

“We’re not British values teachers are we?” Muslim teachers’ subjectivity and the governmentality of unease

This paper is a critical investigation of a group of 8 Muslim religious education (RE) teachers’ views of fundamental British values in education (FBV). Findings demonstrate that as teachers of multicultural RE, they experience dissonance accommodating the requirements of FBV, and are critical of its divisive effects upon their students. They are able to reclaim some professional agency through their problematization of FBV and reinterpretation of its requirements through the pluralistic discourse of RE. Drawing from Foucault’s analysis of power, we argue that the teachers’ views reveal that FBV is a disciplinary discourse, acting upon teacher and student bodies as a classificatory and social sorting instrument, which we conceptualise as an expression of the ‘governmentality of unease’. We conclude that further empirical research is required to critically examine how teachers are enacting this policy to assess how FBV continues to shape the education environment and the student and teacher subjects of its discourse.

This paper offers a critical examination of the views of 8 Muslim teachers of RE on fundamental British values (FBV). FBV were introduced into the new teachers’ standards in 2012 which set out the professional duties of teachers and the minimum baseline requirements for teachers’ practice and conduct (DfE, 2013). The standards included the requirement to uphold public trust by “not undermining fundamental British values” (DfE, 2013, 14). Notably, FBV were not defined by educationalists, nor were they agreed upon through a process of democratic debate, rather, the definition was taken directly from the controversial Prevent strategy, a key element of Contest, the UK government’s counter terrorism programme, which states that, “Extremism is vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs” (HM Government, 2011, 107).

However, it was as a result of events in 2014 that FBV came to assume greater prominence in education as the government responded to the ‘Trojan Horse’ affair. In March 2014 the Sunday Times reported the existence of a letter alleging to show evidence of an Islamist plot to take over the governing bodies of some Birmingham schools. Despite indications that the so called ‘Trojan Horse’ letter was faked, the government commissioned an investigation of 21 Birmingham city schools, led by Sir Peter Clarke, former head of the Metropolitan Police Counter Terrorist Command. Significantly, Clarke found no evidence of radicalisation in the schools but, concluded that there were individuals associated with the schools who failed to challenge extremist views (Arthur, 2015). Nationally, the consequences of the enquiry for teachers were seismic, leading to a raft of new policies, including no-notice OFSTED inspections and new guidance on spiritual, moral, social, and cultural (SMSC) development, which stipulated that schools were to “actively promote” FBV through SMSC (DfE, 2014, 3). Because SMSC provision is a cross-curricular, whole school responsibility, the new advice effectively embedded FBV in all aspects of provision for pupils’ personal development and also became subject to inspection by the education regulator, OFSTED. The addition of the requirement to actively promote FBV in a way that was measurable, demonstrable,

auditable and amenable to judgement by inspection teams, placed FBV at the heart of the frameworks used to regulate and monitor teachers. Despite the espoused cross curricular aims of SMSC, religious education was singled out by Lord Nash, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools, as a having a special role to play in the promotion of FBV. Effectively, a civic nationalist security agenda in which FBV served as the discursive bedrock for SMSC had been introduced into all aspects of school life, including the pluralistic space of RE. For Robin Richardson, former director of the Runnymede Trust, the moral panic of this enquiry only served to lend emotional energy to pre-existing agendas, fashioned within the clash of civilizations discourse of the war on terror to reinforce, “Islamophobic tropes, fantasies and simplifications” (Richardson, 2015, 40).

Reasons for this study

This paper aims to make a contribution to the critical literature on FBV by examining the dilemmas faced specifically by Muslim teachers working in this volatile policy context. The teachers we interviewed have to negotiate this environment in which being a Muslim is a “precarious designation” (Lynch, 2013, 241). As teacher educators, it is our view that the introduction of FBV into education policy and practice positions teachers as the instruments of state security through the requirement to monitor their students for signs of radicalisation, including “non -violent extremism” (HM Government, 2015, 3) defined as the creation of an “atmosphere conducive to terrorism” (HM Government, 2015, 6). The tensions these requirements produce are particularly acute as they are experienced by Muslim teachers working within a context of pluralistic RE yet required to promote a form of civic nationalism incompatible with their critical multicultural practice. As members of a community positioned as suspect, the Muslim teachers’ narratives offer a particularly effective lens through which we are able to undertake a critical investigation of the effects of accommodating policies which entail uneasy shifts in personal and professional positioning and practice.

Our research questions were formulated to investigate teacher views of FBV in order to gain insights into the effects of these policies on teacher subjectivity and teacher- student relationships, as follows:

- How do the teachers understand their positioning in relation to FBV? Do they problematise the requirement or are they able to accommodate it?
- As its points of articulation, how do the teachers view the implementation of FBV in practice? How do they perceive its effects on their students?
- How do the teachers interpret this policy discourse? In what ways are FBV open to interpretation, adjustment and re-appropriation?

Methodologically, our investigation and analysis draws upon a Foucauldian understanding of subjectivity and the ways in which power relations in education policy discourse shape teacher subjectivity. Describing the aim of his work Foucault stated, “I have tried to discover how the human subject entered ‘games of truth’...like those that can be found in institutions or practices of control” (Foucault, in Lotringer, 1996, 432). We aim, therefore, to critically

report on the positioning of Muslim teachers and the dilemmas they experience as they negotiate what we characterise as the “game of truth” of FBV.

The first section of this paper offers a critical examination of the provenance of FBV within the wider geo-political environment of the war on terror and its effects on UK education policy. This analysis provides the context for situating Muslim teacher subjects in a milieu of unease where Islam has become racialised and policy discourse exacerbates age- old racial binaries (Taras, 2013). We characterise this policy environment as one shaped by a “governmentality of unease” (Bigo, 2002).

