Cambridge Educational Research e-Journal

ISSN: 2634-9876 Journal homepage: http://cerj.educ.cam.ac.uk/

The Prevent Duty in Primary Education: A Comparative Study

Lizzie Mansell

To cite this entry:

Mansell, L.(2024). The Prevent Duty in Primary Education: A Comparative Study. *Cambridge Educational Research e-Journal, 11,* 78-89. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.114546

Link to the article online: https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/377857

Published online: December 2024

Cambridge Educational Research e-Journal
2024, VOL. 11
DOI: https://doi.org/placeholder

The Prevent Duty in Primary Education: A Comparative Study

Lizzie Mansell

The University of York

ABSTRACT

In 2015, the Prevent Duty (HM Government, 2015) placed a legal requirement on educational institutions to show 'due regard' to the need to prevent young people from being drawn into extremism or terrorism. Following this, training programmes were created so that teachers could fulfil this responsibility. In this study, primary school teachers' experiences and opinions on the Prevent Duty are compared between two different schools in the same metropolitan council. The first school is situated in a community in which most people living there are Muslim; the second school is situated within a predominantly white, middle-class, non-Muslim community. Teachers were interviewed in semi-structured interviews about their experiences of the Prevent Duty, its training programmes and how relevant they considered it to be for the children they teach in their setting. Their responses to these questions are compared to identify any differences on attitudes towards the Prevent Duty between the two areas. Findings suggest that the way in which the Prevent Duty is viewed by teachers, including the importance they place on it, their experiences of the training programmes and how relevant they see it as being to the children in their setting differs between the two areas.

KEYWORDS

Prevent Duty in schools, CVE, radicalisation, extremism, safeguarding

Introduction

In 2015, the Prevent Duty (HM Government, 2015) placed a legal requirement on educational institutions to show 'due regard' to the need to prevent young people from being drawn into extremism or terrorism. Since its introduction, the policy has had a significant impact on the education sector, seen in the professional obligation placed on teachers to promote Fundamental British Value and the possibility that inadequate application of the policy results in a failed Ofsted inspection (Bryan & Revell, 2021; Farrell et al., 2021; Moffat & Gerrard, 2019). In addition, the impact of the Prevent Duty has been felt at community level, through the creation of 'suspect' communities and the disproportionate targeting of Muslims in the name of national security (Thomas, 2016).

Policy Rationale

Following 9/11, the War on Terror prompted a change in governance to one of risk prevention, with the Prevent Duty constituting a feature of this method (Da Silva et al., 2021). As such, the education sector has become an instrument of state security, as governments deemed young people to have a higher propensity for extremism than older people (Moffat & Gerrard, 2019). In addition, there is the belief that teachers can disrupt the process into radicalisation and extremism (Moffat & Gerrard, 2019).

CONTACT Lizzie Mansell, emm618@york.ac.uk

Prevent Enactment

The consequences of failing to comply with the Prevent Duty have meant that training programmes have been established to help schools to fulfil their legal requirements. The delivery and impact of these training programmes varies according to location and provider, with significant implications for the policy's application (Elwick & Jerome, 2019; Lundie, 2018). Prevent training is delivered to schools from several different sources, including the Local Authority, the police, external and internal specialists, or school staff without formal expertise, often taking the form of a workshop with the use of video content which aims to explain the policy, the process of radicalisation and how to recognise it in students (Elwick & Jerome, 2019). Lundie (2018) found that the person delivering the training impacted the way in which the duty was subsequently applied, as their professional background impacts the framing and enactment of the policy. This is substantiated by Elwick & Jerome (2019), who found that internal training, in which open discussions were encouraged increased teachers' confidence in their ability to apply the duty, whereas training delivered by the police stifled discussion and caused discomfort with the policy. In addition, in a study exploring the training of professionals in sixth form colleges, findings suggest that it does not provide clarity regarding what the policy was, and how teachers could protect their students due to its superficial nature and use of limited resources, such as videos (Moffat & Gerrard, 2019). These studies indicate that the training teachers receive has significant implications for Prevent's application.

