The 'Prevent Duty' (Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015) and its Impact on English Secondary Schools: A View from Leadership

Adam Peter Lang

Abstract: My paper considers 'dialogue' and seeks to begin to consider what has been succeeded and what has not yet been succeeded with the 'Prevent duty' in English secondary schools.

In July 2015, a legal duty came into force requiring that 'specified authorities' in England, which included schools, show 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism'. This is popularly referred to as the 'Prevent duty'. Prevent, developed by the Home Office in 2003 out of full public scrutiny, and only fully operationalised following the 7 July 2005 London bombings, has consistently been the most contentious element of the UK Government Counter-Terrorist Strategy (CONTEST).

Four years on, my research aim is to find out how the 'Prevent duty' has been enacted by school and college leaders in secondary schools and colleges in England and additionally, to discover to what extent, if any, the 'Prevent duty' has 'securitised' education and what effect, if any, it has had on free speech in schools.

I have rich data from school leaders and schools in various geographical locations. My key findings use the work of Stephen. J. Ball on policy enactment, explore different policy actor positions and consider how Prevent is impacting on schools, on the professionalism of school leaders and on concepts such as 'free speech' and 'securitisation'.

Using Michel Foucault to think differently, I place my work in the global context of 'An Age of Anger'. Can Foucault's method be helpful in analysing education policy and practice or does such a lens blur our understanding? Is it possible to evaluate the 'Prevent duty' in terms of success and failure? How important is dialogue in this field?

Keywords: Prevent duty, School leadership, Policy enactment, Securitisation, Extremisms, Citizenship education

Adam Peter Lang is a former London secondary school teacher and school leader. He is now at University College, London, working as a PhD research scholar. He is also an education leadership consultant engaged with a number of projects. He writes and comments in the media on education.

Introduction and Context of my Research

In 2015, a parent came to ask my advice about a relative at a school outside London who had been referred to the Channel programme, a multi-agency programme which, according to the Home Office (HM Government Channel Duty guidance 2015, 2), existed to 'provide support for people vulnerable to being drawn into terrorism'. The child had been referred for allegedly speaking up for a Palestinian state in a discussion with fellow pupils. The woman, a successful, educated, Muslim businesswoman and British citizen spoke of the 'humiliation, shock and anger' that she and her extended family felt – they no longer believed that they were equal citizens in their country. This case confirmed the reservations that I had regarding the new 'Prevent duty' and made me reflect as a head teacher and teacher and question this policy. My concerns and questions motivated me to not only research the' Prevent duty' in its practical and operational effects but to consider the need for this very significant and new 'Prevent duty' to be researched and studied in a rigorous, academic, theoretical and systematic way.

In July 2015, a legal duty came into force requiring that 'specified authorities' in England, which included schools as well as colleges, show 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism'. This is popularly referred to as the 'Prevent duty' (Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015).

These duties, which had not existed in previous periods such as the Troubles[1] in Ireland and the UK, created new challenges and demands for school and college leaders in carrying out their work (Riley in Earley, P. and Greany, T. 2017). As yet no systematic study on the way the 'Prevent duty' is viewed and has impacted on leadership in English secondary schools has been published. Busher et al (2017) produced a limited study on teachers and schools, two years on from the arrival of the legal duty. Their report did not refer to leadership specifically and recognised that more research is needed on the 'Prevent duty' and more evidence needs to be gathered of how it has played out at ground level. It is significant that a new review called for by the Home Office and led by Lord Carlile has in August 2019 just begun its work looking at the government's counter-radicalisation and 'Prevent' strategy. This review is already mired in controversy (Independent 2019) with questions being raised regarding its independence and its credibility as well as the confidence it can instil.

My own context is that I was for over thirty years a London secondary teacher and for twenty of those a secondary school leader working in a range of diverse West London schools. As a school leader I was used to implementing and managing policy and I

---

1   The Troubles – the period of conflict and violence known internationally as the Northern
     Ireland conflict in The UK and Ireland, 1968–1998.

served as Chair of the Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) Public and Parliamentary Committee. In this role I examined, engaged in and influenced and shaped a range of educational policies. I was very interested in the 'Prevent duty' and as a result I was asked to be involved in the consultation led by the Home Office in advance of the Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill of 2015. I had concerns about the statutory 'Prevent duty' at that time and its potential impact both intended and unintended. Having now left leadership in schools, aside from some consultancy work, I decided, after a period of reflection, to return to academic study encouraged by family, former colleagues and fellow academics.