The second section of the paper is a presentation and analysis of the teachers’ narratives which reveal the challenges of alignment to a discourse that they regard as problematic both for themselves as Muslim subjects and their students. The governmentality of unease permeates the data we present revealing evidence of the ways FBV creates divisions, acting upon teacher and student bodies as a “social sorting” instrument.

Education policy in the fog of war

The philosopher John Brenkman states that political thought post 9/11 has been pervaded by the “fog of war” (Brenkman, 2007). From our Foucauldian perspective we argue that this fog has permeated the British education system at all levels of the chain of delivery, from government policy making, to its implementation at the “capillary” level in the classroom. It could be said, therefore, that the war on terror is constituting social and power relations in our educational institutions. Through their operation as an ensemble of rules, practices and calculations (Foucault, 2009), we argue that the policies, statutory duties and requirements placed upon teachers by FBV and Prevent, produce a truth about what constitutes an admissible existence as a British subject. In his 2011 Munich speech David Cameron identified “state multiculturalism” as a factor in weakening the collective British identity FBV purports to reassert. In multiculturalism’s place, Cameron advocated a “muscular liberalism” that offers a defence of “our way of life” (Cameron in Dearden, 2015). However, this game of truth in which *democracy* is a fundamental British value entails paradox. While liberal western governments are organised on the basis of maintaining peaceful civil societies within their own borders, the US, UK and their allies have prosecuted efficient and ruthless wars on the basis of unverified threats posed by alleged Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and links to Al-Qaeda, thus desiccating the very democratic institutions and values they claim to defend (Brenkman, 2007).

The governmentality of unease

Ostensibly benign, soft surveillance and social sorting techniques such as the referral of individuals considered to be at risk of being drawn into terrorism, to Channel, the UK government’s de-radicalisation programme and the Prevent duty (DfE, 2015), have become a governmental necessity, “to classify those that don’t fit into the new framework of governance that the liberal state has sought to create post 9/11” (Morgan, in Vardalos, Letts, Teixeira, Karzai and Haig, 2009, 75). Channel is part of the Prevent duty and forms the multi-agency programme local authorities are required to have in place under duties placed

on them by the Counter-Terrorism and Security act of 2015 (Great Britain Parliament, 2015) to provide support for individuals at risk of radicalisation. Channel panels involve representatives from education, social services, police, and probation services. Since its introduction in 2006 the number of referrals to Channel has increased annually. The latest figures released by the Home Office in 2017 revealed a rise in from 3,934 in 2014, to 7,631 over the 2015-2016 period (Home Office, 2017, 4). A disproportionate number of the referrals (65%) were of young males, under the age of 20, for alleged Islamist extremism. These figures have prompted accusations of inadequate training for professionals such as teachers (Halliday, 2016) who are making the highest numbers of referrals (Home Office, 2017). As Kundnani has argued the way Prevent has been operationalised with more resources and Police counter terrorist activity focussed on authorities with the largest Muslim populations suggests the deliberate targeting of Muslim communities, “in effect constructing the Muslim population as a suspect community” (Kundnani, 2009, 6). Increased police presence is interpreted by Kundnani less as a partnership between local communities and the authorities, but as surveillance, “to gather intelligence on Muslim communities...to then facilitate interventions such as the Channel programme” (Kundnani, 2009, 6).

Technologies such as Prevent and Channel are “soft” in so far as their stated aim is rehabilitation and reform. However, from the Foucauldian perspective of this analysis we argue that their purpose is “disciplinary”, to produce the “right dispositions” in teachers and students through their subjection to the norms of FBV (Foucault, in Faubion, 2002) thus enabling governments to “affirm their role as providers of protection and security and to mask some of its failures” (Bigo, 2002, 3). As a mode of governmental power this is what Bigo characterises as the “governmentality of unease” (Bigo, 2002). The term “governmentality” is a semantic combination of “government” and “mentality” meaning, “‘mentalities of rule’ – how government is justified and rationalised” (Gillies 2015, 67). The statutory requirements of the teachers’ standards position teachers as the instruments of this governmentality. This, we argue, is evidence that British education practice has become one of the racialized and securitized sites of the domestic war on terror (Elton-Chalcraft, Lander, Revell, Warner and Whitworth, 2016; Farrell, 2016). As a discursive site for the critical interrogation of this “governmentality of unease”, the Muslim teachers’ narratives offer a critical lens through which we can undertake the “real political task” of scholarship, that is, “to criticize the workings of institutions, which appear to be both neutral and independent...in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself so obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight against them” (Foucault, in Chomsky and Foucault, 2006, 41).

Teachers and British values

Critical literature on the implementation of FBV demonstrates how education is a site, “where policy and practice, regulation and discipline intersect and subjects are produced” (Ball, 2013, loc 1395 of 3328). The earliest studies report on the inclusion of British values in the citizenship curriculum, highlighting the assimilationist discourse of new Labour community cohesion policy (Maylor, 2010; Jerome and Clemitshaw, 2012). Lander’s (2011) investigation of white ITE students found a lack of reflexivity about white privilege and an attendant inadequacy in their ability to deal with race related issues in school, findings

which confirm the impact of post- race neoliberalism on teacher identity. Keddie (2014) found that that FBV promoted an assumption amongst some teachers that affiliation with Britishness promotes social cohesion, highlighting the penetration of assimilationist discourses of community cohesion into teachers' practice.

More recent studies, have found both evidence of teacher compliance expressed in terms of an "us and them" binary (Smith, 2016) and teacher criticality expressed as willingness to problematise the notion of uniquely British values (Farrell 2016; Maylor, 2016). Panjwani's study (2016) is of note as it investigates Muslim teachers' views of FBV. The teachers report little conflict with FBV, however, they are concerned by the potential of Prevent to alienate pupils and to transform their role into government watchdogs. Similarly, Elton-Chalcraft et al (2016, 1) conclude that the inclusion of FBV in statutory documents is de facto a politicisation of the profession which positions teachers as state instruments of surveillance.