Teachers' attitudes towards the policy provide an insight into its application and highlight difficulties it provokes, with a prevalent belief that it disproportionately targets Muslims and that it makes it harder for students from different backgrounds to socialise harmoniously (Busher et al., 2019). Interestingly, despite these reported issues, teachers believe that the policy belongs in education and there is a general acceptance of it (Busher et al., 2019; da Silva et al., 2021). The explanation for this is found in the framing of the policy, and narratives around national security. When positioned in the context of safeguarding responsibilities, teachers are comfortable accepting the policy as a reasonable, and important, extension of their professional practices (Busher et al., 2019; James, 2022; Jerome et al., 2019; da Silva et al., 2021).

Through its application, the Prevent Duty risks stifling debate within the classroom and limits freedom of expression due to its poorly defined terms (O'Donnell, 2016; Revell & Bryan, 2016; Taylor & Soni, 2017). The policy creates a culture of fear in schools, with both staff and students unclear about what constitutes 'extremism.' As such, debate, which can be a useful tool to alter views and effect change, is stifled and the policy creates an environment of surveillance (Taylor & Soni, 2017). Research has found that this silencing effect of the duty affects Muslim students more than their non-Muslim counterparts (Taylor & Soni, 2017).

Applying the Prevent Duty in the context of far-right extremism presents challenges for teachers and schools as far-right narratives within wider society have become more accepted and normalised, with the overlap of nationalist narratives in both the far-right and 'Britishness' narratives in the policy (James, 2022; Lakhani & James, 2021). In addition, despite having been engaged in violence, the English Defence League are not a proscribed group by the British government. This makes it difficult for teachers to identify when an incident can be considered solely racist, and when it constitutes extremism and therefore needs a referral (Lakhani & James, 2021).

Definition of Terms

As previously noted, the impact of the definitions of the terms within the Prevent Duty has been examined in the published literature, with findings suggesting that these cause problems for its application (Faure Walker, 2019; Lowe, 2016; O'Donnell, 2016). O'Donnell takes issue with the definition of the term 'radicalisation,' arguing that it is vague and provides no explanation of how becoming radicalised would present itself. This is problematic for the duty's application as it requires professionals to identify those in the process of, or vulnerable to, radicalisation (O'Donnell, 2016). Lowe (2016) notes the vague and subjective nature of the definitions, citing 'Britishness' as an example, with the diverse nature of Britain

ensuring that this definition differs from person to person and place to place. These issues with the definitions have clear implications for the policy's application, leaving it open to interpretation and inconsistencies in application.

Marginalisation

The impact of the Prevent Duty on communities within the UK has been examined in the literature with a consensus emerging that the policy contributes to the marginalisation of Muslims within society (Busher et al., 2019; Coppock & McGovern, 2014; Dudenhoefer, 2018; Miah, 2017; Patel, 2017). This is done through the construction of 'suspect' communities and categories that creates alienation, othering, and stigmatisation (Breen-Smith, 2014; Taylor, 2020; Thomas, 2016). In addition, the policy presents 'non-nativeness' as inferior (Smith, 2021).

The effect of marginalisation presents issues for the effectiveness of the policy. By stigmatising students, they are more likely to actively resist what they perceive to be an attempt to impose a worldview on them, while outwardly appearing to comply (O'Donnell, 2016).

Purpose of the Present Study

The present study identified a gap in the existing body of research relating to Prevent training and teachers' attitudes within primary settings, with much of the literature relating to secondary and Further Education (FE) settings. In addition, there is little understanding of whether teachers' views on the relevance of the policy differs based on the location of the school in which they teach, and the demographic of the children attending. This research addresses that lacuna. It focuses on building an understanding of teachers' perceptions within two different communities and locations: those teaching within an area in which most pupils are from white, middle-class non-Muslim backgrounds and those teaching within an area in which most pupils are from Muslim backgrounds, to identify potential inconsistencies in the policy's application. Through semi-structured interviews with teachers from two schools, it aims to answer the following questions:

- How has the training for the Prevent Duty been experienced by primary school teachers?
- To what extent do teachers feel that the Prevent Duty is relevant to them in their setting with the children they teach?
- What differences are there, if any, between delivery, perception, and impact of the training between areas?