I believe that a study of the 'Prevent duty' and school leadership makes a fascinating study and is a rich area to explore particularly in relation to the ways policy is enacted and to the success of dialogue as a tool in this sensitive and controversial field.

The 'Prevent Duty'

The 'Prevent duty' was the latest outcome of the UK's counter-terrorism strategy – called CONTEST – that goes back to 2003. CONTEST has four elements or work streams that are known within the counter-terrorism community as the four Ps: Prevent, Pursue, Protect and Prepare. The aim of the UK counter-terrorism strategy is 'to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from terrorism, so that people can go about their lives freely and with confidence.'

The purpose of Pursue is to stop terrorist attacks by detecting, prosecuting and otherwise disrupting those who plot to carry out attacks against the UK or its overseas interests. The purpose of Protect is to strengthen protection against a terrorist attack in the UK or against its interests overseas and so reduce their vulnerability. The focus is on border security, the transport system, national infrastructure and public places. The purpose of Prepare is to mitigate the impact of a terrorist attack where that attack cannot be stopped. This includes work to bring a terrorist attack to an end and to increase the UK's resilience so the country can recover from its aftermath.

The overall aim of the Prevent strategy, the fourth P, is to reduce the threat to the UK from terrorism by stopping people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism.

The overall Prevent strategy has, according to the UK government, three specific strategic objectives:

- Respond to the ideological challenge of terrorism and the threat we face from those who promote it.

- Prevent people from being drawn into and supporting terrorism and ensure that they are given appropriate advice.

- Work with sectors and institutions where there are risks of radicalisation that we need to address.

Prevent, first developed by the Home Office in 2003 out of full public scrutiny, and only fully operationalised (Omand 2010) following the 7 July 2005 London bombings (7/7), has consistently been the most controversial and contentious element of CONTEST (Griffith-Dickson et al. 2014) and will be the focus of my thesis. A revised version of Prevent was first made publicly available in 2006; after 7/7 further revisions were published on 24 March 2009; and again, in April 2014.

In 2011 the then-Coalition government created an explicitly changed Prevent strategy to deal with all forms of terrorism and to target not just violent extremism but also non-violent extremism 'which can create an atmosphere conducive to terrorism and can popularise views which terrorists exploit' (HMG 2011 Prevent strategy). Prevent still remained a central part of the overall CONTEST policy and was designed 'to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism' (HMG 2011, 6).

The 'Prevent duty' of 2015 broadened and significantly changed the Prevent element of the overall counter-terrorism strategy as for the first time it placed a specific legal responsibility on schools and colleges to play a key role in the prevention of extremism and terrorism. The Government defined extremism in this new duty as 'vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs' (HM Government Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015, s.26).

Research Aims, Research Questions and Conceptual Framework

Four years on from the introduction of the 'Prevent duty' my key research aim is to find out how the 'Prevent duty' has been enacted by school and college leaders in secondary schools and colleges in England; and additionally to discover to what extent, if any, the 'Prevent duty' has 'securitised' education and what effect, if any, it has had on free speech in schools and colleges.

My key research question is:

How has the 'Prevent duty' been interpreted and enacted in selected secondary schools and colleges in England by school and college leaders?

Subsidiary questions are:

1. How do school and college leaders think that the 'Prevent duty' has impacted on schools and colleges, on interactions with students and

parents, on teaching and learning, on the curriculum and on student relations?

2. How do school and college leaders regard the 'Prevent duty'? What positive views and criticisms, if at all, do they have on the duty?

3. How and to what extent, if any, has the 'Prevent duty' 'securitised' education and what effect, if any, has it had on the practices of free speech in schools and colleges?