The 8 teachers who participated in our study are aged between 21 and 37. The majority (7) are under 30 and the average age of the participants is 25. These young British Muslims have grown up and begun their careers in an environment shaped by social and political transformations which follow the "new geopolitical rules devised post 9/11" (Gilroy, 2005, 3). Their subjectivities have been fashioned within an unstable policy ethno-space in which multi culturalism has been denounced and the assimilationism of new Labour's community cohesion policies has been reduced to civic nationalism by the Conservative government (Jerome and Clemitshaw, 2012). This is an environment in which Muslims, particularly, young Asian males, find themselves constructed as the new folk devils of an Islamophobic moral panic (Shain, 2011). Within this war on terror discourse the role of the state has recalibrated from welfarism to securitism, "no longer 'caretaker' but 'traffic cop'" (Kapoor, 2013, 1040). These political shifts were given impetus by the events of 9/11 and the northern riots of 2001. Notably, the authors of the Cattle report (Home Office, 2001) on the northern riots placed responsibility for the structural racisms that produced the violence, "on Muslim communities to become better citizens...taking attention away from the state to provide the resources to create the necessary economic infra structure to do so" (Abbas, 2011, 148). Our participants find themselves negotiating this policy terrain, where national unanimity has replaced pluralism and, "homogeneity rather than diversity provide the new rule" (Gilroy, 2005, 2).

The teachers interviewed in this paper are pre and in service teachers of RE. We wish to highlight the tensions between FBV and the pluralistic model of RE espoused by the RE Council (RE Council, 2013). The dominant pedagogical discourse of RE remains phenomenological, aiming at non-judgemental understanding of religion (Miller, 2013). Until recently RE has been largely marginalised by policy makers, left out of the national curriculum and the English Baccalaureate. RE still remains on the peripheries of the basic curriculum but its capacity to serve strategic governmental objectives has resulted in a new and politicised focus as a vehicle for promoting FBV. When data collection for this study commenced (February 2015) the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools, Lord Nash, had just written to local authority Standing Advisory Councils on RE (SACRE) emphasising the centrality of RE to the government's promotion of community cohesion and SMSC (Nash, 2015). Nash's letter is couched in the language of security, using the Trojan

horse enquiry as its rationale, “The recent events in Birmingham have also highlighted the importance of all schools teaching the fundamental British values... In some schools in Birmingham, inappropriate religious education teaching and a distorted school ethos served to undermine those fundamental British values” (Nash, 2015). The second phase of data collection took place in late December 2015 in a geopolitical context of heightened tension in the wake of the Paris attacks.

Lord Nash’s letter to SACREs identifies RE as a site for the promotion of FBV. It might be argued therefore that RE is at risk of becoming securitised as Revell states, “RE is more likely than some subjects to fall under the regulatory gaze because its subject content involves diversity, values and morality” (Revell, 2015, 59). Given this analysis, the views of RE teachers matter. For the Muslim teachers there is a type of double othering, already positioned by an assimilationist discourse which associates difference with dissent, and as potentially suspect themselves, Muslim teachers have to negotiate the incitements of this game of truth and retain professional and personal integrity.

Methodology and theoretical framework

Foucault argued that the essential task of critical social analysis in modern liberal societies was to make visible the asymmetrical power relations operating through governmental games of truth by trying to *change* the "political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth", in order to constitute a new agonistic "politics of truth" (Foucault in Rabinow, 1991, 74). We deploy Foucault’s concepts of governmentality, bio-politics and discipline as our analytical tools to undertake this critical task by problematizing the truths and norms mobilised by the FBV discourse.

Governmentality is a bio-political form of power in contrast to the sovereign power of the monarch in feudal society. Significantly, bio-political power works to control, monitor, “optimize and organize the forces under it”, it is, “a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit or destroying them” (Foucault, 1998, 136). The management of the population as a resource in the national interest is the predominant concern of bio-political regimes. This governmental power over life evolved in two forms: “discipline”, which focuses on the correction, training, and the normalization of individual subjects in social sites such as schools, hospitals, and prisons and “regulation” which takes the population, the “species body” as its target (Foucault, 1998).

Central to our analysis is Foucault’s insight that modern governmental societies operate around regimes of truth that produce dominant norms. Historically, schools are paradigmatic disciplinary institutions and tactical loci where, “the norm... can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize” (Foucault, 2003, 253). In the case of Prevent we argue that a bio-political policy rationality is operating as a regulatory strategy which has the population as its target, but is also articulated in its disciplinary form as techniques of power directed at individuals, such as Channel referrals, the requirements of FBV, the safeguarding duties placed on teachers as the agents of the Prevent duty, high stakes OfSTED inspections, curriculum audits and pay related appraisals

of teacher performance (Appleby, 2010; Farrell, 2016). The discursive conditions created by successive governments are ideal for the implementation of Prevent. The requirements of Prevent and FBV in education have been introduced into a system already operating within a neoliberal discourse of performativity which aims at the creation of self-governing subjects.

Discipline, regulation and biopolitics are therefore, the essential instruments of security in governmental societies. The disciplinary and regulatory instruments of Prevent mobilize a normalizing civic nationalist binary constructed around notions of Britishness and the un-British other which fragments the bio-social field and “separates out the groups that exist within a population” (Foucault, 2003, 256).

Foucault’s analysis of the power/ knowledge dyad is also relevant here. Prevent collects data through referrals to Channel, thus constructing vulnerable, medicalised subjects who depart from the “norm” instantiated by FBV, a phenomenon highlighted by NUS (National Union of Students) and NUT (National Union of Teachers) reports on the disproportionate number of Muslim referrals despite the fact that Muslims are a minority, constituting 5% of the UK population (Qurashi, 2016). This is how racism functions in Foucault’s analysis, “to fragment, to create caesuras within the biological continuum addressed by power” (Foucault, 2003, 255).