Method

Sample

Two schools were selected for the study, one in each area of interest. Both schools were located in West Yorkshire. School A's pupils are mostly from Muslim backgrounds, whereas School B's pupils are mostly from white, middle-class backgrounds. Pupil data from School B shows pupils are from either non-religious, or Christian backgrounds. The study used school data on the number of pupils entitled to free school meals to determine class. The schools were selected using personal contacts at each. Teachers were selected from each school using snowball sampling. This method enabled a sample to be collected, which had otherwise proved challenging.

This sampling technique resulted in three teachers being interviewed from each school, one man and five women, all were white British as no teachers from black or ethnic minority groups consented to be interviewed. The ratio between men and women reflects the makeup of the profession and can therefore be seen as a representative sample. The responsibilities of those interviewed differed in each school. The interviewees' school and their roles within them are detailed in the table below (table 1).

Table 1
Participants

Interviewee	School	Role
1	A	Year 6 class teacher
2	A	Year 5 class teacher
3	A	Special Educational Needs and Disability Co-ordinator (SENDCO) / Teaches across Key Stage Two
4	B	Year 3 class teacher
5	B	Year 4 class teacher / Deputy Head / Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)
6	B	Head Teacher / Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)

Instrument

The research used semi-structured interviews to gather qualitative data. These were conducted on Zoom and used the record function to ensure that they could be transcribed accurately for effective analysis to be conducted. The interviews were loosely structured with prepared questions to obtain teachers' experiences of the Prevent Duty and their attitudes towards it, including how relevant they see it as being in their current setting. Teachers were asked to describe their experiences of the Prevent training programs and to explain how helpful they have found this to be in enabling them to apply the duty in their setting with the children that they teach. Teachers were also asked to state how important they think the Prevent Duty is and to give their opinions of Fundamental British Values. The semi-structured nature of the interview meant that not every pre-prepared question was asked and that teachers could be asked to elaborate on certain points and the interview could be focused to build up an accurate account of the teachers' experiences.

Design

This study is interpretive in nature. It aims to describe, understand, and interpret teachers' views on the Prevent Duty, seeking to uncover how they construct reality (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). This allows themes to emerge that had not been anticipated in advance. The research design was flexible and had the capacity to be adjusted in response to unexpected information. This approach enabled a greater depth of understanding to be obtained by the researcher as interviews allowing the researcher to respond to what is said and explore perhaps unanticipated themes and ideas, in ways that other data collection methods cannot (Cohen et al., 2018; Hochschild, 2009).

The interview aimed to use open-ended questions in an attempt not to bias or lead the respondent in their replies. In addition, open-ended questioning allows the interviewer to get a truer assessment of what the respondent believes and enables a greater depth of understanding to be established (Cohen et al., 2018). The interviewer made use of prompts and probes throughout the interviews to enable clarification, so misunderstandings did not occur and to enable a richness and depth of response to be established.

Analysis

Following data collection, Braun & Clarke's (2006) approach to reflexive thematic analysis was conducted to identify patterns and themes within the data. In accordance with this method, interview recordings were transcribed, and a process of familiarisation followed. Data transcripts were coded, and themes were constructed. This process was repeated. Some codes and themes identified appeared frequently within the data, whereas some appeared less frequently. They were selected and identified however according to their pertinence to the research questions, rather than the number of times it occurred within the data set. This is consistent with Braun & Clarke's (2006) method of reflexive thematic analysis as inclusion and significance of

a theme does not depend on quantifiable measures. This flexible approach to data analysis enables an in-depth, thorough interpretation of the data collected (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Limitations

This approach is not without its limitations; it is costly in terms of time and as a result of this, the study is small with six participants, from two schools, in total. The decision was taken however, that the depth and richness of data generated from this approach would compensate for its size (Rubin, 2004). As a result of the study's size, any attempts to generalise to the wider teaching profession will be cautious and tentative.

