

**Building a Terrorist House on Sand: A critical incident analysis of interprofessionalism and the *Prevent* duty in schools in England.**

David Lundie, Senior Lecturer in Education Studies, Liverpool Hope University, UK  
lundied@hope.ac.uk

## **Building a Terrorist House on Sand: A critical incident analysis of interprofessionalism and the *Prevent* duty in schools in England.**

In 2015, a duty came into effect requiring all public bodies, including schools, to engage with the UK government's *Prevent* counter-terrorism strategy. This paper presents two case studies from mid-size English cities, exploring the moral prototypes and institutional identities of professional mediators who made schools aware of their duties under *Prevent*. Mediators in each case included serving and former police, teachers and policy advisers, the majority of whom are now private consultants or operating small 3<sup>rd</sup> sector agencies. Drawing from in-depth interviews with 14 professionals, the paper details the ways in which participants constructed their relationship to normative, deliberative and legal obligations. The paper focuses on the recurrence of a high profile critical media incident in which a young child was allegedly subject to a referral for writing about living in a 'terrorist' (rather than 'terraced') house. Reaction to this incident was archetypal of the fear of media moral panic in reconstituting mediators' identities as *Prevent* professionals, illustrating how the enframing of events shifts professional moral codes, policy interpretation and implementation.

Keywords: *Prevent*, counter-extremism, moral development, moral panic, professional identity, professional values

### **Introduction**

The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act of 2015 placed new statutory duties on all public bodies, including schools, to engage with the Home Office *Prevent* counter-terrorism strategy. These changes came at the same time as a renewed focus on a 'narrow, fixed, uncritical and intolerant' (Breslin, Rowe and Thornton 2006, p.21) conception of social and moral education under the 'nativist' (Smith 2016) rubric of promoting fundamental British values; themselves derived from the *Prevent* strategy (DfE 2012; Miah 2017). The duty on the education sector to engage directly with a security agenda opens new avenues of multi-professional collaboration at the same time as school governance, support and accountability were undergoing radical reform. From

the level of central government guidance (DfE 2015; Home Office 2015) down to the incongruent jurisdictions of England's 119 Local Authorities and 44 police forces, gaps in institutional structures created opportunities for the emergence of a new inter-professional workforce supporting schools in implementing the *Prevent* duty. This paper reports findings from a comparative case study of key professionals in two mid-sized English cities (Lundie 2018). Professionals from security and education backgrounds brought moral prototypes and institutional logics from prior experience to bear in reinterpreting the policy. A number of critical incidents, framed by media moral panics around the perceived failings of *Prevent*, subtly reframed professional identities, coalescing around a post-institutional consensus, often without apparent awareness of shifts in professional moral codes.

The most prominent critical incident among practitioners concerns a highly publicised incident in a North West school in early 2016, where a 10 year old boy was alleged to have been interviewed by police, without the knowledge or consent of his parents, after writing that he lived in a 'terrorist' instead of 'terraced' house (Barrett & Jamieson 2016). The case received extensive publicity following the involvement of controversial advocacy group CAGE, and is even cited in a subsequent government report (Casey 2016, p.154) as a "deliberately distorted and exaggerated case" further echoed and distorted by media coverage. Although the case was later revealed to be a social work investigation, instigated under the school's wider safeguarding duties, following disclosures the child had made about being hit by his uncle (Mazza 2016), the case was still remarked on by a mainstream Muslim representative body as an example of "individuals going about their daily life... being seen through the lens of security and... as potential terrorists" (BBC 2016). Despite media misrepresentation, the incident is lent credibility because it functions as a prototype of false-positive or

overzealous application of the *Prevent* duty, of which many participants had first-hand experience.

### ***Prevent, Education and Securitisation***

One of four alliterative strands of the UK *Contest* counter-terrorism strategy, *Prevent* seeks to reduce the risk to the UK from terrorism by safeguarding vulnerable people (Home Office 2018), challenging extremist ideologies and narratives, and through the *Channel* programme enabling those who are engaged in extremism below the level of criminality to disengage. The *Prevent* strategy has been subject to extensive criticism due to perception that it unfairly targets the Muslim community (Farrell 2016; Kundnani 2009; Miller & Sabir 2012), as well as due to nebulous definitions of extremism (Awan & Blackmore 2013) and perceived lack of transparency (Armstrong et al. 2016; Sansbury 2017). A focus on ideological factors has been criticised as obscuring other important factors, such as poverty, with 82% of offenses related to Muslim perpetrators committed by individuals from the 30% most deprived areas in Britain (Stuart 2017). While Muslims constitute around 4.4% of the UK population, 56% of *Channel* referrals to 2014 related to Muslims (NPCC 2016).

Further, the conceptualisation of *Channel* as a ‘pre-criminal’ space poses important questions for the proper scope and sphere of policing and security, blurring notions of due process and culpability which have typically bounded police work. The language of ‘safeguarding’ provides a well understood framework to locate *Prevent* for education professionals, relating to important aspects of teacher professionalism and an existing judgment in Ofsted inspection. While safeguarding language is readily understood and accepted within the teaching profession (Busher et al. 2017) safeguarding language can nonetheless provide a totalising discourse (Marcuse 2002), an ‘unthought’ (Foucault 2002; Pickstock 1998) which functions to close down debate

by labelling opposition as ‘unsafe’, irresponsible or a dereliction of professional duty. This has led some commentators to fear that *Prevent* will have a chilling effect on classroom discussion (Grove 2016; O’Donnell 2016).