Method

The teachers interviewed belong to the initial teacher education (ITE) partnership co-ordinated by our University Faculty of Education in North West England. This study was approved by our University as a small scale investigation of teachers’ views of FBV in order to provide a basis for further research within our partnership. The sample was therefore a convenience sample, delimited by the partnership we have access to, but importantly a religiously and culturally diverse partnership, enabling us to gain rich descriptions of the teachers’ experiences of implementing FBV. All our participants were working in secular 11-16 non-selective co-educational urban local authority or academy schools located in a large North West urban conurbation, including some of the districts that received the largest Department for Communities and Local Government Prevent funding (Kundnani, 2009, 13). The participant sample enabled us to gather the perspectives of both pre and in-service teachers potentially allowing us to gain insight into teacher subjectivity from teachers at different stages of their careers. However there is little evidence that length of service was a factor influencing the teachers’ responses.

Following BERA (2011) ethical guidelines participants were provided with a full outline of the research aims. All participants gave their informed consent and received confirmation from our University Ethics Board that their participation would not compromise their role as partnership mentors or assessment of their professional practice. Anonymity was guaranteed and all the names that appear in this study are pseudonyms. The right to withdrawal was emphasised throughout the data collection process. Participants were provided with DfE documentation on FBV and SMSC in preparation for the interviews.

Data collection

As reflexive teacher educators FBV constitutes a challenge to the multicultural and pluralistic education discourse that has fashioned our professional subjectivities. We endeavour, therefore to align to Denzin's characterisation of valid qualitative research by investigating, "narratives that separate facts from stories, telling moving accounts that join private troubles with public issues" (Denzin in Denzin and Lincoln, 2003, 465). By utilizing semi-structured group and individual interviews we sought to foster an environment where participants were able to offer, "In depth, intimate stories of problematic life lived up close" (Denzin in Denzin and Lincoln, 2003, 464).

The participants

All the participants are secondary teachers of RE. 5 are pre-service teachers. 3 are in service teachers and school based mentors. With the exception of Mazneen and Adam who worked in the same school and department, the other teachers worked in separate schools. Data were collected in interviews in February 2015 and December 2015. The February interviews were held in the teachers' secondary schools in meetings rooms. Individual interviews were necessitated where individual teachers were unable to join the group interviews. The December interviews were held at our university in seminar rooms. Pseudonyms appropriate to participants' age and ethnicity are used.

Table 1. Participants:

Shazia- 35, Pakistani heritage, female; Sadia- 22, Indian heritage, female; Zahra- 27, Pakistani heritage, female	February 2015 student teacher group interview.
Ikram- 35, Pakistani heritage, male	February 2015 in-service teacher individual interview.
Adam- 37, Pakistani heritage, male; Mazneen- 26, Indian heritage, female	February 2015 in-service teacher paired interview.
Aleeza-29, Pakistani heritage, female; Maryam- 23, Pakistani heritage, female	December 2015 student teacher group interview.

The interview questions are as follows:

1. What does it mean to you to be British?
2. In your opinion, what are fundamental British values?
3. As an RE teacher do you think it is your role to promote fundamental British values?
4. Do you think promotion of fundamental British values should be a requirement of SMSC provision?
5. Taking into account the possible responses of pupils, parents/guardians and communities, what are the possibilities and the constraints for teachers engaged in the promotion of fundamental British values?

Interviews are complex intersubjective spaces where meanings are constructed, contested and re-made. The teachers' narratives reveal their own contingent positioning, experiences of racism, and the dissonance between their professional self-understandings and FBV, however, as a sociological intervention the interviews function as a site of resistance where critical dialogue is privileged over the dominant managerial discourse of teacher education (Farrell, 2016, 286).

Main findings

The empirical data presented in our analysis shows how the teachers question the notion of homogenous British identity. A particularly notable finding is the extent to which Muslim teachers feel that FBV will exacerbate their students' sense of being targeted and that Prevent is having the opposite effect of what it purports to achieve. The theme of war recurs throughout the interviews, perhaps providing empirical evidence for Foucault's contention that politics is a continuation of war where the reign of peace by no means neutralizes the "disequilibrium" of war but reinscribes it through policy and the "inequalities" operating through social institutions such as schools (Foucault, 1980). Conversely, the interviews also suggested that FBV could be adjusted and re-appropriated within the policy micro-spaces of the teachers' classrooms. The data was analysed thematically using the conceptual tools of Foucault's analysis of disciplinary power in order to identify dominant themes as they emerged inductively. The main themes are presented chronologically in the sequence in which the interviews took place.

Teacher positioning and FBV: "Are you for us or against us?"

The discussions about British identity have a polarising effect on the teachers whose experiences conflict with a governmental account of FBV which stresses belonging and pride in a shared national heritage. In this sense education policy acts as one of the "modes of objectification" by which teachers and their students are transformed into the subjects of an imposed governmental truth about what it means to be British (Foucault, in Dreyfus, 1983, 208). The discourse of FBV requires that the teachers make choices, make claims about who they are, to state their loyalties, in relation to the disciplinary norm of Britishness and "take up the positions" constructed by the binary incitements of FBV (Ball 1997, 22).

The first sequence is taken from the February group interviews with student teachers. In response to the question 'what does it mean to be British?' Zahra and Shazia state that it is by being a resident Briton, 'even' if a person was born abroad.

Sadia challenges their definition,

Yes. Does that really mean that you are British? Because I would have said ...I was born British, but I don't think a random person would class me as British. They would class me as Asian.

Sadia continues to suggest that the people who wouldn't class her as British,

Have an ideology of what British is ... which would be, I think, a white person ... it's interlinked, yes, with the culture, yes.

Sadia was born in the UK and was educated in the North West. However, her subjectivity is framed by the 'white' gaze which she resists by refusing to class herself as British, to the point of ticking the Asian Indian box on forms.

