

Nurturing Resilient Future Citizens through Value Consistency vs. the Retreat from Multiculturalism and Securitisation in the Promotion of British Values in Schools in the UK.

Abstract

The controversial duty to promote British values in Schools and Further Education Colleges in England, Scotland and Wales was introduced in the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. This duty is described by some as the introduction of securitising mechanism into British Schools, for others it is a symptom of the UK Government's further retreat from Multiculturalism. In this article we present the duty as the most recent reconstructive intervention designed to remedy alleged failings in the education system to produce liberal British citizens and to counter the growth of extremism. In the article we will explore how local institutions such as schools and colleges have implemented the duty in a way that defuses some of the securitising aspects of the Statutory Duty through celebrating the UK as a multi-racial, multi-faith and multi-cultural society and through ensuring that their promotion of British values is consistent with their existing value system and ethos which includes the promotion of pupils' Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development.

Keywords

Muscular liberalism, civic education, autonomy, SMSC Development, resilience.

Introduction

This article has emerged as a response to the introduction of a duty on Schools and the Further Education (FE) institutions (sixth form colleges and independent training providers) in England and Wales, to promote British values under the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 (CT&S Act 2015). The CT&S Act 2015 received Royal Assent on the 12th February 2015, and a Commencement Order specified that 'the Prevent Duty' (which is part of the UK's Counter-Terrorism program, see below) came into force on 1 July 2015. The promotion of British values, which runs alongside other aspects of the Prevent duty, for example, risk-based responses to extremism and radicalisation (HM Government 2015), is controversial as the promotion of 'British' values has in recent years been associated with a perceived lack of: 'British values', 'Britishness', sense of belonging and loyalty to Britain associated with particular sections of British society (McGhee 2010). These concerns are often associated with what some refer to as the retreat from multiculturalism (Joppke 2014) and the necessity for the state to champion British over other values and of promoting civic

integration over the respect for different cultures and traditions. In this article we will examine how this alleged retreat from multiculturalism has been expressed by recent Governments in the UK in terms of a change from the 'live and let live' of liberalism associated most recently with state-level multiculturalism to a more 'muscular liberalism'. Furthermore we will examine how this muscularity was to be instituted (in the education sector in particular) and as a consequence, how British values have in turn become politicised as evidenced in the definition of extremism that underpins the CT&S Act 2015, namely: "the vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values". Politicians pronouncements on British values have incrementally intensified after the 9/11 attacks in the USA in 2001, the 7/7 bombings in London in 2005, the murder of Fusilier Lee Rigby on a London street in 2013, the attacks on Westminster Bridge and House of Parliament in March 2017, the bombing at Manchester Arena in May 2017 and the atrocities on London Bridge and Borough Market in London in June 2017. In summary, the political rhetoric on British values is usually related to concerns about the extremist potential of particular sections of British society, mostly Muslims (but also Far Right and White Supremacist groups) and involves the further distancing by the Government from what they articulate as 'Multiculturalism'. Subsequent extremist and terrorist threats and events have reinforced this concern and strengthened the resolve of subsequent governments to seek solutions to counter the spread of extremism in the UK, which is usually expressed as a desire to inculcate British values, especially in young people. However, in the article we will challenge the retreat from multiculturalism discourse, by suggesting that at the local, neighbourhood and organisational level (in this case, in schools and colleges in the UK) we are seeing the co-option and diffusion of much of the muscularity and securitised aspects of the duty to promote British values through what we refer to here as the local achievement of value consistency. That is, where the schools and colleges absorb the duty to promote British values into their existing structures and ethos which combine both elements of the multicultural respect for diversity with the promotion of a value system consistent with their mission of producing well-rounded, and resilient liberal citizens.

As noted above, the inclusion of the duty to promote British Values in the FE and School Sectors is a component of the government's Prevent programmes which is itself part of the government's overall Contest counter-terrorist strategy which comprises of four components: pursue, protect, prepare and prevent (McGhee 2010). The focus of Prevent I was building resilience and internal surveillance within 'vulnerable communities', whereas

Prevent II's focus was much more on identifying and supporting 'vulnerable individuals' in interaction with the parallel Channel Programme (HM Government 2014). The Statutory Duty to promote British Values in Schools can be attributed to the high-profile Trojan Horse 'scandal' that emerged in a number of Schools in Birmingham in 2014, in which high profile investigations exposed the infiltration of anti-British (and some would say, extremist) values in staff and also amongst school governors in Schools and FE Colleges in Birmingham. This has prompted the Government to intervene and to try to ensure that this cannot happen again in British Schools. However, the ambition to explicitly promote British values in the Schools and especially in the FE sector has been around as far back as 2008 when the then Labour Government lead by Prime Minister Gordon Brown introduced their report in 2008 (Jerome and Clemitshaw 2012).

