INSTITUTE for
STRATEGIC DIALOGUE

Impact of Counter-Terrorism on Communities: Methodology Report

BASIA SPALEK, ZUBEDA LIMBADA, LAURA ZAHRA MCDONALD, DAN SILK AND RAQUEL DA SILVA

Executive summary

This paper has been commissioned out of a desire to systematically examine and compare impacts of counter-terrorism policies in Europe. Currently, few independent impact assessments exist, with a virtual absence of any comparative research. This paper comprises a draft methodology paper that considers some of the issues when thinking about developing a research proposal that explores the impacts of current counter-terrorism policing and policies, with a particular focus on the impact on racial, ethnic and/or religious minorities. Some of the key findings of this paper are detailed below.

The strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to exploring or examining any counter-terrorism impacts include:

- From the perspective of states and their institutions, impacts of counter-terrorism are often viewed in relation to the prevention of violence on the state itself and public safety.
- State-instigated counter-terrorism impact assessments and analyses often differentiate between the needs of the majority, and the impact on the minority communities of Muslims, creating an inherent utilitarian value system in which 'positive impact' on the general public in terms of assumed higher levels of safety is valued over the 'negative impact' on minority communities.

The challenges and issues that arise in the context of research on terrorism and counter-terrorism policing and polices include:

- The importance of definitions around terrorism. Terrorism can be viewed as a concept that shapes public perspectives and counter-terrorism practices, which may include the possibility of state terrorism and gives relevance to contextual aspects.
- There is a lack of primary data on terrorism and counter-terrorism.

The challenges and issues that arise in the context of comparative/multi-country studies include:

- Researchers must be aware of differences not just between countries, but also within countries and even communities within cities as they seek to compare counter-terrorism approaches and their effects.
- Where possible, it is important to try and compare quantitative data in relation to the use of counter-terrorism powers across different international contexts. Qualitative research is also needed in relation to those most likely to be experiencing counter-terrorism measures across Europe.

The challenges and issues that arise from involving individuals from minority racial, ethnic or religious groups include:

- Being inclusive may mean researchers going beyond simply examining the impacts of counter-terrorism. This is because there is a real risk that issues of security that matter at the individual and community level -including experiences of violence, inter and intra community tensions, social and economic exclusion, racism and so forth- are overlooked through the state-led focus upon the prevention of terrorism.
- Much anti-Muslim violence is not being systematically recorded and is not being taken sufficiently seriously by governments, security services and police in countries throughout Western Europe.

Issues relating to ethics of research include:

- Definitions of terrorism may exclude states as possible perpetrators. This is an important point, for understanding any impacts of counter-terrorism measures on minorities may be problematic if some individuals from within those minorities perceive their experiences of counter-terrorism as a form of state-perpetrated terrorism.
- Research itself has the potential to affect those people and communities being researched. Researchers have an ethical obligation to recognise this potential, even while trying to avoid absolutist stands and negotiate competing political interests.

Some key issues arising from the involvement of key stakeholders include:

- There is a need to better define the difference between stakeholders and communities, as both words are used interchangeably.
- As consultation and outreach work is underpinned by a high level of trust and confidence between people (and organisations) -especially if prior relationships were not already in place

-perceived deception and rumour can quickly undo a lot of this hard work which requires constant maintenance.

Introduction

Following the Madrid and London bombings in 2004 and 2005, the dominant European perception of terrorism is that it is perpetrated by Al Qaeda-directed or inspired violent extremists. The response to this has had clear outcomes including a marked increase in ethnic and religious profiling; meaning law enforcement measures against, predominantly, Muslims. These are further compounded by anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim sentiments in many countries.