4.

   a) How has the role of and professionalism of school leaders changed, if at all, as a result of the 'Prevent duty' and how, if at all, has the 'Prevent duty' and its effects changed over a school leader's time working in education and schools?

   b) How have school and college leaders managed and enacted the 'Prevent duty' and what new systems, structures and training have been introduced, if any, by school and college leaders to manage the 'Prevent duty'?

My work considers the way in which leaders, using the ASCL eligibility for membership (head teachers, principals and senior management leadership teams), engage with the policy and how the 'Prevent duty' is enacted.

I have carried out my interview research in three different geographical locations in London, Manchester and Kent. I have identified these areas in order to interview school and college leaders in a range of schools with different student populations and serving different communities. Comparisons can be made between responses from London, with culturally diverse schools with a sizeable (over 30%) Muslim population, and the North of England some with a sizeable Muslim population others with a predominantly white population and responses in Kent, where the schools identified have different school populations, some with high levels (70%) of white British children. I have chosen Manchester because of the 2017 bombing. The schools identified include Local Education Authority (LEA) schools, academies, schools with post-16 provision, at least one faith school and one single-sex school.

Can a theory help or hinder our understanding?

In order to answer the question as to whether a theory or method can illuminate my key and subsidiary questions and those set out at the outset of this paper, I want to turn to Foucault. Using Foucault as a lens, I aim to 'show that things are not as obvious as people believe' (Foucault 2002, 456). My research questions the 'Prevent duty', and in the process of critiquing, probing and analysing it, recognises that 'Foucault offers not solutions but practices' (Ball 2017, 36). Developing from Foucault, I will draw on

the work of Stephen J. Ball on policy enactment. These building blocks provide me with a useful but changing conceptual framework.

The first responsibility of government is traditionally that of protector (Hobbes 1651), and hence in the UK, as in any other state, the desire is for national security. The Prevent duty is situated within this context where real and perceived threats of terrorism have brought this responsibility to the fore. The context is complicated by the fact that we are also witnessing a period of time, when liberalism and neoliberal economics are being strongly challenged: a period of economic and cultural insecurity when some argue that the liberal progressive consensus is breaking down and economics and politics are moving in a post-liberal direction (Pabst 2017; Brender and Pisani 2010; Mason 2015). In essence there is a need to debate theories of neoliberalism which have become a normative and political construct. My work, in the spirit of critique and scholarship, wishes to think through the utility of the concept of neoliberalism around issues of education and education policy.

Thus, a theoretical approach, even a complex one such as Foucault's, can help in our understanding of the 'Prevent duty'. We can use Foucault to think differently and in particular about how schools do policy.

Foucault

I am using Foucault as a theoretical lens to explore how to think differently about how we problematise, research and make sense of education, in this case the 'Prevent duty' and its perceived impact on selected English secondary schools. What would Foucault, as a disruptive scholar, write about 'the Prevent duty' in this 'Age of Anger' (Mishra 2017)? How can we use Foucault to think differently, how can we apply Foucault's method to education and to education policy, and to the 'Prevent duty', and should we ask how and not why and examine practices not solutions?

Using Foucault, it is now possible to describe a new populist *dispositif*, one in which economic populism is rejecting globalisation. Within this emerging populist *dispositif*, Foucault, in his lecture course in Paris (1981-84) and in Berkeley (1980-1983) provides modern scholars with a further very interesting tool, the ancient concept of parrhesia, truth telling or 'free-spoken-ness', and within it the possibility to identify both good and bad parrhesia. Can we detect bad forms of parrhesia that appeal to base, xenophobic instincts in the prevailing global economic/cultural populist discourse, and specifically in the UK?

My research is examining if and how the 'Prevent duty' has been shaped by this emerging parrhesia and for this paper raises the role of dialogue in addressing these challenges.

The 'Prevent Duty' (Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015)
and its Impact on English Secondary Schools: A View from Leadership.

191

My work draws on Stephen J. Ball and analyses policy enactment in this case of a contemporary statutory education policy and seeks to understand how it has been interpreted and enacted by school leaders.