In the Prevent Duty Guidance consultation document introduced by the government in December 2014, fundamental British values were defined thus: "democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance for those with different faiths and beliefs" in addition "we expect institutions to encourage students to respect each other with particular regard to the protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010" (HM Government 2014). The Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales (there is separate guidance for Scotland which also includes Sectarianism) is very detailed in terms of a risk-based response to extremism and radicalisation associated with Prevent II (HM Government 2015), but less detailed with regards to the duty to promote British values in Schools and FE Colleges.

The contribution that this article makes is to examine the duty to promote British values as the Government's attempt to introduce a practical example of what has become known as Muscular Liberalism into the education system. Muscular Liberalism, which was first introduced by former UK Prime Minister David Cameron in his Speech on security in Munich (Cameron 2011), is an example of what Lockyer refers to as a reconstructive citizenship intervention, that is, an intervention designed not just to reproduce a political order, but rather an intervention introduced to remedy a perceived significant failure in the political system. The particular failure that the duty has been introduced to remedy is the alleged failure of Education systems in England and Wales to produce liberal British Citizens.

The common challenge that recent UK Prime Ministers Blair, Brown, Cameron and May have all faced is how to strike the appropriate balance between celebrating the fact of the UK's social and cultural diversity whilst attempting to promote a unifying meta-identity (Britishness) replete with a set of core, common or shared 'British' values (McGhee 2010). Whereas for Blair and Brown, the main focus of their concern was that certain 'communities' in the UK were self-segregating and living 'parallel lives' (a term made famous by Ted Cantle, 2008). Cameron and his then Home Secretary Theresa May, were mostly concerned with Muslim separateness and the security governance of Muslims as potentially dangerous populations (May 2014, 2015). May and Cameron took things a few steps further than Blair and Brown by attempting to put flesh on the bones of this potential desire through introducing the Duty to promote British values in 2015. Prior to this a number of documents were released that have led to the tightening of regulations this has been described by Lander as 'the proliferation of securitized requirements for schools' (2016: 275). Lander also includes under what she describes as 'securitized requirements' the requirements to promote 'fundamental British values' in non-statutory advice which is for the purpose of promoting pupils' social, moral, spiritual and cultural development (Lander 2016: 275). Under this Lander also includes the requirements on Head Teachers and Governors to actively promote fundamental British values and to safeguard children and young people from radicalisation and extremism within the statutory framework for inspections (Lander 2016: 275, Ofsted 2015). David Cameron has perhaps been the most explicit of recent British Prime Ministers in terms of a reconstructive citizenship discourse in which he diagnosed 'the problem' and proclaimed 'the solution' to what he saw as the problem of multiculturalism. Joppke's examination of Cameron's stance is illuminating:

David Cameron's 'Muscular Liberalism' is driven by the instinct that it is not enough to agree to liberal democratic norms only instrumentally or from within one's religion or 'comprehensive doctrine'. Instead, the claim is that these norms be accepted for their own sake, outside and apart from one's doctrinal or primordial preferences. (Joppke 2014: 293).

What David Cameron 'dreaded', and considered 'insufficient'; according to Joppke, was the liberal-cum-multicultural recipe of a passively tolerant society where it was enough for citizens to obey the law and otherwise be 'left alone' (2014: 289). According to Cameron:

...we need a lot less of the passive tolerance of recent years and a much more active, Muscular Liberalism. A passively tolerant society says to its citizens, as long as you obey the law we will just leave you alone. It stands neutral between different values. But I believe a genuinely liberal country does much more; it believes in certain values and actively promotes them...

(Cameron 2011: 4).

In this article we will (a) contextualise the duty in the recent UK Politician initiated discourse of a variety of liberalism (which has come to be referred to as Muscular Liberalism) within relevant political theory literatures that examine the liberal challenges of promoting unity in a context of social and cultural diversity, in particular through the development of intellectual and personal qualities. We will also (b) examine the extent to which, following Department for Education advice, a number of schools and colleges have incorporated the duty to promote British values into their pre-existing Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural (SMSC) development provisions and 'expected behaviour' policies. As a consequence, of this incorporation process, we argue, that these schools and colleges have diffused some of the controversial 'securitising' elements of the duty through the process of ensuring value consistency across both the government defined British values and the values and behaviours expected of the staff and students at their school. These values and behaviours are in turn associated with their ambitions to develop particular personal qualities amongst their student body including, tolerance, understanding, empathy and, we argue, resilience in an ever changing Britain. Our argument is that whereas the intentions of David Cameron and his then Home Secretary Theresa May, was to introduce an explicit counter-extremism mechanism into the UK Education System; the Department for Education, in their guidance for Schools and FE Colleges, provided the possibility for schools and colleges to absorb and seamlessly incorporate this duty into their existing frameworks.