The absence of respondents from black and minority ethnic groups has implications for the representative nature of this data and places limitations on it as their opinions on, and experiences of, the Prevent Duty may differ to those of colleagues from white backgrounds. As a result, generalisations from this data set must be tentative and cautious.

Ethics

Prior to data being collected, ethical approval was granted by the University of York. Ethical procedures were followed at every step of the research process. As part of this, participants were given an information sheet prior to the interview detailing the nature of the research, its aims and outlining what participation would involve. This is attached to the individual consent forms that were completed by each participant. Every attempt to protect the anonymity of the participants was made as the names of the schools and the participants were anonymised in line with the ethics procedure. Interview recordings were stored on an encrypted computer and each interview recording was deleted following its transcription.

Results

An analysis of the interview transcripts showed several themes emerging from this research which highlight teachers' views on the many aspects of the Prevent duty and its training programmes.

Teachers' perceptions of the vulnerabilities of the children they teach

Teachers working in School A all appeared to allude to Islamic fundamentalism as a threat. When asked if there was a particular extreme ideology that their children are particularly vulnerable to, interviewee 2 said:

> Erm (pause) not necessarily, I think obviously with our children they've got links with mosques and things so there is quite a lot of different people that they are exposed to erm and obviously older children because in the mosques they don't get set by year group they get set by ability so there could be the potential for you know those older people to approach them. (Interviewee 2)

Interviewee 3 said, "I think there's a lot of awareness of Islamic fundamentalism and potential for radicalisation just because of the demographic of the community." Interviewee 1 spoke about both right-wing and Islamist extremism being pertinent to their setting by mentioning a child who, as an adult, had detonated an explosive device in a market in Bagdad and a child who had been referred to Prevent for far-right extremism.

Two out of the three teachers in School B considered the children that they teach to be less vulnerable than children in other schools. When asked to say how susceptible the children in their school were to radicalisation compared to other schools in the local authority, interviewee 4 reported that they believed them to be "less susceptible." Whilst they noted that:

> I know that we do live in a little bubble, that our little school is all absolutely fine. However, I do think that there will be some schools out there that have, you know, radicalisation as a big problem. I don't think it's a big problem in our school. (Interviewee 4)

Interviewee 5 said they considered their school to be "way down the list of vulnerability" in the local authority.

Teachers' views on problematic elements of the Prevent duty

Interviewee 3 expressed some concerns with the Prevent Duty acknowledging that the application of Prevent could be seen to be racist and has the potential to alienate the community. When asked if the policy had the possibility to be interpreted by the community as a criticism of a culture or way of life, they replied, 'Or even blatantly racist?' Further probing into this led to an elaboration on the point that:

> I don't think it's racist but I think it could be, it could fall into like profiling. And making, you know, bias judgements on… on just demographics. Without really any, you know, without, without having any evidence to support it. (Interviewee 3)

This teacher went on to acknowledge bad feelings towards the policy, noting that:

> It's not too popular in our community at school. I think people feel like they being a bit surveyed, watched or maybe it can be slightly prejudiced. I mean I'm speaking from exposure to the Muslim community. And I suppose they face a lot of prejudice because of the type of attacks that have happened. I know I speak to some parents, you can tell that they're being really careful with what they say because, and I feel sorry for them, because they don't want to be regarded in that way. I can tell that they do feel a bit under the spotlight when it comes to talking about Prevent, and they kind of feel a bit defensive about being Islamic. (Interviewee 3)

The importance of Prevent

Every teacher interviewed saw Prevent as being necessary and important:

- "I do think it's necessary, it's sad that it is. It is necessary." (Interviewee 4)
- "I think it's definitely needed." (Interviewee 1)
- "I think it's important, absolutely." (Interviewee 2)
- "I think it can have a positive impact if it prevents something from happening." (Interviewee 3)

Teachers working in School A gave examples of personal experiences of children being drawn into extremism, including the instance of the pupil detonating an explosive device in Iraq, and cite relevance to the local community. Interviewee 2 explained that they considered it to be "very important because there are serious cases happening in the local area."