Foucault as educator

It is illuminating to use Foucault's ideas and in particular his concept of dispositif – ideas, laws, activities, policies, speeches, actions (Ball 2013). Dispositif is a word not easily translated, often the English word 'apparatus' is used, but for Foucault dispositif refers to the systems that support a discursive formation which can be administrative, institutional and material. In the case, for example, of the discourse of educational leadership a range of different objects and practices make up the dispositif which can include structures, qualifications, training, professional development, courses and events (Gillies 2013, 11).

When asked about his work he wrote, 'my objective, instead, has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects' (Foucault 1982, 777). Prevent therefore needs to be viewed in the dynamics of social policy/educational policy and within its relation to the state and located within policy discourse. How are policies represented and disseminated, how do key speeches articulate the policy, and how does the policy work at all levels? How indeed, as Foucault notes, are 'human beings made subjects' (Foucault 1982)?

In this 'Age of Anger' (Mishra 2017) that we are living through, an anger has been created by the practice of neoliberalism as a reaction to its failings and shortcomings. Using Foucault, it is possible to identify a recent period of ruptures that has occurred including the economic crisis of 2007/2008, which has seen a 'crisis of capitalism' and linked to it a 'crisis of liberalism'. From these dynamics, the different responses and reactions have supported a global rise of populism and anti-democratic, non-liberal forms of government. Neoliberalism, whilst still dominant, has been and continues to be challenged as there has been a shift away from neoliberalism, both economically and culturally, with the rise of the concept of economic populism. This political discourse can be seen across the world including in China, India, Brazil, Russia, USA, Italy, Hungary, and the UK (Mason 2015, 2018; Pabst 2017).

Foucault enables scholars to consider and describe a new populist *dispositif*, one in which economic populism is rejecting globalisation. This discourse is articulated by, amongst others, Steve Bannon and Donald Trump with his 63 million twitter followers. Within this emerging populist *dispositive,* Foucault in his lecture courses in Paris (1981-84) and in Berkeley (1980-1983) provides modern scholars with a further very interesting tool, the ancient concept of parrhesia, truth telling or 'free-spoken-ness', and within it the possibility to identify both good and bad parrhesia.

I have argued that there is an emerging economic populist apparatus ('dispositif') challenging and overlapping with the neoliberal apparatus and in my research evidence that we can detect forms of bad parrhesia that appeal to base, xenophobic instincts in the prevailing global economic/cultural populist discourse, and specifically in the UK.

Additionally it is possible to identify a primary discourse relating to the 'Prevent duty' specifically around the implementation of a statutory duty and the need for safety and security but beneath that to identify a secondary discourse of how schools deal with this duty, what it is like to be a school leader and how the spaces created are filled.

My work finds that there is a compliance culture because of the high stakes of implementing this statutory duty or not: failure to fully implement the duty can lead to a poor OFSTED report or indeed dismissal. On the other hand, I also find that there is disaffected consent, contestation and other responses. Analysing how schools have organised or re-arranged themselves, their systems and structures to deal with the duty is an illuminating strand of my research.

Thus, in outlining my theoretical context I return to Stephen J. Ball and his influential 'think piece' 'What is policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes' (1993), in which he writes of 'the complexity and scope of policy analysis' (Ball 1993, 10) and in asking what policy is, he finds that 'policies are also processes and outcomes'(Ball 1993, 11).

The messiness of policy enactment

Policy enactment is never straightforward or simple; it is inevitably contradictory and messy. In order to analyse leadership, 'policy work' and 'the paradox of enactment', I utilise the policy actors or positions identified by Ball et al. (2011) as a heuristic device and as a thinking tool. Actors in schools take up different positions in relation to policy, including positions of indifference or avoidance or irrelevance. The positions are:

      1. Narrators

      2. Entrepreneurs

      3. Outsiders

      4. Transactors

      5. Enthusiasts

      6. Translators

      7. Critics

      8. Receivers (Ball et al. 2011, 626).

I interviewed a long-serving secondary school leader (JJ) who led a mixed, large (1,700 students), local authority secondary school with a sizeable Muslim population (30%). In the analysis of the interview I applied the different policy actor positions described by Ball et al. (2011) to school leadership. Below is an extract:

JJ: 'At Thorpeside we had overall very good relations with all of our communities. Prevent and the duty got in the way ... well, initially it did. The training I was on was pretty poor and so obviously biased against Muslims – you know, lots of pictures of dark-skinned, would-be terrorists but with one at the end white to make it not looked biased.'