In the case of the *Prevent* duty, it is not merely the case that unlike other aspects of safeguarding in schools, such as child neglect or protecting children from sexual exploitation, a referral marks out the child as at once ‘at risk’ and *a risk* to others; other, existing forms of safeguarding may indeed include children as both victims and perpetrators (Coppock & McGovern 2014). In the case of *Prevent*, however, the locus of safeguarding sits outside the family, school or community, with a more explicitly political security agenda. While other aspects of safeguarding in schools involve interprofessionality with social workers, community policing and mental health, the *Prevent* duty represents an intersection with the counter-terrorism functions of the security state. Further, unlike other public bodies covered by the *Prevent* duty, in the case of schools, *Prevent* itself, and the acts of extremism and radicalisation which it aims to desist and deter, are themselves potential topics for discussion within the civic curriculum. This liminal status for schooling in the *Prevent* duty led participants in this study to conclude that ‘safeguarding is a curriculum issue’ (Lundie 2018, p.12).

The *Prevent* agenda represents a significant departure from its predecessor, the *Community Cohesion* agenda, which came to prominence following race riots in Oldham and Bradford (Thomas 2009; 2012; Lundie 2017a). The Department for Education’s *REsilience* programme, which ran until 2012 (Miller 2013) encouraged schools to engage with local community mentors, who were often faith group representatives. While such community led approaches have been criticised for both silencing voices within communities (Bhopal 2010; Shannahan 2010; Sirin & Fine 2008) and for contributing to ‘religification’ – the foregrounding of religious identity to

the detriment of racial, economic, local and other factors, particularly among Muslim youth (Francis & McKenna 2017; Panjwani 2017), these critiques largely frame the need for more inclusive, intersectional and democratic forms of representation.

Furthermore, the same needs for culturally responsive, community-based strategies have been remarked on as prerequisites for effective counter-extremism work (MacNair & Frank 2017; Tiflati 2016; Wilner & Dubouloz 2010). In framing community relation policy as essentially security-led, there have even been suggestions that *Prevent* constitutes an ‘anti-cohesion’ agenda through its construction of favoured and suspect minorities (Miah 2017).

Nonetheless, in the context of this study, many participants had begun their engagement with community relations under the *Community Cohesion* rubric, and were keen to stress continuities with earlier policy. Expert knowledge has the capacity to reframe important policy agendas, but it is also important to recognise the extent to which policy funding and critical incidents reframe professional praxis.

### ***Policy Mediation in the Context of Academisation***

Contemporaneously, changes in school governance with the hollowing-out of Local Authority support, the abolition of many mediating institutions in a ‘bonfire of the quangos’ and the introduction of Academies and Free Schools, funded and controlled by central government, have led to complexity and uncertainty regarding meso-level mediating institutions. The reauthoring of the Ofsted handbook for school inspections (2016) has foregrounded a narrower and more compliance-oriented approach to the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development (SMSC) of young people, with a concern for the promotion of ‘fundamental British values’.

### **Theoretical Positioning**

#### ***Historical Institutionalism***

Drawing from the logic of structural realism, Buzan's securitisation theory develops a pragmatic and functional frame for understanding these processes and the agency of individuals engaged in them (Buzan 1993) conceptualising security largely in sectoral terms. The function of the societal sector, for Buzan, is to highlight that even where society and polity are largely coterminous, as in the case of the UK<sup>1</sup>, the societal and political operate according to different logics. The Copenhagen School, associated with Buzan, expands this duality into a multi-sectoral conception of security, with the military, political, economic, societal and ecological sectors overlapping, each with its own institutional logic. The logic of the political sector concerns the organisational security of the state and ideological legitimacy, while the logic of the societal sector concerns 'we identities' identifying the individual as a member of the group (Buzan et al. 1998). Historical institutionalist research contextualises ideas and solutions within the ways people think about the world and their place within it (Steinmo 2008), recognising the role of more stable informal institutional norms and culture (Bulmer & Birch 1998), as much as that of formal organisations, which are, in the case of this research, in rapid flux. Studying educational and multi-agency professionals through a securitisation framework affords greater access to the ways professional values, path dependency and institutional logics are agentive in reframing and reinterpreting policy in its implementation.

### ***Professional Values and Moral Prototypes***

Fundamental to understanding these fractured and reconstituted institutional logics is

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this is made problematic in the case of the *Prevent* duty, as security is a reserved power, while education is devolved in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

understanding how moral prototypes frame ethical decision making. Institutions and experienced individuals replicate paths taken in the past even when circumstances change (Pierson 2000), eventually forming deeply embedded organisational norms and culture (Scott 2001). The importance of imitation or mimesis to moral thinking has a long history (Spinoza 1999; Kojève 1969; Girard 1988) but has seen something of a revival in recent years thanks to the moral psychology of Jesse Prinz. For Prinz, moral thoughts have an emotional component (2006) which is influenced by situationally dependent prototype moral reasons (2009). This rescues mimetic approaches to moral thinking from a Wittgensteinian folk-psychology approach which assumes we have a communicable image or mental representation of the prototype guiding moral thinking (c.f. Stickney 2008; Park 2013). Moral thoughts are not propositionally structured representations, but rather different levels of thinking intrude on one another (Prinz 2011). Drawing on *gestalt* psychology, moral prototypes can be regarded as more basic than the conscious definitions we give to them (Hampton 1993; Fischman et al. 2012). Moral prototypes in use are inseparable from their narrative concept of self (Hart 2005). Over time, through the selective pressures of institutional framing (Churchland 1995) individuals construct moral prototypes by abstracting salient properties of concrete exemplars within a social context (Larson 2017).