Zahra responds,

I would class myself as British, just because your culture is there.

Sadia questions this definition, answering,

You would always say you're British but you'd always get asked "Oh, what country are you from?" ... It's the first thing that you get asked ... *and I'm like born here!*

Part of Sadia's response to the ontological insecurity produced by the war on terror is a reassertion of her Islamic identity, whereas Shazia and Zahra seek to distance themselves from the 'un-British other' constructed by FBV discourse. As new teachers, they have studied hard to obtain their degrees and to gain the cultural and social bridging capitals (Abbas, 2011) valorised by a society that inflicts further symbolic violence on them through the oxymoronic discourse of FBV, a discourse which they negotiate through total identification with Britishness.

Shazia states,

Not for me, I totally feel British because we were brought up, you know, very British, we had those cultural aspects, but quite British, I've been one of the only Asians in my primary school and things like that, so I do feel very British.

Shazia offers support for British values, which she also sees as synonymous with Christianity. For Shazia, British values offer a means by which communities can unite. She expresses her view that FBV can provide a point of commonality for disaffected whites as well as what she characterises as naïve young Islamists,

I think what's gone wrong with this country is that they have been so afraid to promote Britishness because of being deemed racist if they do, if they do fly their own flag or whatever, they're deemed as racist, so because people are so afraid to be British or to be proud to be British and being British has lost its meaning and now nobody knows what it actually means.

However, as the interview progressed, this identification was shown to be fragile. Shazia, Zahra and Sadia talked about their experiences of everyday racism as hyper-visible Muslim women living in towns stratified by racialised no-go areas. Shazia comments,

But I'm just so sorry, it's so sad Francis but sometimes you feel safer in your own community, don't you?

The February 2015 interviews with in-service teachers revealed greater criticality about British identity and FBV. For Ikram, Mazneen and Adam, British identity has social and political significance beyond the possession of a British passport. Their constructs of Britishness have been fashioned through their personal experiences and those of their students.

For Ikram the question of British values is almost irrelevant because it conflicts with what he perceives as universal values that transcend national interests. He is concerned that people who 'feel let down' by the 'system' will be marginalised by FBV. He argues for a multi-cultural and pluralistic construct of Britishness. Significantly, for Ikram, Britishness is synonymous with whiteness,

Because a lot of people feel marginalised that you are no longer a British citizen because of your skin colour.

Adam's initial reaction to FBV was bemusement. He describes himself as a liberal, a 'global citizen' and he is deeply proud of his city, exhibiting a postmodern fluidity,

My ethnicity is Pakistani, my religion is Islam... But I am also British and I like to think of myself as a European, so it's part of my identity but not the sole part and it doesn't define me in totality.

His own experiences growing up in a large multi-cultural northern city led him to instinctively think of Britishness in terms of skinheads or what he described as the myth of little England, 'Carry On' and all that!

Mazneen's experiences are shaped by the alienating effects of everyday racism on her and her family, particularly her mother 'for not speaking English'. Like Sadia, she has greater identification with her Indian Asian heritage than British identity. However the determining factor shaping Mazneen's identity was 9/11,

And so I felt that over the years especially during the time of September 11...I used to get the conversations in the streets about dress and why are you dressed [like that]? And what is that on your head? And you know the undertones of prejudice, and having gone through that it influenced me to become, and become sadly to become less British. I don't know if it is a sad thing but to become less British and to become more inclined towards, again the aspect of culture...And I don't particularly class myself as too British.

Adam agrees,

Maybe it goes back to George Bush's original question... 'Are you for us or against us'?

Adam identifies an explicit relationship between FBV and the war on terror. The difficulty for teachers is to detach the potentially alienating link between "British" and teaching on values because for his students, the majority of whom are the grandchildren of formerly colonised peoples, "British" has connotations of imperialism, old and new,

And that's where we have to work to detach... but is it detachable, that's the question? Has it become the new link that is hard to break as a result of wars, and subsequent wars in Palestine or Iraq?

On realisation that the definition of FBV was taken from Prevent, both teachers agreed unequivocally that the policy was a governmental strategy. Adam states,

That is not what I consider British values, that's a different, that is a political agenda.

These extracts show how FBV as a form of power, "imposes a law of truth" on the teachers (Foucault, in Dreyfus, 1983, 212). Shazia's initial avowal of FBV shows that she realises there is more to this discourse than "signs, language and speech" (Foucault, 2002, 54). She knows that rebuttal risks social and professional exclusion, and despite the daily reminders of her otherness she wants to be recognised as British and wants others to recognise this in her. However, as Foucault consistently argued, where there is power, there is resistance (Foucault, 1998, 95). Sadia's, Mazneen's and Adam's repudiation of FBV is a rejection of ideological state violence which "ignores who we are individually", it is a refusal of the politics of truth operating through an "administrative inquisition which determines who one is" (Foucault, in Dreyfus, 1983, 212).

Implementing fundamental British values: "It feels like it's aimed at one particular group"

The teachers are required to implement FBV, they are its points of articulation, but their day to day experiences in multi-cultural urban secondary schools give rise to anxieties about the effects of introducing British values to students who already feel that they are targeted by the forces of a dominant white society. The sense that FBV is a "dividing practice" (Foucault, 2009) that introduces a hierarchy of values is expressed in Ikram's observation,

They (pupils) might feel that their religious or cultural values might have to be pushed aside to make space for British values.....there are students that I've taught which are from ethnic minorities, and now they might feel intimidated if I kept on using the words 'British values', because they might feel as though what message are you trying to get across? Are we not British? Or why is it that the word 'British' has to be mentioned all the time?