'I had been at the school a long time so knew the families and communities, and they knew and trusted me....... We didn't really ever use the term Prevent ......it was interesting that at the beginning some more Muslim parents came to school events you know parents' evenings; maybe they were checking out what we were up to. I do remember one difficult meeting with a parent...but things did calm down and the hot issue turned to knife crime'.

It is possible to use the policy actor framework to place JJ as 1) a narrator; 2) an entrepreneur; 6) a translator; 7) a critic, and possibly from the full interview, 8) a receiver.

I am also placing the 'Prevent duty' within the messy context of school policy and theory of enactment. I place the school at the centre in a complex web of discourses and institutions, and consider the 'delivery chain', focusing on head teachers and senior leadership teams, who are passing on the pressures to perform.

Shadow boxing

Below are extracts from three of the semi-structured interviews I have undertaken:

Geoff

From the 90s onwards, with the introduction of OFSTED inspections, we went ... we had been through a period which maybe we are now starting to come out of, but through most of my headship we went through a period where I think there was more ... there was a greater centralisation and more expectation of compliance by school leaders, and I think that Prevent perhaps fits into that, but it was by no means the only ... there seemed to be more and more things that we were told that we had to do, whether or not they were necessarily going to be in the best interests of our own schools and our own school communities. ... And I think it, you know, it varies from school leaders to school leaders depending perhaps on your own background and your own experience. But I think that ... personally I do think that the best most effective

school leaders feel able to use a degree of judgement and autonomy and are resistant perhaps to those instructions from government agencies that they feel genuinely will not be in the interests of their school community.

Maria

Staff, some staff haven't liked, they think it will criminalise, but we've *shadow boxed* that, we know … as a school I think with most things we kind of … they're controversial, we shadow box – what will be the key concerns – so I've already gone through that. 'Cos they haven't a monopoly on liberalism – we are liberals, we know what it is – but we also know about safety. So, when staff say 'Oh but if we do that, we criminalise it' – because I have to have faith in the Prevent strategy, I have to have faith that it's not going to criminalise. I don't have faith in it, to be honest – I wouldn't say that out there, because I have a duty, a legal duty, and also a duty to make them feel that I'm calm. Because they know me, I think they have faith that I'm not going to criminalise the children.

Helen

I think there could be more in leadership training. I mean there's a deficit model in leadership training currently I think, compared to what it used to be, and I think that may come back to bite the system ultimately. Also, not enough leaders, good leaders at the right stage to move up – some moving up too quickly. I think those in large multi-academy trust chains, it's all kind of very regimented and corporate, and therefore you know the feeling it, the understanding of, you know, walking around a building, being able to feel things, you know, not having to do things according to how the whole group does it but how you feel as an individual, and as a professional how to manage – so I do worry about all of that. Because it is about experience and it is about being able to hear those who have had the experiences and learn from them through really good quality training. So, I think there is a deficit model in that regard.

How to begin to evaluate? Emerging themes

Themes that have emerged from the analysis so far of my data include a key, over-arching finding that school leaders see the 'Prevent duty' as very much fitting in with their and their institution's safeguarding responsibilities and rarely question or critique its place therein. Yet the responses of leaders to the 'duty' varies across a continuum from compliance to resistance and can depend on local circumstances, the prevailing school culture, and the age and experience of the school leader. Many school leaders cite that critical debate, engagement, and discussion are all crucial and that dialogue creates the conditions to consider the Prevent duty beyond policy acceptance or reluctant policy accommodation.

The 'Prevent Duty' (Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015)
and its Impact on English Secondary Schools: A View from Leadership.