The prototype theory of moral thinking can be distinguished from an exemplar theory, as in Aristotelian virtue ethics, in that it posits a series of concepts, categories or features of moral situations, drawn from examples of particular morally praiseworthy or blameworthy acts, as the basis of moral concepts, rather than exemplars of morally praiseworthy individuals (Park 2011). Prototype effects are a by-product of the organisation of a moral category structure (Lakoff 1987) such that institutional factors can lend prominence a particular category, e.g. keeping others safe, encouraging



dialogue, upholding the law - providing insight into why individuals recognise or prioritise competing moral claims (Hart 1998). On this account, the historical track record helps explain more contemporary institutional behaviour (Tilly 1984), while avoiding an overly deterministic theoretical model. Institutional logics may also frame ideal processes of moral reasoning; aptly, Monin, Pizarro and Beer (2007) identify the models of the 'philosopher', who thinks deeply and rationally about moral dilemmas, and the 'sheriff' whose moral life is defined by split-second affect-laden judgments which must be appropriate in the heat of the moment, though these models appear more as exemplars of cognitive virtue than moral prototypes *per se*. Given the fracturing of institutional contexts outlined above, this study sets out to understand the impact of professional self-narratives (Reimer et al. 2009), and their malleabilities in new multi-agency contexts and securitised frames.

The theoretical contribution of this paper is that it draws together the concepts of path dependency, sectoral logics and post-institutionality at the contextual level with situational dependence, ideal processes and moral category structures at the level of individual decision-making. In framing their responses to the 'Terrorist House' moral panic, the paths which professional institutional memory suggest provide individuals with a framework for identifying what kind of moral action is called for. The focus and logic of activity within either societal or political organisations further frames the process of moral deliberation; while the informal institutional norms which have survived the hollowing-out, bridging and transitioning between organisational and sectoral structures situate action within horizons of possibility. In this way, historical institutionalism, operating at a level of abstraction above the individual professional narrative, and moral prototype theory, operating at a pre-narrative level, are harnessed to delineate a shifting agentive space in the articulation of interprofessional identity.

## Methodology

Recognising the complexity of policy change nested within structural change in schools, a qualitative case study approach employed semi-structured elite interviews with 14 key professionals, representing a range of meso-level institutions engaged in the mediation of *Prevent* policy into school practice in two mid-sized cities in England. In each interview, participants were asked about their understanding of the operation of the policy, and the networks of individuals with whom they work to develop and disseminate practical knowledge. A second methodology, involving a sociogram (Wolfgang 2001) in which participants provide a visual representation of their professional networks, proved unworkable due to the fluidity and complexity of networked knowledge (c.f. Lundie 2019). A conference was held in July 2017 making use of the Delphi technique (Baumfield et al. 2011; Lundie 2018) to enable practitioners to verify the draft conclusions of the project, aiding analytic authenticity (Lincoln & Guba 1986). While the moral prototype approach would lend itself to naturalistic research methods (Robinson 2001), the nature of *Prevent* training work, with the importance of complex networks and information dissemination made this impossible. Very often, however, participants' responses are quotative, reflectively drawing upon exemplars in ways which illustrate the moral and cognitive prototypes to which they contribute. Due to the pre-rational nature of prototypes themselves, it would be impossible to enter into its presence empirically, let alone to represent them in text (van Manen 2006), rather, the focus on continuity and critical incident attempts to capture a critical juncture in the convergence of multi-agency identities toward a shared narrative conception within which moral prototypes may (e)merge. By seeking the precedents and prototypes for the construction of values and folk models (Hutto 2009) of key terms the coding framework was able to delineate thinking which proceeded from earlier educational and *Community Cohesion* logics and changing working models in the

context of increased securitisation (Gearon 2013) and the precautionary logic which depoliticises the governance of risk (Aradau & VanMunster 2007).

The timing of data collection, from July 2016-January 2017, was critical, corresponding to the implementation of the second revision of the Home Office Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent (WRAP-II), and engaging the first wave of training providers who had helped schools prepare for the *Prevent* duty first coming into effect in September 2015. Given the importance of framing effects on subsequent decision-making (DeMartino et al. 2006), this research represents an important initial frame-setting for interprofessional work around the *Prevent* duty in schools. Precarity, complexity and multiple roles were a recurring theme among participants:

At the moment, I'm on the RE CSGT Council, I'm heading up the directorship of the Learn Teach, Lead North hub. I supervise Farmington fellows for the North West, I oversee the PGCE, PGDE and SchoolDirect Religious Education at a local university, I'm on a community steering group, I'm part of... the APPG group on anti-semitism, and I volunteer for a local Jewish charity... I'm part of the Barbara Wintersgill 'Big Ideas' research seminar... I'm a chief examiner for GCSE... as a governor, as a trainer, I've done a number of training sessions on Life in Modern Britain... I have quite a number of links with mosques and madrassas within a particular part of London... the same with ISKON, has a school now, where I've been involved. [ITE professional, Riverton]

While this post-institutional complexity was a new development, professionals were keen to present this as a continuity with previous work. Six of the participants had retired from institutional roles, in many cases not being replaced or seeing institutions, such as QCDA, dissolved. In many cases, involvement with Religious Education, Citizenship or PSHE had brought a deepening specialism in work now deemed to fall within the remit of the *Prevent* duty. Not infrequently, this involved transitions across the education and policing sectors:

I have been involved with Prevent right from the pathfinder year... as a member of the local Muslim community that was interested in what was happening. Then I got the post of lead Prevent Officer... I was a teacher prior to that... I was a community liaison teacher at that particular time, so I'd been taken off timetable to work with cohorts, particularly young boys, Pakistani Muslim young boys that were underachieving... I have worked with police and local authority... I was with [neighbouring constabulary] counter-terrorism unit for a few years... and I have still got very good links with the police. [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Beachtown]

Drawing on elite interview methodology (Neal & McLaughlin 2009; Ostrander 1993; Williams 2012), the study departs from a concern with policy 'making' (c.f. Ozga & Gewirtz 1994) towards an understanding of policy-framing and information dissemination. It also happens to have coincided with the height of the expansion of Daesh/ISIS in Iraq and Syria, and attendant concern from governments in the West. Recent historical change is particularly amenable to elite interviews (Hochschild 2009), as elites often act as gatekeepers and mediators to policy interpretation (Lilleker 2003). To reassure participants, many of whom worked in the policing and security sector, participants were assured that they would not be asked about details of specific cases, and were shown a final transcript of their interview and offered an opportunity to redact any confidential details. Because the topic of the interview included matters related to terrorism and national security, the institution's ethics policy required ethical approval to be given by the full University Ethics Committee, the highest level of scrutiny.