Adam and Mazneen described a senior leadership meeting where the Prevent agenda was discussed, compelling Adam to state his anxieties about its potential to stigmatise staff and students. They also express deep concern about the parameters of 'individual liberty'. Adam

described a situation in a lesson that he believes was mishandled because of the impact it would have on students already feeling stigmatised,

Earlier this year we had the horrific shooting of the cartoonist in Paris, the Charlie Hebdo affair. In our school a teacher showed those cartoons to some students. And all Hell broke loose as you can imagine. Parents were outraged, and multiple phone calls and letters demanding that an investigation be carried out. But one of the fundamental British values is freedom of expression so I am stuck there. Because as an RE teacher and as a liberal myself I will not show those cartoons at [name] High School so am I then not, as an individual, meeting that freedom of expression value which is fundamental to British life?

Adam is clear to qualify his total disassociation from restriction on expression from his personal perspective, stating, “cartoonists, draw away”, but he knew the cost of that teacher’s misjudgement and the negative consequences for students and their communities. This might be read as an example of illiberal liberalism operating through the politically constructed truth regime of FBV. Adam and Mazneen were concerned that Prevent could turn teachers of RE into informants misinterpreting ordinary teenage behaviour as radicalisation. Mazneen gave an example of a scenario where their fears were being materialised. Mazneen had been asked to mentor a 16 year old girl, which she describes as ‘odd’, as it was half way through the student’s final year,

And it was directly after the news had just reported that two girls from Manchester had just travelled to Syria. And the teacher said explicitly, ‘She’s one to watch. You need to be careful because I can imagine her on TV after trying to get to Syria’. Something like that. And the conversation stopped dead because if there is an assumption that it (FBV) starts in RE and the RE teacher is supposed to embed this (FBV), well are we saying that RE can’t have that safe space but teachers around the school can say what they like about certain things and they won’t get into trouble or that won’t be touched?

This extract shows how the discourse of the war on terror is systematically constituting the “objects of which it speaks” by producing the suspect student as, ‘one to watch’ (Foucault, 2002, 54). The interviews provide further empirical evidence for Foucault’s argument that a normalizing biopolitical society governs populations through the management of threats to the population, the “menace within” (Foucault, 2003, 255) through the requirement to surveil students.

The introduction of the duty upon schools to have due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism (DfE, 2015, 5) under section 26 of the counter terrorism and security act meant schools have to be demonstrably evidencing ways in which they implement FBV. The December 2015 student teacher group interview revealed the extent to which the war on terror in education discourse was materialising in divisive practices experienced by students as a sort of sub division of the school population. Maryam described an assembly on FBV led by the Principal in which the students were presented by a video clip of the attack on the twin towers,

My school ...it's like 50% white, 50%, you know ethnic minority. Now, the Asian children they walked in and they were like right, from what we've heard about this assembly, 'this is targeted at us', so it's like, you know the way that she, when she came across in that video she was trying to address everyone but at the same time she was saying 'they', 'them', 'them Muslims', 'they did this', 'they do this, they do that'. So when you've got children who haven't got the academic ability to understand the, you know the reasons, and you know they can't understand these issues unless you explain it to them. So if they're watching that video, that's where the divisions are going to be created, they're the next generation, these divisions are created because of people like Theresa May [former Home Secretary], the younger generations are going to grow up, they're going to have hatred towards whites, towards black, towards you know, 'other' people, that's where the misunderstandings will start, that's where the judgements will start, so then it goes back to the question who has radicalised who?

Problematizing and reconfiguring FBV: "We're not British values teachers...we're RE teachers"

The student teachers interviewed in February 2015 had no experience of the implementation of FBV and these interviews pre-date the safeguarding legislation introduced in July 2015 in the revised Prevent duty. There is less explicit criticism which may be a reflection of the early stages of the policy's implementation but as the group interview progressed the teachers developed a more critical perspective leading Shazia to question the nationalist connotations of FBV,

But we're not doing *British* studies, we're doing *RE* studies so we can study religions that are prevalent in other parts of the world. That's our subject, we're not *British* values teachers are we? We're *RE* teachers.

All the teachers interviewed agreed that RE was already addressing the values that FBV purports to foreground. There was consensus that they wanted to disassociate FBV from its nationalist connotations. They know that they are working in over regulated environments so they reconfigure statutory requirements within the pluralistic terms of the critical and phenomenological discourse of RE which has shaped their professional subjectivities. The teachers are not dupes and their narratives show how they are beginning to translate, and interpret policy creatively in their practice. "Global" citizen Adam reformulates FBV in terms of universal values,

As a teacher I'd still like to think that I work towards those universal ones of decency, good manners, empathy, caring for one another and really in a way I'd love to move away from even the construct ...of Britishness... going towards just being a human.

Maryam came from the community her school serves, enabling her to build a strong relationship of trust with her pupils. She stated that they felt they were being "targeted" by the FBV discourse, but she was able to show through her pastoral practice in RE how she could mitigate its effects,

We're not going in with a biased approach...when you are in your classroom you are able to create that comfortable environment for them to understand.

She described the “backlash” after the Paris attacks and how she was able to use RE to explore the concepts of revenge and forgiveness remarking that one of her Muslim pupil's responses was to quote Gandhi,

Miss, it's like a vicious circle, an eye for an eye and the whole world will go blind.

But perhaps more significantly she was able to facilitate more nuanced classroom discussions about religion problematizing the caricature of Islam as fundamentalist,

Fundamentalism exists in every single religion, it's not just Islam, but there is a focus on Islam.

Aleeza described an incident in her RE class room which took place after the Paris attack. Her example shows how her relationship with her non-Muslim mentor had produced a counter narrative, through RE, to the polarizing incitements of FBV, where reverence for those who had died in the Paris attacks was extended to bodies that exceed the normative requirements of the war on terror discourse. As Ball, Maguire and Braun (2012) have shown teachers can act in novel and creative ways to make adjustments to policy,

In our RE class my teacher said why are we observing this minute's silence, and all of the kids were like, 'Because of the Paris attacks.' And my teacher said, 'No, for all of them who have died and suffered around the world.' She made that categorically clear because for her that is what fundamental British values was, to show that respect to every life, whether you're a police, whether you're a Palestinian, whether you're a Syrian, whether you're a Parisian, whatever you are you show that minute's silence for every life.