195

Emerging themes include;

Master/Policy/School discourse – linked to the rise of populism;

- Parrhesia – linked to the above, the emergence of a non-liberal, at times xenophobic, policy discourse;

- Secondary discourse – how schools talk and deal with policy;

- Policy acceptance and/or policy contestation;

- Safeguarding: schools view the Prevent duty within a continuation of existing safeguarding responsibilities;

- 'Responsibilisation': school leaders as individual professionals are now responsible for policy, a process characteristic of neo-liberal systems of governance (Thomas 2017);

- 'Securitisation': since the London bombings of 7/7, society has become more securitised, which in turn has placed a greater onus on schools, school curriculums, and school leaders (Osler 2009);

- Professionalism – the ever-changing nature of school leaders in an increasingly diverse system and their remit and varied training within;

- The importance of local circumstances and local communities: can local school leaders rightfully claim to know their communities?

- Free speech: has the 'Prevent duty' restricted or damped down free speech or have some institutions/school leaders used the space created to open up debate?

Analysing these themes can offer ways in which to evaluate whether the policy has been successful in the experience of school leaders.

Much of the literature about 'Prevent' in education thus far has focused on the criticisms and negative implications of the policy but my research is showing that the response and actions of school leaders are much more complex and nuanced. Indeed, for some school leaders the space that has been created in some institutions has stimulated debate amongst students and staff and within the space has created positive opportunities. So here dialogue is being used as a positive tool to promote debate amongst young people, although my interviews have shown great frustration and indeed anger amongst school leaders that professional judgement has been taken away from teachers in the desire to conform and freedom of speech has been curtailed. For some, the reaction has been to comply but, for others, there has been

the opportunity to challenge, contest, and even resist or, as Maria says, 'shadow box'. A paradox of the policy is an unintended consequence that in some schools it has succeeded in promoting debate.

The almost full acceptance of the 'Prevent duty' as a safeguarding issue by school leaders can be seen on the one hand as a success; on the other, it raises a separate issue of whether our assumptions about safeguarding as a concept and practice need to be critiqued. How far can school leaders act as individuals exercising their professional judgement and to what extent does a leader's length of experience and experience of working with an inspiring and influential school leader affect a leaders' actions and approaches to this and other policies? Professionalism is learnt on the job and rooted in an institution's strong values within its community as much as it is learnt in training My research shows that school leaders in general are much more accepting of the 'flawed' 'Prevent duty' than they are of the 'un-British' Fundamental British Values. There is a nuanced mix of responses to policy and its enactment and these responses reflect and are shaped by engaged dialogue amongst school leaders themselves and within school communities including parents, governors, young people and staff.

My interviews show two specific areas where the 'Prevent duty' has not been successful. The first regarding the training offered particularly at the outset of the 'duty' in 2015 but also since. My data raises questions about the need for both good quality local and national training. Leaders raise questions about how prepared they are for the professional role of leadership given the complex nature of these societal 'problems' and the high status stakes attached to dealing with issues such as 'terrorism' and 'knife crime' which interestingly is being considered by the Home Office in much the same way as 'Prevent'. Secondly, many school leaders point out that the existence of far-right extremism has been missed or under-played throughout and in a number of schools, leaders spoke of their Channel referrals being for far-right extremism, not Muslim extremism.

So, what does the 'duty' mean for the professionalism of school leaders today and how much are they compliant, 'responsibilised' participants or are acting or can they operate using a professional degree of judgement and autonomy? Where and what is the balance between accountability and autonomy? My research demonstrates that there is a mixed response, particularly when one looks below the 'master narrative' or primary discourse of how schools deal with this duty to the more reflective secondary discourse. Whilst there is a compliance culture partially formed because of the high stakes of implementing or not a statutory duty and all schools have placed 'Prevent' within their Safeguarding duties and policies, nevertheless, professional opinions and actions have varied along the continuum of acceptance to resistance. School leaders take up, often depending on their experience, different policy actor positions, including being 'enthusiasts' and 'critics'.

Conclusion

Omand (BBC July 2017), the creator of the original Prevent strategy, now expresses some doubts that 'Prevent', by joining together the need for counter-terrorism and the need for some form of community cohesion and agreed set of values, can succeed in its present form. He cites the lack of trust and perceived hostility and concludes that 'if it is not accepted, then it is not going to work.' These new priorities require nuanced responses both within our communities and within our schools and colleges. The 'Prevent' programme permeates the entire UK education system, yet there is little evidence that the securitisation of education is contributing to the creation of more peaceful conditions within or outside the classroom (Novelli 2017).