Employing a snowball sampling technique in the two sites of inquiry in order to understand the professional social networks drawn upon by schools (Hollstein 2011), participants were engaged at levels between (but not including) National policy-making and school leadership. Many participants held multiple roles in relation to *Prevent* and the education sector. The largest group identified by the snowball sample were independent consultants or representatives of small voluntary or third sector bodies

(n=7), followed by civil service and local government personnel (n=4); other participants included police, university teacher educators and school inspectors.

Given the focus on critical moments, much of the data presented in this paper is drawn from one sub-question within the semi-structured interview format:

3. Where did that understanding [of *Prevent*] come from, and how has it evolved over the past 2 years or so?...

c. Were there any critical incidents that changed your understanding of the *Prevent* duty?

i. How did things change after [incident]?

ii. Did your own views change? In what way?

A methodological note is needed here on the unplanned initiation of the researcher from outsider to insider in the world of *Prevent* education professionals. While the research was conceived as etic, studying the professional community, such as it was, from the outside (Kottak 2006), the nature of the subjects as a trans-institutional community in formation, combined with the synergy between intuitive ad-hoc post-institutional networks as a mode of working with the social network sampling approach taken in this research, led to the entanglement of the researcher within the network. Knowledge of the professional network itself was represented by professionals as a form of expertise, and as my understanding of the network in the two case study sites grew, interviews took on an increasingly emic, interprofessional tone. Talking about training programmes on deradicalisation with one participant in Riverton, for example, I reply:

Participant: I've tried to find out who offers the training and it's quite difficult to find out that information...

Interviewer: Okay, I could possibly put you in touch with some people in [Riverton] who are doing that sort of work, if that's something you'd be interested in.

Subsequently, I have provided training on *Prevent* as a speaker at CPD events aimed at teachers and *Prevent* education officers, facilitated links between professionals in Bechtou and the city council in Riverton, and helped to form a North West Consortium together with some of my research participants, suggesting a transition from researcher to practitioner, and a liminal character (VanGennep 1908) to this research, and perhaps to all research on emerging professional knowledge elites in the contemporary institutional climate. The implications of this transition speak to an interpersonal dimension to this research, challenging much of the literature on elite interviewing, and potentially highlighting an important limitation to historical institutionalism as a research paradigm in the field of education.

### **Critical Incidents and Media Moral Panics**

Coding of the interviews focused on critical incidents and moral prototypes. The prototypes represent the evolving institutional paths and logics of professional narrative identities, while the critical incidents, which were largely framed by media moral panic, slowly and often unreflectively shift these logics from dependence on a societal or educational pathway, toward a more politicised, securitised pathway. The focus on critical incidents was by design, but the mediatised enframing was an emergent finding of the project. In some ways, this framing represents the relatively short history of the *Prevent* duty, such that even at the level of local professional elites, most experience is vicarious. Drawing on Stanley Cohen's (1987) seminal study of moral panics, recognising the transactional construction of deviance between deviant behaviours and

societal representations, it is possible to identify two intersecting forms of moral panic around the *Prevent* duty. The first of these, highlighting failures of over-reporting, constructs *Prevent* itself as playing into ‘mythologies, stigma, stereotypes, patterns of exploitation, accommodation, segregation and methods of control’ (Lemert 1951) in the construction of deviance. The second, highlighting failures of under-reporting, both nuances and reinforces that construction. The positions participants take relative to these mutually reinforcing hostile narratives of media myth-making, Islamophobia and self-segregation serve to negatively define the *Prevent* professional community, in the absence of clear sectoral identities, institutional stability or shared professional language, as possessing a shared narrative identity.

While the paper focuses on one high profile media critical incident in the development of professionals’ moral prototypes this is illustrative of many others, including reporting of the three girls from Bethnal Green who travelled to Syria in 2016, the 7/7 terrorist attacks in London, the Paris and Nice terrorist attacks, the Charlie Hebdo attack and, perhaps archetypally, the 2014 ‘Trojan Horse’ moral panic in Birmingham schools. In Bechtown, the cases of Nicky Reilly and Andrew Ibrahim, both white converts to Islam with complex mental health needs who carried out, or attempted, acts of terrorism, were also frequently cited. This case highlights a further complex intersection, between *Prevent* and mental health professionals (c.f. Weine et al. 2017), which is not the focus of this paper. Subsequent to this research, a cycle of similar media reporting of terrorist and extremist incidents can be observed, contributing to a ‘mythic feedback loop’ which functions as a connective structure in individuals’ moral reflections (Haw 2009; Schostak & Schostak 2009).

***Professional Moral Prototypes: Post-institutionality and situation dependency***

A “tower of babel” of intersecting or superseded policy languages and institutional jargons was noted by the participants. Against these precarious and post-institutional professional narratives, shared personal commitments came to occupy prominence. “[A]n understanding of jargon and police terminology” [Independent consultant, Riverton] was highlighted as important to multi-agency *Prevent* work, particularly with regard to the work of local *Prevent* boards and *Channel* referral panels. Given the complexity of the multiple roles which participants occupied, understanding what sort of a case the ‘Terrorist House’ moral panic represents was the first challenge of moral action.