Contextualizing reconstructive citizenship interventions in the UK

Parry (2003) identifies two broad approaches amongst classic texts on the role education is intended to play either in 'reproducing' citizens to maintain a political form; or in 'remedying' failing political systems by 'reconstructing' citizens to improve social and political structures. According to Lockyer (2003) recent attempts in the UK, including the

Crick Report (the advisory group chaired by Bernard Crick on Education for Citizenship and Democracy in Schools, 1998, which culminated in the English Citizenship Order, 2002) are in the reconstructive idiom. The duty to promote British values in the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015, is the latest example of this type of ‘citizenship’ reconstruction initiative through education. The Crick Report and the resulting Citizenship Order, had an emphasis on promoting active and critically reflexive citizens as well as the promotion of some of the liberal or procedural values common to the Duty to promote British values (Jerome and Clemitchaw 20102). The scale of the duty to promote British values is greater, as it encompasses not just England, but also Wales and Scotland, and includes The FE sector as well as schools.

Nevertheless, both the Citizenship Order (2002) that was adopted in English Schools following the Crick Report and the duty to promote British Values (2015) under consideration here have one common objective, namely, to promote the adherence to liberal procedural values (McLaughlin 2003). That is, both of these interventions that target the UK education sector have been introduced with the intention of promoting what Davies (2003) refers to as procedural concepts which are supposed to enable students to think and act as liberal citizens. In the Crick Report (which led to the introduction of the Citizenship Order in English Schools the intention was to promote the classic liberal values of: tolerance, understanding and empathy (Crick 2003: 26). The duty to promote British values, under investigation here, is less ambitious (in terms of liberal aspirations) than the Crick Report, and the associated Citizenship Order which set out to ‘teach democracy’ in Schools and to restore a degree of ‘common citizenship’ through promoting ‘a sense of belonging – of identity – with the community around them’ (Crick Report, 1998: paragraph 11.1). In contrast, the Duty to Promote British Values, as a component of the UK’s wider Counter-terrorism strategy (known as the Prevent strategy), has the more specific intention of targeting extremist values that the government believe are potentially disrupting some British young peoples’ adherence to expected liberal and procedural values. In a way, the Duty to promote British values has both communal substantive values (such as intolerance for particular lifestyles and practices that are thought to exist in parts of some communities) and extremist values as its targets. Thus, at its core, the Duty to promote British values has the primary objective of promoting what Crick refers to as ‘the fairly obvious procedural values’ in order to foster agreement about ‘substantive values’ (2003: 25) which is at the heart of the liberal project and the promotion of liberal values in advanced democratic democracies.

The Citizenship Order and the Duty to promote British values have also a number of challenges in common. Both the Order and the Duty, can be described as ‘light touch’ interventions in terms of the Government avoiding being too prescriptive and detailed with regard to guidelines and curriculum, as according to Crick, ‘it would be inappropriate for the government to give precise prescriptions on some politically or morally sensitive matters’ (2003: 19). However, according to Crick, the other reason for the so-called ‘light-touch’, is to allow for ‘local discretion’ (2003: 20). Thus, in the case of the Citizenship Duty, although the goals and broad topics to be covered in the curriculum are indicated in the Crick Report, the local discretion amounts to the government not stipulating ‘the events or problems that might be used by teachers as illustrations’ (Parry 2003: 40).

The common challenge shared by both the Citizenship Order and the Duty to promote British values is the tension between what recent British Prime Ministers view as the passive tolerance associated with the multicultural celebration of diversity and - the increasingly ‘muscular’ insistence that particularly ‘British’ values be privileged. Thus, it is the task of these education interventions (the Citizenship Order and the Duty to promote British values) to ‘strike a balance between accepting social and cultural diversity, which permits value pluralism, and privileging some values and practices of liberal democracy, which endorses some sense of common identity’ (Lockyer 2003: 8). As noted above the Duty to promote British Values, is rather more explicit in this regard than the Citizenship Order in that the Duty has emerged directly from recent governments’ concerns about what they perceive as the extremist values that, are said to, exist in particular aspects of some communities in the UK. Furthermore, the promotion of liberal multicultural values in local communities and institutions (such as schools and FE colleges) has come into tension with the Muscular Liberal backlash at state level (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2009). This tension is most commonly experienced in terms of the institutions and organisations who ‘service’ local communities (such as schools) being more focused on the everyday task of promoting respect of difference, community cohesion and social harmony in the context of increasing social diversity – and some state-level institutions and Heads of State (including Prime Ministers and Home Secretaries) who advocate a ‘tough’ or ‘muscular’ approach in their rhetoric associated with assimilationist integration discourses (McGhee 2010). The consequence of this is that in the UK and across many other European countries, ‘local policy’ remains multicultural while ‘national policy’ has shifted to more centrist ‘citizenship approaches’ (Joppke 2014: 286-7). In this article we will examine how the Department for Education (a