Discussion

Foucault stated that the task of his critical project was to “to create a history of the different modes by which in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (Foucault in Rabinow, 1991, 7). Our analysis set out to investigate how the FBV discourse is shaping the ways teachers are made its subjects. We sought to examine the extent to which the teachers were able to accommodate the requirements of FBV and to gain insights, through their views of its effects upon their students. Our findings show that the FBV discourse is inherently divisive, magnifying the exclusionary dynamics of structural racism by creating a new constitutive outside, a new way for the Muslim teacher subjects of this study to be alienated but in their professional roles. The effects of the governmentality of unease are evident throughout the data, leading us to conclude that schools are now biopolitical sites of exclusion, border zones of the war on terror giving weight to Foucault's argument that politics is the continuation of war by other means (Foucault, 1980).

These conclusions are evidenced most starkly through Maryam's account of the school assembly. The effects of the FBV assembly were to stratify students and teachers, through the exercise of disciplinary power, introducing a caesura into the school community. These disciplinary practices are experienced in terms of a binary choice between assimilation and compliance or social exclusion. As Foucault states,

“If the power of normalisation wished to exercise the old sovereign right to kill, it must become racist...when I say killing I obviously do not mean simply murder as such, but also every form of indirect murder: the fact of exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or, quite simply, political death, expulsion, rejection and so on” (Foucault, 2003, 256).

On this analysis alone it appears we are left with bleak prospects for the advancement of social justice and racial citizenship rights. However, our data also shows the teachers possess agency and the ontological and cultural resources to resist the objectifying effects of the Prevent strategy. Foucault states that whilst subjects are constituted through power relations, they are, “at the same time its vehicle” faced by a field of possibilities (Foucault, 1980, 106). The teachers we interviewed demonstrate agency through a reflexive refusal of FBV, derived in part from their own experiences of Islamophobia. There is recognition amongst the teachers that FBV is a governmental device which justifies state surveillance and instrumentality, “by provoking fear of the other, of dangerous social classes” (Morgan, in Vardalos et al, 2009, 90). It might be argued, that this manoeuvring of subjects around an incorrigible bio-political binary is a ruse of governmental power which operates the deliberate social sorting of compliant or resistant subjects. But these regulatory strategies and the governmental truths they circulate are problematized by the teachers.

The teachers are aware of the way that they and their Muslim students could be objectified by the power/knowledge strategies of Prevent. Foucault was particularly interested in the analysis of what he called the ‘multiple points’ of resistance in power relations, through attention to detail, to the micro level of the power network to show up “even when they are hidden, all the relationships of political power which actually control the social body and oppress or repress it” (Foucault, in Chomsky and Foucault, 2006, 40). Our interviews reveal the rich empirical under life of policy in the ways the teachers resist, disrupt and reappropriate policy (Ball, 1997). In Foucault's analysis of subject formation he also considers those processes of self-formation in which the person is active, what he called the technologies of the self or “*ascesis*” (Foucault, in Rabinow, 1991). Our data also shows that the teachers' subjectivities had been fashioned through their agency as RE practitioners evidenced in their recognition of the incompatibility of multi-cultural RE with civic nationalism. The critical and pluralistic underpinnings of Theology, Religious Studies and Philosophy provided the teachers with the resources to reposition and reappropriate the FBV discourse within a genuinely multi-cultural interpretive framework. Values, questions of identity and purpose are grist to the philosophical mill of an RE discourse that exceeds the narrow requirements of FBV, perhaps best expressed by Shazia,

We're not *British* values teachers...we're *RE* teachers.

As a critical study we sought to question the “violent imposition of the truth” of what governmental logics propose it means to be British in the “fog of war” (Ball, 2013, loc 1230). We have embraced Foucault’s argument that the role of the critical public intellectual is to detach “the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, cultural and economic, within which it operates at the present time” (Foucault in Rabinow, 1991, 75) by foregrounding the dilemmas experienced by teachers implementing FBV. The teachers narratives problematise FBV revealing the agonistic element to power relations where they are marking out the ethical spaces that will enable them to, “develop conversations about belonging and being British” (Elton-Chalcraft et al, 2016) with their students through the reassertion of pluralistic education as the “practice of freedom” (Foucault, in Peters, 1998, 101). To this end we conclude that further empirical work is required to investigate enactments of FBV in practice in order to contribute to critical knowledge on how teachers resist policy, make adjustments or are discursively re-coded and made integrable through this governmentality of unease, thus undertaking Foucault’s “real political task”, by unmasking power in the workings of institutions and policies that appear neutral and independent (Foucault, 2006).

References

- Abbas, T. 2011. *Islamic Radicalism and Multicultural Politics* Abingdon: Routledge
- Appleby, N. 2010. “Labelling the innocent: how government counter-terrorism advice creates labels that contribute to the problem”. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 3(3): 421-436
- Arthur, J. 2015. “Extremism and Neo-Liberal Education Policy: A Contextual Critique of the Trojan Horse Affair in Birmingham Schools”. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 63(3):311-328.
- Ball, S. 1997. *Education Reform: A Critical and Post Structural Approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Ball, S. 2013. *Foucault, Power and Education* Abingdon: Routledge [Kindle version]
- Bigo, D. 2002. “Security and Immigration: towards a critique of the governmentality of unease”. *Alternatives* 27: 63-92
- British Educational Research Association (BERA).2011. *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, British Educational Research Association* [on-line], available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf?noredirect=1> accessed 25.03.16
- Brenkman, J. 2007. *The Cultural Contradictions of Democracy: Political Thought since September 11* Princetown: Princetown University Press
- Ball, S., Maguire, M., and Braun, A. 2012. *How Schools do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Cameron, D. 2011. *PM’s speech at Munich Security Conference* [on-line] available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>

accessed 18.11.16

Chomsky, N. and Foucault, M. 2006. *The Chomsky- Foucault Debate* New York: The New Press