This paper has been commissioned out of a concern to systematically examine and compare impacts of counter-terrorism policies in Europe. Currently, few independent impact assessments exist, with a virtual absence of any comparative research. The need for better information and assessment has been recognised by European Parliamentarians. Sophie in't Veld, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, the Rapporteur for the recent committee communication "EU Counter-Terrorism Policy: main achievements and future challenges" (COM/2010/0386) calls for greater assessment of the impact and effectiveness of counter-terror policies. Her January 2011 parliamentary working papers called for thorough evaluation of EU counter-terror policies by independent experts, and recommended that the European Fundamental Rights Agency report annually on profiling and data mining among other issues. New research in this area would have relevance to both national and regional policy arenas and debates

There are currently a range of planned activities in Europe that might loosely be thought of as 'counter-terrorism'. The current "Stockholm programme" includes counter-radicalisation-awareness-raising with a strong focus on the identification and promotion of good practice. The project will receive €4 million in coming years and has been extended to Norway. It is important that a greater concern for impact assessment, with a particular focus on vulnerable rights (non-discrimination, freedom of religion and speech) be incorporated into this work, as, currently, objective assessments of the fairness and effectiveness of counter-radicalisation are lacking. A good practice should be identified as being based on a credible assessment of its impact both on fundamental rights and on public safety.

In light of the above, this paper comprises a draft methodology paper that considers some of the issues that require consideration when thinking about developing a research proposal that explores the impacts of current counter-terrorism policing and policies, with a particular focus on the impact

on racial, ethnic and/or religious minorities. This paper has been written by a group of researchers who regularly work with issues related broadly to 'conflict transformation': how community-based initiatives can reduce the use of extreme forms of violence. Key issues that are focused on in this paper are:

- The conceptualisation and understanding of 'impact' in the context of studies of criminal justice and security policy. The policy discourse often refers to the impact of counter-terrorism and policing measure, but what do we mean by impact? Impact on whom and impact on what?
- The strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to exploring or examining any impact; this should include both qualitative and qualitative research.
- Challenges and issues that arise in the context of research on terrorism and counter-terrorism policing and polices, including definitions, availability of open/closed sources, and externalities.
- Challenges and issues that arise in the context of comparative/multi-country studies, including definitions, the availability of comparable data, comparability of different national contexts, and externalities.
- Challenges and issues that arise from involving individuals from minority racial, ethnic or religious groups.
- Issues relating to ethics of research.
- Involvement of key stakeholders. What are the issues that arise in seeking to ensure involvement of key stakeholders in the research project? What are the different mechanisms for involvement, (advisory groups, steering groups) and what issues should be born in mind, particular where stakeholders with differing interests are involved, i.e. community activists and police?

I. The conceptualisation and understanding of 'impact'

Stemming from the expectation of a professionally dispassionate standpoint, discourse within policy and academia is often presented as neutral and objective, utilising terms that can obscure the complex, often messy realities of the people, practices and communities framed as 'subject'. In the case of criminal justice, and especially in relation to security and counter-terrorism, the term 'impact' is commonly used, a broad and impartial term useful for its nebulous definition, employed with a general assumption that it will be understood in all contexts. Depending on the perspective and subject, 'impact' appears to

encompass any relational and causal action in any direction, 'positive' or 'negative'; the impact of terrorism on victims, of policy on policing practices, of law on suspects, or counter-terrorism on communities, for example. In order to better understand the implication of this variation it is imperative that the term 'impact' and its usage is carefully unpacked. This introductory section therefore aims to highlight the differing notions of 'impact' as utilised by different stakeholders involved in security and counter-terrorism, from which an analysis may be made regarding the variations in usage and their implication on a theoretical and practical level.

1.1 'IMPACT' IN NORMATIVE DISCOURSE: TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

The relevance and type of impact inferred throughout a large body of academic and policy literature on terrorism and counter-terrorism relates closely to an understanding of 'effectiveness'. Unsurprisingly, the concern of states and their institutions with regards to these subjects is the prevention of violence on the state itself -physically and symbolically- and public safety. Impact in this context therefore takes a crime prevention perspective, in which policy and subsequent practice is expected to impact effectively against terrorism and its perceived causes. That is, terrorism is to be prevented and disrupted as quickly and completely as possible. Policy documents and related academic analyses therefore refer to the impact of law and policy on the needs of counter-terrorism to operate, such as intelligence gathering, effective communication between state agencies, and programmes to disrupt the radicalisation and recruitment of individuals by terrorist groups (HM Gov. 2006, 09, 11, 12; HO 2008, 11; Limbada & Silk; 2012 Schmid & Jongman 2005). The measurement of success in this context is concerned with impact on the specific directly visible problem; violent extremism and associated acts of terrorism (Spalek et al 2008). Within this framework, the question of communities and the impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism is bound to the dominant discourse, so that is assumed to operate on two levels; the potential and actual victimisation -primary, secondary and vicarious (Spalek 2006)- of the public by terrorist actions and associated behaviour, such as hate crime or fear; and the impact of counter-terrorism in relation to public health and safety (SIA 2012), such as operative policies in the case of arrests, counter-terrorism law or its impact on public rights. The body of citizenry is viewed as homogenous in experience, needs and expectations with regards to state responses to terrorism.