Government Department) has helped to resolve the tensions between the ‘muscular’ dictates of other aspects of the UK Government (in particular, the Prime Minister’s Office and the Home Office) and thus enable local service providers (e.g. Schools and Colleges) to satisfy this duty in a way that is consistent with their ethos that combine both the respect for diversity and the expectations on student and staff behaviours in the context of an multicultural advanced liberal democracy.

in their state-level retreat from multiculturalism. Before examining how Schools and Colleges have followed Department for Education guidance that has enable them to sensitively incorporate the duty to promote British values into their existing structures and processes that also promote respect for social diversity; in the next section we will present a critically review and evaluate of a selection of what we consider to be the most relevant academic literatures that have examined, and in some cases prescribed, how educational institutions such as schools and colleges might attempt to facilitate liberal critical thinking and autonomy in young people regardless of their parentage, faith and ‘communities of origin’.

Intellectual skills for the promotion of progressive attitudes

There is a great deal of literatures, especially from North America that attempts to clarify the role of schools in promoting the future citizens suitable for advanced liberal democracies. In much of this literature, the school and the ‘civic education’ programmes that they deliver are seen as a key interface between private or communal beliefs and practices and the forging of the intellectual skills that will allow young people to objectively determine their own beliefs and ideas. There are a number of shared concerns between some of the political theorists who will be examined here and the multicultural retreatism associated with recent UK Governments. Both are concerned that the school should be an institution where young people should be given the opportunity to learn the skills to think for themselves, to enable them to eventually become autonomous and independent adults free to make their own decisions within expected liberal parameters.

According to Stephen Macedo, civic virtues are associated with the insistence that children learn that the freedom to choose is the birth right of every citizen of a liberal political community; that they are rights holders, and that as adults they may leave oppressive associations and relationships without losing their status as equal citizens (Macedo 2000:

238). For Macedo, young people must, at the very least, be provided with the intellectual tools necessary to understand the world around them, formulate their own convictions, and make their own way in life (2000: 238); and furthermore, ‘the commitment to critical thinking is inseparable from the core civic capacities of good liberal citizens’ (2000: 239).

In Macedo, as in the UK Government’s Muscular Liberal ambitions, there is an assumption that the primary socialization institutions of the family and the community are sometimes insufficient in producing ‘the right kind’ future citizens. That is, that these institutions are insufficient, or should not be trusted with this task. This responsibility, it seems, is to fall to the institutions of secondary socialisation, including Schools. In Macedo we also find the common desire to encourage a critical distancing from the ‘private’ beliefs, convictions and traditions found in families and ‘communities’ in order to facilitate a process whereby young people can ‘think like citizens’ through secondary socialization in the form of civic education. Macedo elaborates on the necessity of civic education for the purpose of breaking young people out of what he calls ‘mental straitjackets’ (Macedo 2000: 240) in order to allow them to think like citizens and be civically orientated.

Macedo’s suggestions are similar to Amy Gutmann’s recommendations for promoting ‘liberal character’ through ‘...equipping children with the intellectual skills necessary to evaluate ways of life different from that of their parents’ (Gutmann 1987: 39). For Gutmann the same principle that requires a state to grant adults personal and political freedom also commits it to assuring children an education that makes those freedoms both possible and meaningful in the future. According to Gutmann, a state makes choice possible by teaching its future citizens respect for opposing points of view and ways of life (1987: 39). In a similar vein, for Macedo, ‘Liberal persons are distinguished by the possession of self-governing reflective capacities (1991: 269) and developing these reflective capacities leads one toward the ideal of autonomy and that ideal is the source of other liberal virtues’ (ibid.).

For Macedo: ‘autonomy is not a matter of discovering a deep, fixed core of individuality within the self, it is an actively critical and reflective way of comporting oneself within the complex matrix of a pluralistic culture, and of making its resources one’s own’ (Macedo 1991: 270). Following Oakeshott, Macedo suggests that familiarity with the traditions and practices of one’s society (an understanding of one’s social inheritance) is not a constraint upon but really a condition of meaningful development and the exercise of individuality (Macedo 1991: 270). This is akin to promoting what British-based Social Theorist Nira Yuval-Davis (1994) describes as ‘transversal’ or ‘dialogic politics’ which McGhee describes as ‘a process involving ‘rooting’ and ‘shifting’ in which participants

remain 'rooted' in their cultures, traditions, identities and values, as long as they are cooled down, and as long as they demonstrate their willingness to have their views shifted and challenged through dialogue with those who have different cultures, traditions, identities and values' (McGhee 2005: 172).