The almost full acceptance of the 'Prevent duty' as a safeguarding issue by school leaders can be seen on the one hand as a success, while on the other it raises a separate issue of whether our assumptions about safeguarding, as a concept and practice, need to be critiqued. Leaders in general are much more accepting of the 'flawed' 'Prevent duty' than they are of the 'un-British' Fundamental British Values.

Leaders raise questions about how prepared they are for the professional role of leadership given the complex nature of these societal 'problems' and the high-status stakes attached to dealing with controversial issues such as 'terrorism' and 'knife crime'. Secondly many school leaders point out that the existence of far-right extremism has been missed or under-played throughout. In a number of schools' leaders spoke of their Channel referrals being for far-right extremism not Muslim extremism and post the Brexit referendum vote 2016 that this dynamic has become more visible and concerning.

Finally, it is instructive to return to Foucault, as theory can illuminate, to consider dialogue as a tool within this sensitive and controversial policy and four years into the operation of the 'Prevent duty' to consider what has succeeded and what has not yet been successful or failed. Foucault enables us to consider 'the how of power', to reflect upon the concepts of *dispositif* and parrhesia, to understand 'how we are made subject' but, most importantly, he enables us to think differently about education and learning in order that we continue to be disruptive, critical and questioning scholars in this 'Age of Anger'.

Bibliography

Ball, S.J. (1993) What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse*, 13:10-17.

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools.* Routledge.

Ball et al (2011) Policy actors: doing policy work in schools, *Discourse,* 32:625-639.

Ball, S.J. (2017) *Foucault as Educator*, Springer Briefs on Key Thinkers in Education.

Brender, A. and Pisani, F. (2010*) Global Imbalances and the Collapse of Globalised Finance.* Centre for European Policy Studies Brussels.

Busher, J., Choudhury, T., Thomas, P., & Harris, G. (2017, July 5) *What the Prevent duty means for schools and colleges in England: An analysis of educationalists' experiences* [Monograph]. Retrieved February 14, 2018, from http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/32349/

Earley, P., & Greany, T. (2017) *School Leadership and Education System Reform.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1976) Politics: the study of discourse, *Idealogy and Consciousness, 3:7-26.*

Foucault, M. (1982*) The Subject and Power Critical Inquiry,* 8:777-795.

Foucault, M. (2002*) Archaeology of Knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2008*) The Birth of Biopolitics : Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979.* Picador.

Foucault, M. (2009*) Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-78.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2010) *The Government of Self and Others,* New York:Palgrave MacMillan.

Griffith-Dickson, G., Dickson, A., & Robert, I. (2014). Counter-extremism and De-radicalisation in the UK: a Contemporary Overview. Journal for Deradicalization, *0(1): 26–37.*

Mason, P. (2015*) Post Capitalism: A Guide to Our Future.* Allen Lane

Mishra, P. (2017) *Age of Anger: A History of the Present*. New Yok, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Novelli, M. (2017) Education and countering violent extremism: Western logics from south to north? Compare*: A Journal of Comparative and International Education,* 47:835-851.

Omand, D. (2010*).* Securing the State. Oxford University Press.

Osler, A. (2009). Patriotism, multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and the teaching of history. *Educational Review,* 61(1): 85–100.

Pabst, A. (2017). Post liberalism: The New Centre Ground of British Politics. *The Political Quarterly,* 88(3): 500–509.

Thomas, P. (2017). Changing experiences of responsibilisation and contestation within counter-terrorism policies: the British Prevent experience. *Policy & Politics*, 45(3): 305–321.

Primary documents including government documents

HM Government Channel Duty guidance (2015)

Counter Terrorism and Security Act (2015)

HMG 2011 Prevent strategy Home Office (July 2011)

BERA Debating theories of neoliberalism (2018)

Open Society (2016)

Omand, D. (BBC July 2017)

The Prevent digest

Kettle, M. The Guardian (2016)

Independent (August 2019, Review of Prevent counter–extremism scheme risks becoming 'whitewash'.)