In recent years however, a body of more critically engaged scholarship and non-governmental activism has challenged this dominant notion of 'impact', pointing out the importance of recognising differing experiences and levels of impact on different parts of the public. The impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism on 'communities' has therefore become an intrinsic element of policy, practitioner, activist, and academic analysis. Interestingly, this shift to include 'community impact' remains sharply differentiated in relation to the ways in which it is framed and understood.

1.2 STATE INTEREST IN COMMUNITY IMPACT

At the heart of many counter-terrorism analyses and related policies lies a theory which explicitly identifies terrorist recruitment and support as happening within and between members of the public, or more accurately, in specific communities. In the case of the post 9/11 War on Terror, in which Al Qaeda related violence is viewed as most threatening to national and international security, the 'community' of focus is most often the 'Muslim community'. This is the impact of communities on counter-terrorism. This may mean the conceptual body of Muslims worldwide, living communities in which members of the public share a common Muslim identity, or actual local geographical locations in which Muslims live. The interest in communities is therefore problematic on a conceptual level; the use of a term such as 'Muslim community' within a policy document is unable to reflect the nuances of people's lived realities, especially problematic when the community in question is identified as a location of potential or actual terrorist activity. In this context, 'impact' becomes a term of functionality as well as effectiveness. That is, counter-terrorism policy is interested in the impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism on communities because of the ways in which communities are perceived as being functional to the prevention or escalation of violence. Phrases such as 'communities defeat terror' (Spalek et al 2008, 2011) and 'winning hearts and minds' (Briggs et al 2006; DCLG 2007) highlight the ways in which 'impact' on communities is framed from this functional perspective; the impact on communities is seen as either positive or negative in relation to effective security, if communities are likely to become more radical, or more likely to come forward with intelligence or information in response to certain state practices.

A further form of policy interest in community impact lies with broader notions of equality, as part of the state-citizen contract. Here, the practice of 'impact assessment' is used to quantify and measure impact of policy on the public. Again, the interest is usually macro; a general interest in the impact of policy on the public at large, for example trust and confidence in counter-terrorism policing (Innes et al for ACPO 2011) or on the experience of equal treatment by the state (OUN 2007; HO 2011). These assessments and analyses differentiate between the needs of the majority, and the impact on the minority communities of Muslims, creating an inherent utilitarian value system in which 'positive impact' on the general public in terms of assumed higher levels of safety is valued over the 'negative impact' on minority communities. While this is framed as impact on equality and human rights as well as practical impacts of countering violence, it remains 'top-down' and state-orientated in its conceptualisation of success and benefit. This tension between public safety, human rights and state-led criminal justice is further highlighted by legal discourse, as Walker summarises:

> "Criminal justice solutions to counter-terrorism are worthwhile and should be prioritised, but they are not all without costs to the values of criminal justice. Therefore, the state should not assume

that a criminal justice preference in counter-terrorism represents an unquestionable victory for societal values. Impact from a state perspective is thus as multifaceted as it is broad" [1]

1.3 A GRASSROOTS PERSPECTIVE ON IMPACT

The impact of counter-terrorism on communities from a grassroots perspective has been given increasing exposure as a result of community activism, critical academic research and non-governmental concern. High-profile issues such as incarceration without trial, the killing of innocent members of the public during counter-terrorism operations, and public outcry against invasive intelligence practices such as the spy cameras in Birmingham under Project Champion, have served to highlight a conceptualisation and experience of negative impact. A burgeoning body of literature testifying to this understanding (Choudhury & Fenwick 2011), one in which the subjective perceptions and experiences of individuals and communities are explored, is helping to define a new concept of community impact. The impact of a range of counter-terrorism related issues are included in this understanding; foreign policy, counter-terrorism laws, policing practices, and public and policy discourse -including academic research- that arguably fuel Islamophobia by conceptually linking Muslims with terrorism and a responsibility to prevent or disrupt it.