Thus, the ultimate aim of Macedo, Guttman and also Yuval-Davis's suggestions is to facilitate '... less rooting and more shifting so that the hold of thick solidarities can be decreased...' (McGhee 2005: 172). In a sense all of the above can be distilled down to a distrust in the primary institutions of socialization which might be insufficient for the purpose of 'reproducing' the type of skills, dispositions and character deemed necessary for future citizenry in multi-faith and multi-cultural societies. What Macedo, Gutmann, Yuval-Davis (and the UK Government) have in common is that people, especially young people, should not be 'left alone' (a concern also shared by David Cameron) to hopefully become the type of citizens required of liberal democracies. Future citizens, it seems, cannot just be 'left alone', they have to be made, nurtured and encouraged to develop the intellectual skills that will promote objectivity and autonomy.

Kymlicka, adds to this when he suggests that the virtues of civility and public reason that (as we shall see below) are being promoted through the SMSC programmes in schools, are the cornerstones of the secular conception of liberal-democratic citizenship. In a sense, the co-option of the duty to promote British values into the SMSC programmes in British Schools is a means of facilitating the interface between personal (or private) values and public values associated with advanced democratic democracies. Kymlicka explains the processes whereby children are confronted with and reconcile their private values with public values, we argue that this type of process is precisely what SMSC in UK schools are also attempting to do:

because reasonable people disagree about the merits of different religions and conceptions of the good life, children must learn to distinguish reasons based on private faith from reasons that can be publicly accepted in a diverse society. To develop this capacity, children must not only learn to distinguish reasons based on private faith from reasons that can be publicly accepted in a diverse society. To develop this capacity, children must not only learn how to distance themselves from beliefs that are taken for granted in their private life, but they must learn to put

themselves in other people's shoes, in order to see what sorts of reasons might be acceptable to people from other backgrounds.

(Kymlicka 2003: 51)

For Kymlicka, empathy can also lead to reflexivity and ultimately to transcendence:

that children be exposed to competing ways of life, and be encouraged to view them as the expressions of coherent conceptions of value that have been sincerely affirmed by other reasonable people. Learning to view other ways of life in this way does not inevitably lead to the questioning of one's own way of life, but it surely makes it more likely, since it requires a sort of broad-mindedness that is difficult to combine with an unreflective deference to traditional practices or authorities.'

(Kymlicka 2003: 51-52).

Kymlicka's formulation seems to be associated with a longer term aim: the performance of public reasonableness 'in public' will eventually (or is likely) to infiltrate all aspects of the person, including their private beliefs, in time. This will eventually lead to a more coherent, consistent and reconciled 'liberalised and reflexive' rather than 'orthodox and deferential' attachment to comprehensive doctrines. This appears to be part of what the featured Schools and Colleges (below) are attempting to achieve through SMSC. Namely, a student body that is broad-minded, and has broad sympathies in the hope that these young people will take these qualities, skills and dispositions into adulthood.

So, how are Schools and Colleges responding to these challenges? We decided to explore this through an examination of the readily available statements of a number of schools in England on how they were responding to the duty to promote British values. We decided to explore this through examining the readily available information presented by schools and FE colleges on their websites. In our investigations of school and FE college websites we noticed the strong influence of the Department for Education's (DfE) 2014 advice for both Maintained and also Independent schools, entitled 'Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools' in the statements produced by the schools and colleges featured in this section. The DfE's 'departmental advice' relates 'specifically to the requirements to actively promote British values in Schools and explain how this can be met through the general requirements in the 2002 Act.' (DfE 2014: 3). What is being referred to here is

section 78 of the Education Act (2002) which requires schools, as part of a broad and balanced curriculum, to promote the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school (DfE 2014: 3). Thus, following the DfE lead, what we noticed is that Schools are being encouraged, not to treat Prevent and the promotion of British values as a standalone duty; but rather to fold the duty into the wider SMSC developmental provisions of the school.

In terms of ‘faith schools’ (that is, a school intended for students of a particular religious faith) Catholic Schools and indeed the Catholic Education Service were very explicit in their celebration of both Catholic Values and British Values (Catholic Education Service 2015). Other Faith Schools, including Muslim Faith Schools were rather less visible in our initial web-based searches (that is not to say that they do not exist) just much less visible. What we did find in our initial web searches is a significant amount of concern about ‘unregulated educational settings’ and reports on how these institutions were undermining fundamental British values.

