engaging in new territory but with no 'muscle memory'. It is here that the consequences of liquidity can be understood; whilst teachers have no subject knowledge to bring to the classroom in relation to radicalisation, and in spite of the fact that they are statutorily required to prevent radicalisation, they do not complain because they practice in a state of liquidity; liquidity is their norm. There *should* be tension here but it is not apparent – we had fully expected teachers to challenge the Prevent Duty in terms of their preparation and expertise to enact this Duty but it has not materialised. And it is here that liquidity is situated, in the space where tension should be located. This indifference, this absence, is the essence of Liquid Modernity, where fluidity and uncertainty are the norms.

Student teachers also reported that, in their experience, all schools were *aware* of their Prevent Duty but that not all schools enacted the Prevent Duty through lessons or whole school activities. Analysis of the questionnaires and interviews shows that the Prevent Duty was enacted largely by foregrounding narratives and icons of Britishness. These were apparent in the posters displayed around schools on values, and in displays of British artefacts, famous British people, well-known landmarks and monuments. Student teachers also reflected that The Rule of Law and Democracy were less obviously addressed through displays or posters and posters and/or displays on radicalisation and extremism were not evident. The aspect of the Prevent Duty that requires teachers to prevent pupils from becoming radicalised was less apparent in schools. Interestingly, the student teachers were untroubled by this discrepancy, oblivious to the fault line running through the enactment of the Prevent Duty. Teachers too were untroubled by this discrepancy. Our student teachers' experiences suggested that they had little sense of who was taking overall responsibility for ensuring Prevent was enacted appropriately by each teacher, and that teachers were

working collectively on some aspects of Prevent but that not all teachers were au fait with all aspects of Prevent. Significantly, this did not cause them concern. In a sense, they did not assume agency over their work in this area. Bauman suggests that liquefaction results in restricted human agency (Bauman 2012, Best, 2017), and this is helpful in understanding why the teachers in this study did not appear to take individual responsibility for this area of work –the restriction of agency in professional practice has been brought about by waves of change and Prevent, it seems, is the latest.

In relation to countering terrorism, all student teachers said they felt that teachers should do all they can to counter terrorism, and yet no student reflected that their teacher training did not include this, or that their induction programme did not cover this aspect of the Prevent Duty. There is a sense here of the student as consumer, rather than seeking a solid understanding of the subject matter in hand. Bauman's notion of consumption (2008) as a feature of Liquid Modernity, and of the subsequent fragile nature of this consumption is apparent in this data, where the students had no sense of, or concern about, the fragility of their knowledge. And it is here again that Bauman's (2012) thesis on liquidity highlights a new aspect of professional practice where the student teachers were untroubled by flux, by the changing nature of practice in schools, by competing demands upon their professional knowledge and skills, because this is what it is to be a professional educator in times of Liquid Modernity.

In a similar vein, all students agreed that they should do all they can to promote fundamental British values, although some then reflected that, in their view, the concept of fundamental British values is problematic – too limited, too inward looking. This though was a dilemma that once expressed, abated, and students carried on with their Prevent Duty. The shadow of lack of professional agency fell over the data once again, as we considered how comfortable students were practicing in this contested field.

Whilst student teachers were confident that their future schools would have protocols to address Prevent, this was viewed in two ways; firstly, in terms of offering a counter narrative to terrorism through the promotion of fundamental British values, through posters, displays and artefacts and secondly, through the curriculum where radicalisation and terrorism would be explored. However, none of the participating student teachers received induction into the processes of radicalisation – this was not part of the induction programme, although they as teachers are required to prevent pupils from becoming radicalised. It is significant that an introduction to the processes of radicalisation was not part of induction, although of greater significance is the fact that student teachers had not raised this as an issue. Some 60% of students had no discussion about or introduction to the Prevent Duty from their Mentor, despite the statutory nature of the Prevent Duty both within the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2012) and the OfSTED inspection framework for ITT providers; Mentors will have been acutely aware of both frameworks and would have understood the significance of this from both perspectives. It was also clear that the way schools fulfilled their legal duties in relation to Prevent varied, so that while some schools embedded the obligation to promote fundamental British values in and across the curriculum and inducted student teachers into the protocols for reporting potential radicalisation in the school, for other schools the engagement with Prevent was largely invisible.

Bauman (2012) argues that in liquid times power is wielded through uncertainty, and this is apparent in the ways in which teachers and student teachers are engaging with the Prevent Duty. The education professionals in this research accepted their Duty without question. They did not query the nature of the latest iteration of Prevent and articulated complete compliance with Government requirements. Government then, has assumed a position of power in relation to teachers in spite of the fact that this is an inchoate field.

There are two observations to make on the data. Firstly, the data demonstrated many discrepancies (for example schools understood the statutory nature of the Prevent Duty and yet students received variable induction in this; teachers had limited expertise in the processes of radicalisation and yet no teacher expressed concern about this - and so on). These discrepancies highlighted where one might expect to find tensions, and yet no tensions were articulated. There was a sense of absence when we listened to the students describe their practice or that of their teachers – and the space between the discrepancies became a place of focus for us. The student teachers seemed to feel little agency in relation to this work, and a sense of indifference in relation to the discrepancies. This sense of indifference, the space between the issues, expresses a central dimension of Liquid Modernity.