Prevent as safeguarding

All teachers interviewed considered Prevent to be an extension of safeguarding and that education has a role to play in disrupting the route into radicalisation. When asked the question, 'Do you consider Prevent as an extension of safeguarding?' there was consensus among the respondents:

- "Oh yeah absolutely it's another part of it, I mean on CPOMS it is just another area on the list." (Interviewee 1)
- "Yeah yeah definitely." (Interviewee 2)
- "This is a whole big safeguarding thing," (Interviewee 3)
- "Yes." (Interviewee 4)
- "Yes absolutely." (Interviewee 5)
- "Yes definitely." (Interviewee 6)

The DSL in School B explained how, in their view, Prevent fits into the school's safeguarding policy:

> I would always see it as part and parcel of the safeguarding duty because I think, for me, the safeguarding duty is looking for those children who have those particular vulnerabilities and making sure that we put protective factors in place. (Interviewee 6)

The relevance and helpfulness of the training

Both schools had received the Local Authority's Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent (WRAP) in which a member of staff from the Prevent Hub had delivered training to staff based around video content, which aimed to explain the purpose of Prevent, the process of radicalisation and to enable staff to identify someone vulnerable to radicalisation. Teachers in the two schools reported different views on the relevance and helpfulness of the training. Teachers in School A saw the training they received as relevant to their setting and as predominantly helpful to their responsibility to prevent students from being radicalised. They were able to give examples of how the training is rooted within the local area and note sightings of extremist symbols within the local area. Interviewee 1 explained that "They showed us symbols that have been seen in the local area." Interviewees 2 and 3 spoke in detail about the training they had received:

> The police came and gave us a rundown on the kind of figures in the local area. They showed us a presentation about some of the groups that are in the area. They gave a lot of sort of statistics with it and you know it is occurring in and around the local area. (Interviewee 3)

> We've had a lot of local context cues with that so understanding what radicalisation has been seen in our area and what to look out for. I thought it was really good because like I said the local things especially were shown for example the local park was shown with a lamp post with a symbol on it that is symbolic of radicalisation and for me I didn't even know what to look out for and actually having the context of 'oh you're dealing with this' it can make it more realistic I think and brings Prevent closer to home. (Interviewee 2)

As a result of the training, two out of the three teachers in School A feel confident that they would know when to make a referral and comfortable in doing so, Interviewee 3 said, "I haven't made a referral, but I would feel confident doing so, yeah." The class teachers in School B reported differing opinions on the relevance and helpfulness of this. When asked if they'd found the training useful for the children in their setting, Interviewee 5 stated, "On the whole, I'm gonna say no." The other class teacher, Interviewee 4, said that they considered the training to be sufficient for their setting, but it might not be for a different one. When asked if the training had enabled them to recognise a child in the process of radicalisation, they replied: "I think for our school, for our catchment, yes. I think that possibly in another school, in a different environment it might not be and maybe we would need more training." They later said that "The training is suitable for teachers at my school but it wouldn't be suitable for other schools."

Teachers' understanding of the Prevent Duty

Interviewee 4 in School B was unclear regarding the purpose of Prevent. "Prevent is making everybody who works with children aware of different situations where children could be possibly in danger." When prompted on whether there was a particular danger that was relevant to Prevent, they replied, "The one that stands out to me, there's different elements to Prevent, but radicalisation."

All three teachers working in School A explained clearly that Prevent is in place to stop children from being radicalised and drawn into extremism. They gave examples of indicators they know to look out for in their students based on the training. Interviewee 5 explained that they knew to look out for, "any jottings in books, symbols that the kids have done or if they've been bringing up the dark web." Teachers in both schools reported concerns with the definitions and struggled to offer definitions of 'radicalisation' which were

consistent with those in the policy.