How are Schools interpreting the general advice produced by the DfE? The first example we will examine is All Hallows Catholic College, Macclesfield, Cheshire (see ‘British Values and our Catholic ethos statement’, <http://www.allhallows.org.uk/about-us/catholic-education/british-values-and-our-catholic-ethos/>). Like many other Catholic Schools and Colleges, All Hallows take the Catholic Education Service approach, when they state that ‘the promotion of British values is central to Catholic education because British Values have their own origin in the Christian values of our nation.’ Furthermore, following DfE advice, they have absorbed the duty to promote British values into their SMSC development provisions:

At All Hallows we recognise not only the importance of helping students to flourish academically but also spiritually, morally, socially and culturally, so they are fully prepared for life in British society and for their role as citizens, able to make the strongest possible contribution to the Common Good of all. We teach the importance of British values by going much deeper into the meaning of what it means to live a good life, within a framework of Catholic Christian values. This provides the context and the meaning for understanding *why* British *values* are important. (Emphasis in the original).

What this example reveals is the co-option of the duty to promote British values into not only the School's ethos, but also within Catholic values as a whole. Thus, of particular significance to the approach adopted in All Hallows is both, the development of the key intellectual skills necessary for the fulfilment of good school citizenship and eventual adult citizenship, but also, the relevance of providing a 'safe space' for debate and disagreement in order to hone pupils' democratic and social justice perspectives. For example,

In line with our commitment to democracy, students are always able to voice their opinions as we foster an environment where students can debate ideas and are safe to disagree with each other. We encourage students to substantiate opinions and to realise the value of co-operation and consensus....

For other Schools, such as The King's School in Lincolnshire, which is a boys' school, (see the 'SMSC and British Values Policy' <http://www.kings.lincs.sch.uk/attachments/download.asp?file=2430&type=pdf>), the development of autonomy and responsibility are key, for example:

The intention at King's is that boys, as they develop a sense of morality, will develop and acquire value systems that are their own, together with an understanding that their behaviour and actions will significantly impact on those around them and encourage them to understand how they can make a worthwhile contribution within their local community and further afield.

This is to be achieved through what Kings describes as 'maintaining an ethos which is characterised by mutual respect and tolerance throughout our school community...and providing a clear framework of values and behaviours which is promoted consistently throughout all aspects of school life'. What we can see from this example is that the duty to promote British values is being absorbed and also conflated as 'the Schools values' in the context of SMSC development. Thus, the duty to promote British values is being embedded into the ethos of the school and this includes practical intellectual skills development such as 'encouraging conflict-resolution based on co-operation, discussion and agreed responses...[for] addressing moral and ethical issues, through formal debate, assemblies and the PSHE programme.' Kings also encourages horizontal tolerance through 'ensuring the

practice of respectful listening to others and encouraging individuals to contribute with confidence'. We were particularly struck by Kingsstatement on the causes of radicalisation:

Citizens who feel respected, connected and valued within a community are far less likely to be at risk of radicalisation. When a student feels marginalised or under-valued there is a greater opportunity for extremism to be fostered.

At Brackenbury Primary School, Hammersmith, London (see SMSC & British Values at Brackenbury, <http://www.brackenbury.lbhf.sch.uk/php/smsc-british-values.php>), their ethos is one which develops the individuality of each child to ensure that 'they are comfortable with who they are and that they respect others; they are able to contribute to the life of the school and the wider community; and they make a positive contribution to society and are prepared for life in modern Britain.' In Brackenbury's provisions for moral, social and cultural development the emphasis is on the development of future citizens in supra diverse contexts, for example

Moral Development: is the building of a framework of moral values which control our personal development. There is a recognition within this area of development that in a multi-racial, multicultural and multi-faith democracy such as Britain there will always be debate about moral values and these will differ from person to person.

Social Development: is concerned with each child's ability to develop the skills, understanding and personal qualities necessary for living and functioning effectively in our multi-racial, multicultural and multi-faith society and to be able to contribute to that society. **Cultural Development:** is about helping children to understand their own cultural heritage alongside the cultural traditions of the school, the local community, those of the wider British community and the wider world. They will explore these cultures in order that they are able to understand, accept, respect and celebrate the differences and similarities they discover.

From this we can see that Brackenbury's interpretation of the duty to promote British values and SMSC development expectations is very much a focus on equipping their pupils to develop the 'personal qualities' of understanding, respecting, accepting and celebrating both differences and commonalities in multi-racial, multicultural and multi-faith Britain. In many ways, their ethos, and that of the other schools we have albeit rather superficially examined

here, is one of building character in terms of the personal qualities that encourage good citizenship in the school which these schools and colleges view as a microcosm of and preparation for citizenship of an ever changing Britain. Their SMSC approach to developing future citizens is certainly not examples of promoting ‘passive tolerance’ and ‘anything goes’ Multiculturalism – rather, theirs are examples of facilitating a variety of relevant, contextualised and resilient citizenship suitable for living in our multi-racial, multi-faith and multi-cultural society. That is, these schools are developing the attributes and intellectual skills and the respect for difference and diversity in their communities. They are not retreating from multiculturalism, they are embracing it and at the same time ensuring that they satisfy the duty to promote British values in the context of their much broader promotion of SMSC.