The most frequently cited critical incident among participants in both case study cities, it functioned as situational shorthand for a path taken repeatedly in relation to a number of categories of moral action:

you know, the ‘terrorist house’, or... even when teachers actually do follow Prevent directions, procedure, it gets misunderstood and blown out of all proportion. [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Beachtown]

There are lots of quite worrying incidents and a lot of them have been the ones that have had some prominence in the media because they get shock value: ‘terrorist house’; the mother who was questioned because her four year old son had said ‘cooker bomb’ when he was talking about a cucumber... [Independent consultant, National]

Functioning as a prototype for professional ethics, the ‘terrorist house’ case has some moral lability. For some participants, the most important message was the misuse of media itself, and the fear which schools have of media attention:

Media as a result of parents’ complaints, that’s a huge deal, nobody wants that. I mean, that’s just happened again [in a neighbouring town] four weeks ago, and that was completely unexpected. A primary school, where a child had been watching things [on the Internet] that it was alleged they shouldn’t have been watching. And the Prevent officer at the school, and the child was then a Social Services issue, and



it was on the news... you know, father being on television, and the child... and what that meant for the school. So, no school wants to get involved with it. [ITE professional, Riverton]

This categorisation of the crisis followed the paths of educational institutions' concerns with the societal, at the level of safeguarding their students, parents and communities. Others chose to highlight concerns about a vocal 'preventing Prevent' lobby, seeking to undermine the same critical work:

So, I think a school in London were doing some work with the class on Syria and ISIS, and I think, you know, some parents in school reported it, I don't know CAGE or [someone ran the story] and it was... suddenly under the media spotlight [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Beachton].

This latter interpretation, common among the security institution, with its concern for protecting the wider polity, casts the domain of moral action more widely, portraying the security and education professionals, each operating according to their institutional logics, as forming a single moral actor, responding to an exterior moral threat. Both interpretations speak to a concern with a mutually reinforcing media narrative of demonising Islamism and Islamophobia, a mimetic crisis of sorts (Girard 1988) in which the object of emulation is clear, but its purpose more ambivalent.

### ***Sectoral Logics and Ideal Processes: Deliberative virtues and vices***

While other policy discourses were cited, overwhelmingly the language of 'community cohesion' and its methodology predominated:

Craig<sup>2</sup> [shares my commitment to interfaith work]; Craig comes from a very different, Special Branch background, but he's much more personally involved with this, when he retired from the police. He's formed a great rapport with the Muslim community. [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Beachtown]

The dominant prototypes of *Community Cohesion* work involved ongoing strengthening of relationships between communities, understood in a societal framing. Among educators, in particular, this enabled spaces for more authentic dialogue to take place (Lundie & Conroy 2015) and for the development of critical capacities (Jerome & Elwick 2017), compared to a focus on responding to risk. Participants were keen to stress the continuities of this approach with their previous, institutional professional ethics:

one of my friends from one of the local madrassas would say, 'We've been doing Prevent for centuries. You know, we've been trying to bring people up the right way for centuries, so don't you come here and tell me.' I feel a bit like that as a cop, you know, 'How long have I been working on trying to prevent [violence]? Well, 28 and a bit years, actually, since I joined the police [Police officer, National].

Without tea-and-cake foundation-building, you're not going to get that engagement. You've got to be able to build trust and build relationships... If [my colleague] goes out and pops into the mosque and has a cup of tea for half an hour, an hour once a week... she might not have been talking about Prevent, but... when something happens and you can pick up the phone and talk to those people. [Local Authority employee, Riverton]

What should schools do?... First thing is, have we got safe spaces for pupils to discuss sensitive topics?... what I call education for cohesion, respect and equality. ... Exploring controversial issues. Promoting critical thinking that can interrogate and challenge extremist ideologies. Building personal resilience to violent narratives and developing a positive sense of identity. Which links to SMSC. In

---

<sup>2</sup> A pseudonym

other words, how have you got good and outstanding SMSC? [Independent consultant, National]

This societal framing, with its emphasis on cohesion, encounter and resilient identity, stands in stark contrast to the reactive model of much of the public perception and media rhetoric around the *Prevent* duty. Nuancing Pizarro's ideal processes of the 'philosopher' and the 'sheriff', the deliberative model of the community cohesion worker foregrounds processes and spaces of interpersonal trust. This contrasts with the characterisation of a secretive, disruptive *Prevent* work, involving an unannounced 'knock at the door'.

### ***Viewing and Categorising the 'Terrorist House' case***

Drawing on some participants' backgrounds as educators, concerns around the chilling effect of these cases were sometimes framed in terms of educational practices in RE, Citizenship and PSHE:

[A] number of teachers now, particularly if they're using things like Philosophy for Children in their lessons, that perhaps won't go that one step further with provoking pupils into expressing something that might then get a pupil reported. So it's a huge problem, you know, if you're saying to a pupil, 'Every view counts, you can say what you want, but actually if you say that view you'll be reported'. [ITE professional, Riverton]

[P]eople are so afraid of being accused of being racist or Islamophobic or anti-semitic or whatever [for asking questions]... people are very frightened but they need to ask questions otherwise they don't understand. [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Riverton]

Further, the case delimited a moral domain of *Prevent* as ethical practice. Some participants made use of the initial coverage of this case to highlight a distinction between critical and reflective *Prevent* education work and overzealous surveillance:

I say to schools... ‘If you ring me up,... the advice that you’ll get is to go and tell the child the difference between the word “terrorist” and “terraced”. That is not a Prevent issue... [Independent consultant, Riverton]