DfE. 2014. *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools departmental advice for maintained schools* DfE: Crown copyright

DfE. 2013. *Teachers standards guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies (introduction updated 2013)* DfE: Crown copyright

DfE. 2015. *The Prevent Duty. Departmental advice for schools and childcare providers.* DfE: Crown copyright

Dearden, L. 2015. David Cameron extremism speech [on-line] available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/david-cameron-extremism-speech-read-the-transcript-in-full-10401948.html> accessed 18.11.16

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. 2003. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dreyfus, H., and P. Rabinow.1983. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* Chicago: Chicago University Press

Elton-Chalcraft, S., Lander, V., Revell, L., Warner, D., and Whitworth, L. 2016. "To promote, or not to promote fundamental British values? Teachers' standards, diversity and teacher education". *British Educational Research Journal*, DOI:10.1002/berj.3253 published on-line November 3, 2016

Farrell, F. 2016. "Why all of a sudden do we need to teach fundamental British values? A critical investigation of student teacher positioning within a policy discourse of discipline and control". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (3): 280-297

Faubion, J. 2002. *Power: Essential Works* London: Penguin

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge* Edinburgh: Pearson Education

Foucault, M. 1991. *Discipline and Punish* London: Penguin

Foucault, M. 1998. *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality: 1.* London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended*, London: Penguin

Foucault, M. 2009. *Security, Territory, Population* Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan

Gillies, D. 2015. *Educational leadership and Michel Foucault* Abingdon: Routledge

Gilroy, P. 2005. *Postcolonial Melancholia* New York: Columbia University Press

Great Britain Parliament .2015. *Counter-Terrorism and Security Act* [on-line] available at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/6/contentsenacted accessed 25.03.16

Gutting, G. ed. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Halliday, J. 2016. Almost 4,000 people referred to UK deradicalisation scheme last year [on-line] available at <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/mar/20/almost-4000-people-were-referred-to-uk-deradicalisation-scheme-channel-last-year> accessed 18.11.16

- HM Government.2011. *Prevent Strategy* [on-line] available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97976/prevent-strategy-review.pdf accessed 18.11.16
- HM Government .2015. *Prevent Duty Guidance: for England and Wales* [on-line] available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/439598/prevent-duty-departmental-advice-v6.pdf accessed 18.11.16
- Home Office. 2001. *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team* [on-line] available at <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/14146/1/communitycohesionreport.pdf> accessed 18.11.16
- Home Office. 2017. *Individuals referred to and supported through the Prevent programme April 2015 to March 2016* [on-line] available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/662824/individuals-referred-supported-prevent-programme-apr2015-mar2016.pdf accessed 09.01.18
- Jerome, L. and Clemitshaw, C. 2012. "Teaching about Britishness? An investigation into trainee teachers' understanding of Britishness in relation to citizenship and the discourse of civic nationalism". *The Curriculum Journal* 23(1): 19-41
- Kapoor, N. 2013. "The advancement of racial neoliberalism in Britain". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(6): 1028-1046
- Keddie, A. 2014. "The politics of Britishness: multiculturalism, schooling and social cohesion". *British Educational Research Journal* 40(3): 539-544
- Kundnani, A. 2009. Spooked! How not to prevent violent extremism [on-line] available at <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/spooked-how-not-to-prevent-violent-extremism/> accessed 18.11.16
- Lander, V. 2011. "Race, culture and all that: An exploration of the perspectives of White secondary student teachers about race equity issues in their initial teacher education". *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 14(3): 351-364
- Lander, V. 2016. "Introduction to fundamental British values". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (3): 274-279
- Lynch, O. 2013. "British Muslim youth: radicalisation, terrorism and the construction of the other". *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 6(2): 241-261
- Lotringer, S., ed.1996. *Foucault Live Semiotext(e)*: Columbia
- Maylor, U. 2010. "Notions of diversity, British identities and citizenship belonging". *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 13(2): 233-252
- Maylor, U. 2016. "I'd worry about how to teach it: British values in English classrooms". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (3): 314-328
- Miller, J. 2013. "'REsilience' Violent Extremism and Religious Education". *British Journal of Religious Education* 35(2): 188-200
- Panjwani, F. 2016. "Towards an overlapping consensus: Muslim teachers' views on fundamental British values". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (3): 329-340

Qurashi, F. 2016. Prevent gives people permission to hate Muslims [on-line] available at <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/apr/04/prevent-hate-muslims-schools-terrorism-teachers-reject> accessed 12.12.16

Peters, M., ed. 1998. *Naming the Multiple*. Westport: Bergin and Garvey.

Rabinow, P., ed. 1991. *The Foucault Reader* London: Penguin

RE Council of England and Wales .2013. *A Curriculum Framework for Religious Education in England* [on-line] available from

http://resubjectreview.recouncil.org.uk/media/file/RE_Review.pdf Accessed 25.03.16

Revell, L. 2015. "Predicting religion". *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 36 (1): 54-64

Richardson, R. 2015. British values and British identity: Muddles, mixtures and ways ahead. *London Review of Education* 13 (2): 37-48

Shain, F. 2011. *The New Folk Devils: Muslim boys and education in England* London: Trentham

Smith. H. 2016. Britishness as racist nativism: a case of the unnamed 'other' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (3): 298-313

Taras, R. 2013. "'Islamophobia never stands still': race, religion and culture". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(3): 417- 433

Vardalos, M., Letts, G.K., Teixeira, A., Karzai, A., and Haig, J., eds. 2009. *Engaging Terror: A Critical and Interdisciplinary Approach* Boca Raton: Brown Walker Press