Conclusion

Schools and colleges, as well as the Department for Education, have responded to the statutory duty in creative ways to ensure that the prevent duty is embedded into their usual business. What we have observed is the enfolding of the duty to promote British Values into the SMSC development provisions of schools and colleges. What this ensures is that the Prevent duty is not being experienced as a controversial top-down ‘imposed’ duty. Rather it is being embedded into other general requirements (including the promotion of SMSC in the Education Act of 2002). By so doing schools and colleges are attempting to promote value consistency to their staff, pupils and parents, and to ensure that the duty is being put to ‘good use’, namely the development of the qualities of good citizenship in the school, with the hope that these qualities will outlive their school years as the young person becomes an adult member of society.

The achievement of value consistency is an incredibly important aspect of this process. For example, Parekh refers to the precariousness of the sense of loyalty and attachment to the political community which is a personal response ‘based on such highly elusive factors as how she feels towards her community, her own or her group’s historical memories of it, the congruence between its values and her own, and the depth of her socialization’ (Parekh 1999: 459). Thus, for Parekh, citizenship attachments and loyalties, can be situational and Social. Furthermore, they can be both reinforced and also undermined by the impact of prejudice,

discrimination and othering. As such, context is important, as are the presumed patterns and behaviours of others (McTernan 2014: 98). Thus, if policy is perceived as being discriminatory or overtly targeted at specific communities; or if groups of citizens feel that they are consistently being scapegoated, stereotyped and treated as if they were a homogeneously 'suspect' community; then they might be prone to questioning the consistency of some of the values (for example, equality of treatment and opportunity, non-discrimination and toleration) held by the political community and the political elite (not to mention, the school). For the social norms that guide behaviours (including 'political' behaviours) to be effective, according to McTernan, they must be situationally and interactionally reinforced through the presumed behaviour of others (2014: 98). That is, social norms are effective when they are consistent and embedded within society (ibid). We would like to add, that in the three feature schools and colleges included above, the reinforcement of values in the behaviour of staff was explicitly expressed in their 'SMSC+British Values' statements.

This in turn maps onto the wider issues of patriotism, belonging and attachment to political communities. As well as the necessity of 'value consistency' and sensitivity to what might reinforce or undermine fragile or precarious attachments and loyalties, Parekh also calls for greater flexibility and openness in terms of the recognition the various form that patriotism takes across different groups in society. Parekh reminds us that 'patriotism takes different forms and has different bases' (Parekh 1999: 259) and that the 'political community evokes and receives different kinds of moral and emotional allegiance from different groups of citizens' (ibid). What challenges does this introduce?

Societies must ensure that newcomers, established 'minority' and other groups (including White British 'communities' with Far Right dispositions) are subtly pulled towards rather than repelled by the imposition of the seemingly compulsory values and the institutions of the liberal democratic polity. This is in direct confrontation with one of the recommendation included the Casey Review, namely: 'the government should look at what is required for British Citizenship, as opposed to leave to remain, and separately consider an Oath of Integration with British Values and Society on arrival, rather than awaiting a final citizenship test' (Casey 2016: 168). When it comes to the policy intervention in question, we argue that there are many more potential societal gains to be achieved as a consequence of a subtle and sensitive approach to encouraging an appreciation of British values, including the promotion of British values in British schools and colleges. If these programmes are thoughtfully and sensitively implemented they can create a safe space for young people to work out the

connections among their political and extra-political convictions and values (Macedo 2000: 215) and also to develop their generic intercultural competences (UNESCO 2016). Macedo's conviction is that:

Promoting core liberal virtues – such as the importance of a critical attitude toward contending political claims-will probably have the effect of encouraging critical thinking in general. Liberal civic virtues and attitudes will spill over into other spheres of life.

(Macedo 2000: 179)

This is, without doubt, the explicit ambitions associated with the SMSC + British values policies of the schools and colleges we included above. The problem is that if these sorts of programmes which are dedicated to the fostering of intellectual skills and 'key competences', are perceived as being too forceful and too 'muscular' (as in the particular recommendation included in the Casey review, mentioned above) they could further entrench communal defensiveness and a sense of targeted discrimination and suspicion. Perhaps all we can hope for is that many more schools and colleges are following the lead of the schools and colleges featured above. Through interpreting the duty in particular ways, and embedding it within their existing SMSC development programmes, these schools and colleges have managed to translated a top-down controversial remedial citizenship intervention which has been imposed on schools and FE Colleges into their institutional contexts where respecting diversity and difference amongst pupils, parents and staff is essential to their operational effectiveness. What we argue here is that, through their 'local discretion', schools and colleges have been able to filter out some of the muscularity of the imposed duty to produce what could be subtly effective and challenging interventions that attempt to encourage young people, regardless of their 'background', to begin their journey towards a more reflexive, open-minded and tolerant variety of citizenship conducive to their own way (following Parekh) of being British.