I’ll give you an example. Somebody ringing up and saying a five year old has been throwing some of the skittles balls in the playground, and saying that they’re bombs... and I said, ‘Well, if you step back from that, twenty years ago, pre-Prevent, would you have even thought about getting into contact with anybody?’ I’ve got three kids, and they’ll often say, ‘this is a bomb, this is a gun’, you know... And we would not take that any further. [Local Authority employee, Riverton]

An extended quotation from one practitioner instantiates how the the internalisation of this complex interplay between perceived overzealousness, hostile organisations and publicity in the practice of intercultural sensitivity in a securitised frame:

One school, I think they had a couple of Egyptian children and it was out in [a rural area], very white. What the teacher quietly said to me was ‘Look, this boy can do everything he wants to, but the girl, she’s not allowed out.’... I said, ‘Well, look, actually, all I can see is there’s no evidence that she is being radicalised. It’s unpleasant, but unfortunately, you know, girls don’t get the same opportunities, they’re perhaps oppressed, and they’re not treated as equal... Now that is not a sign of radicalisation, but in order to get parents’ trust, you as a school are going to have to do a bit more work... Now, if those parents, you know, were made aware that she had been reported, and were unhappy about it, and went to the right organisations that might publicise that, they could not have been good, for anybody – for the school or the family. It’s just that lack of understanding about very conservative cultural practices really, vis-à-vis vulnerability to radicalisation. That teacher really didn’t have anywhere he could ask the question. [3<sup>rd</sup> sector director, Beachtown]

Characterised by different forms of reflection, interprofessionalism in the context of *Prevent* presents itself through two prototypes of moral action. The first, common among education and ‘Community Cohesion’ professionals, foregrounded deliberative dialogue in trusted spaces, ‘cups of tea’ and the formation of societal bonds inimical to a more transparent ‘public’ enframing. Alongside this, a more securitised enframing foregrounded the public communication of a largely uncontested political agenda aimed at protecting young people and the wider community. While both sides rejected facile, unthinking or knee-jerk reactions to *Prevent*, and their rejection of the ‘Terrorist House’ narrative of moral panic served to some extent as a unifying event, these intersecting yet distinct moral logics serve to sublimate tensions at a deeper level of ideal types for professional moral action. It is within this tension that interprofessional *Prevent* work is carried out, through the constant reinterpretation and renegotiation of professional language in shared contexts viewed and categorised through professionals’ divergent path-dependent experiences.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

The ‘terrorist house’ critical incident exposes an important, yet often imperceptible, shift in professional moral prototypes. While professionals engaged in the formation of a multi-agency *Prevent* community in both case study cities drew upon earlier prototype logics of *Community Cohesion*, with its focus on societal bonds, pedagogies of encounter and the building of resilient identities to reinscribe *Prevent* policy with particular pedagogical commitments, those professionals were themselves being repositioned by the need to respond to high profile media narratives. These narratives, far from being singularly Islamophobic, as Kundnani, Farrell and others have contended, force professionals to position themselves relative to both Islamophobic and illiberal Islamist discourses. In the course of this positioning, a securitising move is

affected, such that professionals' efforts are reframed as political or policing work, rather than societal or pedagogical.

The 'Trojan Horse' allegations in Birmingham schools in 2014 provide something of a model of the way such critical incidents influence professional moral codes. Beginning with significant policy and accountability blind-spots, media attention focuses on allegations, provoking a political response. The political response is in turn framed by the professional trajectories and institutional inertias of the respondents, and professionals find themselves delimiting their position relative to these conflicting narratives. Guidelines for practice are revised in the light of political and media framing, which in turn reframe the ways professionals call to mind their own experiences. Cumulatively, such incidents precipitate a departure from professionals' espoused continuity with the community cohesion agenda.

This incident serves to illustrate the nested complexity of *Prevent* in education. At once, while raising awareness of teachers duties under *Prevent*, professionals positioned themselves between a hostile Islamophobic media narrative, and a media counter-narrative focused on exposing that hostility, while recognising that both *Prevent* and the media narratives around *Prevent* could be the legitimate subject of critical debate in the civic curriculum in schools. The necessity of adopting the securitised language of *Prevent* in order to critically position themselves affects a securitising move, shifting the prototypes, paths and logics of educational professionals away from an espoused concern with societal cohesion.

This analysis fits with the institutionalist concept of path dependency, recognising a role for ideas in context, while challenging a crude folk-psychology which is often implicit in historical institutionalist research, which assumes the subject has a communicable image of the prototype in their mind guiding their thinking. Rather, these

moral prototypes are malleable, emerging conditioned by critical junctures which have become inseparable from the narrative self-concept of the subject. Critical incident analysis reveals critical incidents and uncritical continuities. The continuities represent a groundwork to the professional narrative, while the incidents, largely enframed heteronymously by the media discourse around terrorism, have the effect of imperceptibly shifting the sectoral logic of key professionals from dependence on a societal or educational pathway, toward a more politicised, securitised pathway.

The framing of the *Prevent* duty is essential to its success. Approaches which foregrounded a societal and pedagogical approach for students to develop critical enquiry skills, intercultural competences and media literacy provide a more positive framework to those often reported in the media. This study reports the formative stages of a new community of practice, coalescing around shared language, values and commitments. The explicit commitment to the continued relevance of community cohesion is one which may finally be acknowledged by recent policy developments (DHCLG 2018), but attention needs to be paid to the subtle yet persistent distorting effect of recurring media moral panics.

#### Acknowledgements

The research findings discussed in this paper are the result of British Academy/Leverhulme grant SG151930: *The influence of securitisation on Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural development in England's schools.*

Table 1. Type your title here.

Figure 1. Type your title here. Obtain permission and include the acknowledgement required by the copyright holder if a figure is being reproduced from another source.