Schools as agents of state security

Two out of three teachers teaching in School A alluded to schools having a responsibility for, and contributing to, state security through Prevent. Interviewee 3 commented that:

> You have an awareness of it (Prevent) in the background. So you know, you're on the lookout for things, if you have a conversation with a child and it leads down an avenue where you might join the dots of something to stop something from happening. (Interviewee 3)

Interviewee 2 saw Prevent as being a link between schools and the police: "It's linking up education with law enforcement and that's important because we can either see the effects of something (radicalisation) in school or we can pick up on something and make somebody aware of it." Teachers in School B did not report a view that schools had a responsibility for state security.

Discussion

The differing views on the pertinence and the relevance of the Prevent Duty between the two locations are significant. This finding builds on the existing body of knowledge by providing new insight into the fact that teachers' perceptions of the policy's importance seem to differ based on the location in which they teach and therefore the children that they teach. The teachers in School A all stated that they considered the policy to be highly relevant to their children and all at least alluded to their children being vulnerable to radicalisation by Islamic fundamentalism, whilst the teachers in School B considered the policy to be important, some stated that they thought there were other schools where it would be a more pressing issue. This finding poses questions about the framing of the policy as it suggests that the perception of the policy is that it is more relevant to Muslim and working-class communities than to white, middle-class communities. It also raises questions about teachers' perceptions of who in society is vulnerable to radicalisation and why this is the case.

This research demonstrates the fact that teachers seem to hold differing views on, and perceptions of, the Prevent Duty's training programmes depending on the community in which they teach. Teachers in School A all consider the training to have been helpful to them and relevant to them in their professional capacity, giving examples from it of instances of extremist activity from the area in which their school is located. Teachers in School B, however, are more critical of the training, with one stating that they do not consider it helpful and another stating that it would not be sufficient in every setting. These discrepancies in views regarding the training programmes reveal and substantiate the finding of this study that teachers' attitudes to the policy differ depending on the community in which they teach. As previously discussed, these differences raise important questions regarding the policy's framing and further substantiate the idea that teachers perceive the policy to be more relevant to Muslim communities than white, middle-class ones.

The issues concerning teachers' understanding of the policy and of the term 'radicalisation' are noteworthy as they have implications for the policy's application. The fact that teachers failed to offer a consistent definition of 'radicalisation' substantiates and exemplifies O'Donnell's (2016) criticism of the definition of the term within the policy, as she argues that it is vague and provides no explanation of how becoming radicalised would present itself. The findings from this study show that this is the case in practice. The unclear nature of this definition poses issues for teachers as they are legally required to recognise, and report, 'radicalisation,' yet seem unsure as to what it is and how it might manifest itself.

The result regarding teachers' view that schools have a responsibility for state security is important as it poses the question of what the purpose of education is, as well as what the role of the teaching profession is, or should be, within a functioning democracy.

Previous research into the implications of the framing and positioning of the Prevent Duty found that

it had the potential to stigmatise certain communities and create 'suspects' of Muslim communities (Breen-Smith, 2014; Jerome et al., 2019; Taylor, 2020; Thomas, 2016). This research confirms this position as teachers in School A voiced concerns about how the policy was being perceived amongst the community, whereas teachers in School B expressed no such concerns. The teachers in School A also found the policy to be highly relevant to their role as teachers and the pupils that they teach. Most of the teachers in School B however, reported that while they considered the policy important, they hypothesised that there were other schools and areas within the local authority where it would be more important. This finding is significant because it clearly shows that the policy is targeting and being directed towards some communities more than others. It is an example of how the policy and professionals working within it view some communities as more 'suspect' than others.