References

Archard, D. (2003) Citizenship Education and Multiculturalism, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 89-102.

- Advisory Group on Citizenship ('Crick Report') (1989) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*, qualifications and Curriculum Authority, London.
- Beck, U. (2002) The cosmopolitan society and its enemies, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19:1, 17-44.
- Cameron, D. (2011) Prime Minister's Speech at Munich Security Conference, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>
- Cantle, T. (2008) *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Casey, L. (2016) *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration*, Department for Communities and Local Government, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration>
- Catholic Education Service (2015) *Catholic Values and 'British Values': Practical Advice from the Catholic Education Service*, <http://www.catholiceducation.org.uk/guidance-for-schools/british-values>
- Davies, I. (2003) Developing Education for Citizenship, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 161-174.
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*: Sage: London.
- DfE (2014) Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in Schools, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/380595/SMSC_Guidance_Maintained_Schools.pdf
- Farrell, F. (2016) 'Why all of a sudden do we need to teach fundamental British values?', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42.3, 280-297.
- Forst, R. (2007) A Critical Theory of Multicultural Toleration, in A. S. Laden & D. Owen (Eds) *Multiculturalism and Political Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 292-312.
- Galston, W. (1991) *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Gilroy, P. (2004) *After Empire: Melancholia or convivial culture*, London: Routledge.
- Gutmann, A. (1987) *Democratic Education*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Haydon, G. (2003) Aims in Citizenship Education: Responsibility, Identity, Inclusion, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 78-88.

- Jerome, L. & 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.
- Joppke, C. (2014) The retreat is real – but what is the alternative? Multiculturalism, Muscular Liberalism, and Islam, *Constellations*, 21.2, 286-295.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003) Two Dilemmas of Citizenship Education in Pluralist Societies, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 47-63.
- Lockyer, A. (2003) Introduction & Review, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 1-14.
- Lander, V. (2016) Introduction to fundamental British values, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42.3, 274-279.
- Macedo, S. (1991) *Liberal Virtues: Citizenship, Virtue and Community in Liberal Constitutionalism*, Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Macedo, S. (2000) *Diversity and Distrust: Civic education in a multicultural democracy*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- May, T. (2014) Home Secretary Theresa May on counter-terrorism, 24 November, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/home-secretary-theresa-may-on-counter-terrorism>.
- May, T. (2015) Home Secretary: we must work together to defeat terrorism, 18 June, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/home-secretary-we-must-work-together-to-defeat-terrorism>.
- McLaughlin, T. (2003) Teaching Controversial Issues in Citizenship Education, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 149-160.
- McGhee, D. (2005) *Intolerant Britain? Hate, Citizenship & Difference*, Open University Press: Buckinghamshire.
- McGhee, D. (2010) *Security, Citizenship and Human Rights: Shared values in uncertain times*, Palgrave: Basingstoke.
- McTernan, E. (2014) How to make citizens behave: Social Psychology, Liberal Virtues and Social Norms, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 22.1, 84-104.
- Parekh, B. (1999) Common Citizenship in a Multicultural Society, *The Round Table*, 351, 449-460.

Ofsted (2015) School Inspection Handbook (online)

<https://www.government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-from-september-2015>

Parekh, B. (2000) *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, London: Profile Books.

Parekh, B. (2013) Religious intolerance in a comparative perspective, J.

Parry, G. (2003) Citizenship Education: Reproductive & Remedial, in A. Lockyer, B. Crick & J. Annette (Eds) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory & Practice*, Ashgate: Aldershot, 30-46.

Queen's Speech (2016) State Opening of Parliament, 18 May,

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/lords/2016-05-18/debates/16051852000171/QueenSSpeech>

Sian, K. (2015) Spies, Surveillance and Stakeouts: Monitoring Muslim Moves in British State Schools, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 18.2, 183-201.

UNESCO (2016) The Teacher's Guide on the Prevention of Violent Extremism,

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002446/244676e.pdf>

Vertovec, S. & Wessendorf, S. (2009) Assessing the Backlash against Multiculturalism in Europe, Max Planck Institute, Working Paper, 09-04,

http://www.mmg.mpg.de/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/wp/WP_09-04_Vertovec-Wessendorf_backlash.pdf

Yuval-Davis, N. (1994) Women, Ethnicity and empowerment, *Feminism and Psychology*, 4.1, 179-197.