## References

Aradau, C. & VanMunster, R. (2007) Governing terrorism through risk: Taking precautions, (un)knowing the future. *European Journal of International Relations* 13(1) 89-115.

Armstrong, K. & 139 co-authors (2016) Anti-radicalisation strategy lacks evidence base in science, open letter *The Guardian* 29<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

Awan, I. & Blackmore, B. (2013) *Extremism, Counter-Terrorism and Policing*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A. & Lundie, D. (in review, a) Educating global Britain: Perils and possibilities promoting ‘national’ values through critical global citizenship education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*.

Barrett, D. & Jamieson, S. (2016) Father of Muslim boy, 10, questioned by police for saying he lived in ‘terrorist’ house brands it a ‘joke’, *The Telegraph* 10<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016 <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/12109399/Father-of-Muslim-boy-10-questioned-by-police-for-saying-he-lived-in-terrorist-house-brands-it-a-joke.html> [accessed 30th Aug 2018].

Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A. & Lundie, D. (in review, b) Beginning teacher agency in the enactment of fundamental British values: A multi-method case study. *Oxford Review of Education*.

BBC News (2016) Lancashire ‘terrorist house’ row ‘not a spelling mistake’, *BBC News* 20<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-lancashire-35354061> [accessed 30th Aug 2018].



- Bhopal, K. (2010) Gender, identity and experience: Researching marginalised groups, *Women's Studies International Forum* 33(3) 188-195.
- Breslin, T., Rowe, D. & Thornton, A. (2006) *Citizenship education: Current state of play and recommendations – The Citizenship Foundation's written submission to the Education Select Committee.*
- Bulmer, S. & Birch, M. (1998) Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British State and European Union, *Public Administration* 76(4) 601-628.
- Busher, J., Choudhury, T., Thomas, P. & Harris, G. (2017) *What the Prevent duty means for schools and colleges in England: An analysis of educationalists' experiences.* Aziz Foundation.
- Buzan, B. (1993) From international system to international society: Structural realism and regime theory meet the English school. *International Organization* 47(3) 327-352.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O. & de Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: A new framework for analysis.* London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Casey, L. (2016) *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration.* London: Department for Communities and Local Government.
- Churchland, P. (1995) *The engine of reason, the seat of the soul.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cohen, S. (1987) *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of the Mods and Rockers.* Abingdon: 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.
- DeMartino, B., Kumaran, D., Seymour, B. & Dolan, R. (2006) Frames, biases, and rational decision-making in the human brain. *Science* 313(5787) 684-687.

Department for Education (2015) *The Prevent duty: Departmental advice for schools and childcare providers*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2012) *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies*. London: Department for Education.

Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018) *Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper: Building stronger, more united communities*. London: HMSO.

Fischman, G., Haas, E. & Robertson, S. (2012) Beyond idealized citizenship education: Embodied cognition, metaphors and democracy. *Review of Research in Education* 36(2) 169-196.

Foucault, M. (2002) *The Order of Things*. London: Routledge.

Francis, L. & McKenna, U. (2017) The religious and social correlates of Muslim identity: An empirical enquiry into religification among male adolescents in the UK. *Oxford Review of Education* 43(5) 550-565.

Gearon, L. (2013) The counter terrorist classroom: Religion, education, and security. *Religious Education* 108(2) 129-147.

Girard, R. (1988) *Violence and the Sacred*. London: Bloomsbury.

Grove, J. (2016) Prevent 'stopping students speaking out in class', *Times Higher Education* 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

Hampton, J. (1993) Prototype models of concept representation, in Van Mechelin, I., Hampton, J., Michalski, R. & Theuns, P. (eds.) *Categories and concepts: Theoretical views and inductive data analysis*. New York: Academic Press, 67-95.

Hart, D. (2005) The development of moral identity, in Carlo, G. & Edwards, C. (eds.) *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Moral development through the lifespan, theory, research and application*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Hart, D. (1998) Can prototypes inform moral development theory? *Developmental Psychology* 34(3) 420-423.
- Haw, K. (2009) From hijab to jilbab and the 'myth' of British identity: Being Muslim in contemporary Britain a half generation on. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(3) 363-378.
- Hochschild, J. (2009) Conducting intensive interviews and elite interviews, *Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research*, Harvard University.
- Hollstein, B. (2011) Qualitative Approaches, in Scott, J. & Carrington, P. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Home Office (2018) *CONTEST: The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism*. London: HMSO.
- Home Office (2015) *Revised Prevent duty guidance for England and Wales*. London: HMSO.
- Hutto, D. (2009) Lessons from Wittgenstein: Elucidating folk psychology. *New Ideas in Psychology* 27(1) 197-212.
- Jerome, L. & Elwick, A. (2017) Identifying an educational response to Prevent policy: Student perspectives on learning about terrorism, extremism and radicalisation. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. DOI:10.1080/00071005.2017.1415295
- Kojeve, A. (1969) *Introduction to the reading of Hegel: Lectures on the phenomenology of spirit*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kottak, C. (2006) *Mirror for Humanity*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kundnani, A. (2009) *Spooked: How not to prevent violent extremism*. London: Institute for Race Relations.