The second observation is the ease with which the student teachers handled the state of flux they found themselves in. In the past, flux would have been an interruption, whereas these student teachers regarded flux and uncertainty as part of the educational landscape, and are a defining feature.

Conclusion

This research indicates that there are implications for the ways in which student teachers, through their experiences in schools, are conceptualising their Prevent Duty. In a sense this is unsurprising because the Prevent Duty offers an incomplete narrative of fundamental British values as a counter narrative to radicalisation and extremism. Bauman's (2012) thesis has enabled us to interpret this data from the perspective of liquidity and change, and it is here that our most valuable insights lie. It seems from the research that students are enacting what we would wish to identify as a new form of professionalism – liquid professionalism – where some of the grand narratives of 'Teacher Professionalism', namely subject knowledge and professional autonomy, are recast in liquid times; none of our participants expressed concern about their lack of subject knowledge of radicalisation or extremism and none of our participants expressed a concern that they had been bestowed with a Prevent Duty, despite the fact that this is beyond what teachers have traditionally been required to do as teacher work. While Bauman (2012) offers the notion of boundaries melting away, which is helpful when conceptualising the notion that teachers should promote fundamental British values within and outside of school; the private and public spheres are without boundaries in this policy space - and student teachers and teachers have not expressed concern in this regard. It could even be suggested that these student teachers' lack of concern towards the imposition of Prevent duties might characterise a teacher/pupil relationship which is fluid, exemplifying restricted human agency (Bauman 2012) and indifference towards radicalisation and extremism. While not all student teachers adopted an uncritical and compliant attitude it is concerning that the majority did.

References

- Bauman, Z. (2012) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity
- Bauman, Z. and Haugaard. (2008) Culture, Modernity and Revolution in *Journal of Power*. Vol 1 Issue 2 pp. 111-130
- Bauman, Z. (2005) Education in Liquid Modernity in *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*. Vol 27 Issue 4 pp. 303-17
- Best, S. (2017) Education in the Interregnum: an evaluation of Zygmund Bauman's liquid turn in education. In *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. Vol 38 Issue 2 pp. 203-220
- Bryan, H and Revell, L. (2011) Performativity, faith and identity: Student religious education teachers and the ambiguities of objectivity, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 59 (4), 403-419.
- Bryan, H. (2017) (in press) Developing the Political Citizen: how teachers are navigating the statutory demands of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 and the Prevent Duty. In *Journal of Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. Available at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1746197917717841> accessed on 12.05 .18
- Bryan, H. and Revell, L. (2016) Calibrating Fundamental British Values: how Head Teachers are approaching appraisal in the light of the Teachers' Standards 2012 and the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act, 2015 *Journal for the Education of Teachers* Special Edition on Fundamental British Values vol 42 issue 3
- Bryan, H (2012) Reconstructing the Teacher as Post-Secular Pedagogue: a consideration of the new Teachers' Standards in the *Journal of Values and Beliefs*. Vol 33 Number 2 August 2012 pgs 217-228
- Day, C. Kington, A. Stobart, G and Sammons, P. (2006) The Personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal*. 32(4) 601-616.
- Durodie, B. (2015) Securitising Education to Prevent Terrorism or loosing Direction? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 64 (1) 21-35.
- 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* vol 43 no 1 Feb 2017 available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/berj.2017.43.issue-1/issuetoc>
- 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* vol 42 issue 3 special issue: Fundamental British Values pg 280-297

Gearon, L.(2015) Education, security and intelligence studies, *British Journal of Education Studies*, 63 (3),263-279.

Heath-Kelly, C. (2013) Counter-Terrorism and the Counterfactual: producing the 'Radicalisation' Discourse and the UK PREVENT Strategy. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. 15. 394-415.

Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. (1995) *The Active Interview*. London: Sage Publications

Home Office (2011) *Prevent Strategy*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2015) *Counter - Terrorism and Security Act 2015*. London: The Stationery Office (TSO) available at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/6/contents/enacted/data.htm> accessed on 20.10.17

HM Government (2015) *Revised Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales*. London: Home Office.

O'Donnell, A. (2015) Securitisation, counterterrorism and the silencing of dissent: The educational implications of Prevent, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64 (1) 53-76.

Panjwani, F. (2016) Towards an overlapping consensus: Muslim teachers' views on fundamental British values *Journal of Education for teaching* vol 42 issue 3 special issue: Fundamental British Values pgs 329-340

Sian, K. P.(2013) Spies, surveillance and stakeouts: Monitoring Muslim moves in British state schools, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*,18(2), 183-201.

Whitty, G. (2000) Teacher Professionalism in new times. *Journal of In-Service Education*. 26(2) 281-295.