Future Implementation and Research

This study has highlighted issues with the Prevent Duty's training programmes and these need to be addressed to ensure that teachers feel equipped to fulfil their responsibilities outlined within the policy. Based on the findings of this study that the perceptions of the teachers interviewed on the importance and relevance of the Prevent Duty differed between the two schools, further research could explore how the training programmes and the policy might position themselves to present the Prevent Duty as being relevant to all settings. One teacher from School B suggested that the training should seek to position itself as relevant to the school's location, and as this was an aspect of the training that teachers in School A noted as useful, it is perhaps an avenue worth investigating. Lakhani & James (2021) note how it is important that extremism is not deemed to be relevant to certain communities but to all and this study has highlighted that more work needs to be done to ensure that this is the case.

The concern that 'suspect' categories are created because of the Prevent Duty (Breen-Smith, 2014; Taylor, 2020; Thomas, 2016) is borne out in this study as teachers viewed the policy more relevant in one community than in the other; further research might be conducted into how to alleviate this implication of the policy. This could be done by exploring Thomas' (2016) and Lundie's (2018) suggestion that the Prevent Duty be reworked into a whole curriculum approach to the prevention of extremism to remove the problematisation of certain communities.

The vague nature of the definitions, notably 'radicalisation,' pose issues for the application of the policy. As teachers appear to be unaware of what constitutes 'radicalisation,' the training programmes might need to be adapted to provide more concrete examples of the definition to enable teachers to fulfil their responsibilities within the policy. In addition to this, the definition within the document might be revised to provide a clearer picture of what 'radicalisation' entails.

Conclusion

The results of this study showed that the teachers interviewed in the two schools view the training for the Prevent Duty differently. The teachers in School A all found it helpful, whereas most of the teachers in School B reported that they either considered it unhelpful or that they believed it would be insufficient in other settings. This finding highlights a problematic element of the training for the Prevent Duty as Lakhani & James (2021) note extremism should be considered relevant to all rather than certain race or class groups. The fact that teachers in this research have reported different experiences of it shows that this is not the case.

The study found that the teachers in the two schools expressed different views regarding the relevance of the Prevent Duty to them in their professional capacity with the children that they teach. The teachers in School A considered the Prevent Duty to be highly relevant to their setting whilst the teachers in School B said it was relevant and important, most added that they thought there were other settings where it would be more relevant. This finding also highlights an issue with the framing of the policy as it has had the effect of creating the notion that extremism and radicalisation are more of a problem within some communities than within

others. One teacher in School A expressed concerns about the framing of the policy as having the potential to be racist and risking negatively impacting the local community.

Teachers in both schools received the same training but their views on this differed as the teachers in School A recognised it as being grounded in their local context, whereas some of the teachers in School B noted that it based around other areas in the local authority. This led them to consider it less helpful than the teachers in School A.

Teachers reported mixed impact of the training: some believed it had enabled them with the ability to correctly make referrals, whereas some did not, teachers were incorporating the Prevent Duty into the curriculum inconsistently both across and within the two schools. The impact of the training could also be measured through responses to other questions that teachers gave. For example, teachers gave inconsistent responses when asked to give the definition of 'radicalisation.' This highlights an issue with the training and the framing of the policy (O'Donnell, 2016).

The study has made suggestions and recommendations for further research and policy adaptions, based on its findings. These include proposing that further research might explore how the training programmes and the policy could position themselves to present the Prevent Duty as being relevant to all settings, advocating for exploring how the Prevent Duty might be embedded into the curriculum to reduce the atmosphere of suspicion and surveillance of certain communities, and for a re-defining of terms within the policy.

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Breen-Smyth, M. (2014). Theorising the "suspect community": counterterrorism, security practices and the public imagination. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *7*(2), 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2013.867714

Bryan, H., & Revell, L. (2021). School leadership and the civic nationalist turn: Towards a typology of leadership styles employed by head teachers in their enactment of the Prevent Duty and the promotion of fundamental British values. *PRISM: Casting New Light on Learning, Theory and Practice*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.24377/prism.ljmu.0302203

Busher, J., Choudhury, T., & Thomas, P. (2019). The enactment of the counter-terrorism "Prevent duty" in British schools and colleges: beyond reluctant accommodation or straightforward policy acceptance. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *12*(3), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2019.1568853