- Lakoff, G. (1987) *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Larson, C. (2017) A cognitive prototype model of moral judgment and disagreement. *Ethics and Behaviour* 27(1) 1-25.
- Lemert, E. (1951) *Social pathology: A systematic approach to the theory of sociopathic behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lillekar, D. (2003) Interviewing the political elite: Navigating a potential minefield, *Politics* 23(3) 207-214.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1986) But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation, in Williams, D. (ed.) *Naturalistic Evaluation* (pp73-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lundie, D. (2019) Counter-extremism, institutional chaos and education: A post-historical perspective, *Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Research Seminar*, University of Birmingham, 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2019.
- Lundie, D. (2018) *Security, Safeguarding and the Curriculum: Recommendations for effective multi-agency Prevent work in schools*. Liverpool: Liverpool Hope University.
- Lundie, D. (2017) Religion, schooling, community and security: Exploring transitions and transformations in England. *Diaspora, Indigenous and Minority Education*, 11(3) 117-123.
- Lundie, D. & Conroy, J. (2015) 'Respect Study' the treatment of religious difference and otherness: An ethnographic investigation in UK schools. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 36(3)
- MacNair, L. & Frank, R. (2017) Voices against extremism: A case study of a community-based CVE counter-narrative campaign. *Journal for Deradicalization* 10(1) 147-174.

- Marcuse, H. (2002) *One Dimensional Man*. London: Routledge.
- Mazza, E. (2016) Was a 10-year-old Muslim boy questioned by police over a spelling mistake? *Huffington Post*, 21<sup>st</sup> Jan 2016  
[https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/muslim-boy-terrorist-house-spelling-mistake\\_us\\_56a041b2e4b0404eb8f04ac8](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/muslim-boy-terrorist-house-spelling-mistake_us_56a041b2e4b0404eb8f04ac8) [accessed 30th Jan 2018].
- Miah, S. (2017) *Muslims, schooling and security: Trojan Horse, Prevent and racial politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miller, D. & Sabir, R. (2012) Counter-terrorism as counterinsurgency in the UK ‘War on Terror’ in Poynting, S. & Whyte, D. (eds.) *Counter-terrorism and state political violence: The ‘War on Terror’ as terror*. London: Routledge.
- Miller, J. (2013) REsilience, violent extremism and religious education, *British Journal of Religious Education* 35(3) 188-200.
- Monin, B., Pizarro, D. & Beer, J. (2007) Emotion and reason in moral judgment: Different prototypes lead to different theories, in Vohs, K., Baumeister, R. & Loewenstein, G. (eds.) *Do emotions help or hurt decision making? A hedgefoxian perspective*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Neal, S. & McLaughlin, E. (2009) Researching up? Interviews, emotionality and policy-making elites. *Journal of Social Policy* 38(4) 689-707.
- NPCC (2016) *National Channell Referral Figures*  
<http://www.npcc.police.uk/FreedomofInformation/NationalChannelReferralFigures.aspx> [accessed 1st March 2018].
- O’Donnell, A. (2016) Securitisation, counterterrorism and the silencing of dissent: The educational implications of Prevent, *British Journal of Educational Studies* 64(1) 53-76.
- Ofsted (2016) *School Inspection Handbook*. London: HMSO.

- Ostrander, S. (1993) "Surely you're not in this just to be helpful" Access, rapport, and interviews in three studies of elites. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22(1) 7-27.
- Ozga, J. & Gewirtz, S. (1994) Sex, lies and audiotape: Interviewing the education policy elite. In Halpin, D. & Troyna, B. (eds) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London: Falmer, 126-135.
- Panjwani, F. (2017) No Muslim is just a Muslim: Implications for education. *Oxford Review of Education* 43(5) 596-611.
- Park, J. (2013) Prototypes, exemplars, and theoretical & applied ethics. *Neuroethics* 6(2) 237-247.
- Pickstock, C. (1998) *After Writing: On the liturgical consummation of philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pierson, P. (2000) Increasing returns, path dependence and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, 94(2) 251-267.
- Reimer, K., Dewwitt-Goudelock, B. & Walker, L. (2009) Developing conceptions of moral maturity: Traits and identity in adolescent personality. *Journal of Positive Psychology* 4(3) 372-388.
- Robinson, V. (2001) Prototypes, virtues and the ethics of practice. *Journal of Educational Administration* 39(6) 521-538.
- Sansbury, I. (2017) *Enough is enough: Addressing the root causes of radicalisation*. Oasis Foundation.
- Schostak, J. & Schostak, J. (2009) *Researching Violence, Democracy and the Rights of People*. London: Routledge.
- Scott, W. (2001) *Institutions and Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Shannahan, D. (2010) Some queer questions from a Muslim faith perspective. *Sexualities* 13(6) 671-684.

- Sirin, S. & Fine, M. (2008) *Muslim American Youth: Understanding hyphenated identities through multiple methods*. New York: NYU Press.
- Smith, H. (2016) Britishness as racist nativism: A case of the unnamed 'other'. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 42(3) 298-313.
- Spinoza, B. (1999) *The Ethics, Part III*. Champaign, IL: Project Gutenberg.
- Steinmo, S. (2008) What is historical institutionalism? in Della Porta, D. & Keating, M. (eds.) *Approaches in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stuart, H. (2017) *Islamist terrorism: Analysis of offences and attacks in the UK*. London: Henry Jackson Society.
- Thomas, P. (2012) *Responding to the threat of violent extremism – Failing to Prevent*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Thomas, P. (2009) Between two stools? The government's Preventing Violent Extremism agenda. *The Political Quarterly* 80(2) 21-43.
- Tiflani, H. (2016) Western Islamic schools as institutions for preventing behavioral radicalization: The case of Quebec. *Journal for Deradicalization* 6(1) 180-205.
- VanGennep, A. (1908) *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Van Manen, M. (2006) Writing qualitatively, or the demands of writing. *Qualitative Health Research* 16(6) 713-722.
- Weine, S., Eisenman, D., Jackson, L., Kinsler, J. & Polutnik, C. (2017) Utilizing mental health professionals to help prevent the next attacks. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 29(4) 334-340.
- Williams, C. (2012) *Researching power, elites and leadership*. London: Sage.
- Wilner, A. & Dubouloz, C. (2010) Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: An interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. *Global Change, Peace & Security* 22(1) 33-51.