Chavez, C. (2008). Conceptualizing from the Inside: Advantages, Complications, and Demands on Insider Positionality. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1589

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Coppock, V., & McGovern, M. (2014). "Dangerous Minds"? Deconstructing Counter-Terrorism Discourse, Radicalisation and the "Psychological Vulnerability" of Muslim Children and Young People in Britain. *Children & Society*, *28*(3), 242–256. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/chso.12060

da Silva, R., Fontana, G., & Armstrong, M. A. (2021). "It's about keeping children safe, not spying": A governmentality approach to Prevent in primary education. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *24*(2), 136914812110212. https://doi.org/10.1177/13691481211021212

Dudenhoefer, A L. (2018). Resisting Radicalisation: A Critical Analysis of the UK Prevent Duty. *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*, *14*(1).

Elwick, A., & Jerome, L. (2019). Balancing securitisation and education in schools: teachers' agency in implementing the Prevent duty. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, *40*(3), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2019.1600322

Farrell, F., Lander, V., & Yildiz, Ü. (2021). The Mission of Integration. *PRISM*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.24377/prism.ljmu.0302210

Faure Walker, R. (2019). The UK's PREVENT Counter-Terrorism Strategy appears to promote rather than prevent violence. *Journal of Critical Realism*, *18*(5), 487–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767430.2019.1646095

G. Patel, T. (2017). It's not about security, it's about racism: counter-terror strategies, civilizing processes and the post-race fiction. *Palgrave Communications*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.31

HM Government. (2015). *Prevent Duty Guidance: for England and Wales*. Accessed 12th September 2022 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/445977/3799_Revised_Prevent_Duty_Guidance__England_Wales_V2-Interactive.pdf

HM Government. (2021). *Revised Prevent duty guidance: for England and Wales*. Accessed 12th September 2022 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/prevent-duty-guidance/revised-prevent-duty-guidance-for-england-and-wales#contents

Hochschild, J. L. (2009). Conducting intensive interviews and elite interviews. In *Workshop on interdisciplinary standards for systematic qualitative research* (pp. 124-127). Harvard: National Science Foundation.

James, N. (2022). Countering far-right threat through Britishness: the Prevent duty in further education. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *15*(1), 121–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2022.2031135

Jerome, L., Elwick, A., & Kazim, R. (2019). The impact of the Prevent duty on schools: A review of the evidence. *British Educational Research Journal*, *45*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3527

Lakhani, S., & James, N. (2021). "Prevent duty": empirical reflections on the challenges of addressing far-right extremism within secondary schools and colleges in the UK. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *14*(1), 67–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2021.1876550

Lowe, D. (2016). Prevent Strategies: the Problems Associated in Defining Extremism: the Case of the United Kingdom. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *40*(11), 917–933. https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610x.2016.1253941

Lundie, D. (2018). Multi-agency Prevent work: A whole-curriculum approach. *British Journal of School Nursing*, *13*(2), 92–93. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjsn.2018.13.2.92

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Miah, S. (2017). The Prevent Policy and the Values Discourse: Muslims and Racial Governmentality. In M. Mac an Ghaill & C. Haywood (Eds.), *Muslim Students, Education and Neoliberalism Schooling a "Suspect Community"* (pp. 131–144).). Palgrave Macmillan.

Moffat, A., & Gerard, F. J. (2019). Securitising education: an exploration of teachers' attitudes and experiences regarding the implementation of the Prevent duty in sixth form colleges. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *13*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2019.1629860

Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball Sampling. *SAGE Research Methods Foundations*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036831710

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2016.1184464

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Smith, H. (2021). Britishness and "the outsider within": tracing manifestations of racist nativism in education policy in England. *PRISM*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.24377/prism.ljmu.0302209

Taylor, J. D. (2018). "Suspect Categories," Alienation and Counterterrorism: Critically Assessing PREVENT in the UK. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *32*(4), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2017.1415889

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2017.1358296

Thomas, P. (2016). Youth, Terrorism and Education: Britain's Prevent Programme. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *35*(2), 171–187.