At the broadest level is a concern for state relations with communities, a mirror image for the state discourse of equality and rights, in which the impact on communities as citizens is highlighted. This relates to the experience of laws and practices that impact more on certain groups than others -Muslims in particular- and, in doing so, create a less secure form of citizenship, in which rights and responsibilities are recast through a lens of security (Pantazis & Pemberton 2011; Pickering 2008; Ahmed 2011). As part of this new citizenry, the impact on engagement is also increased, once more creating a new form of state-citizen relations, which, despite having 'positive' impacts in relation to the increased activism of communities (McDonald 2012), raises questions about choice and power relations. The use of new laws which disproportionally incarcerate Muslim individuals, or the policing practices of stop-and-search and raids also produce an understanding of impact that plays out in literal and physical ways, and in which state security is created at the expense of community security and trust in the state is eroded (Spalek & McDonald 2011). On the most micro level, the impact on the psychology of individuals and communities creates a further, arguably more profound form of impact. This is the negative and intersectional impact of counter-terrorism on the perception of personal identity, of social relations within and between communities of individuals, and of emotional impact in which fear, alienation and anger see pervasive and personal form of victimisation.

[1] Walker, Clive, The Impact of Contemporary Security Agendas Against Terrorism on the Substantive Criminal Law (2012). Masferrer, A. (ed.), Post 9/11 and the State of Permanent Legal Emergency (Springer, Dordrecht. 2012) pp.121-152. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2100558

1.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACT

These multiple forms of impact, which will be further explored in this paper, show the importance of conceptual and practical issues in understanding the impact of counter-terrorism on communities. Furthermore, they must be understood as being experienced in multiple layers, therefore generating an accumulative impact that may be more far-reaching than any single factor. The visceral testimony of community members whose stories are alluded to in statistics, but felt most keenly through the qualitative studies through which voices can be heard (Blackwood et al 2011; Choudhury & Fenwick 2011; Kundnani 2010; Spalek et al 2008, 10, 11) demonstrate the importance of a nuanced and thorough investigation into this subject.

II. The strengths and weaknesses of different approaches

In assessing a subject as complex and positional as the impact of counter-terrorism on communities, it is important to refer to the methodological underpinnings and influences of research methods on our analyses. This relates to the use of quantitative and qualitative methods, but, perhaps more crucially, to the ways in which these methods are utilised; the results of similar studies may offer very different conclusions. Such differences are not limited to 'quality' but to power, politics and ideological positionality, and this may have a major effect on any conclusions drawn.

From a methodological perspective, the measurement of impact presents a number of challenges; how a study defines impact, from whose perspective impact is viewed and what kind of data is valued. Impact is inherently subjective, fluid and perception-based and, as such, challenging for anyone claiming such a standpoint.

On a basic level, the use of quantitative or qualitative methods will produce different forms of data; if interested in statistics in relation to stop-and-search, or the religion of terrorism suspects, large-scale surveys from which numerical data may be derived is of primary interest. Should the personal, temporal and subjective voices of a community need a platform, the small-scale qualitative study in which the use of interview, testimony, and focus groups may produce complex, messy and in-depth data which may reveal the impact of counter-terrorism from the individual level. Both have their benefits, providing layers of information through which a three-dimensional picture may be produced: a mixed methods approach. This can minimise the criticisms against the small-scale snapshot, or the impersonal survey, by providing both. However, the ways in which these methods are utilised, and by whom, remains of equal import.

The state, for example, in employing its own researchers, presents a bias in its ability to produce neutral research, the power and lack of benefit in truly critical approaches inherent in the very act of state investigation. In the case of the UK, government analysis through impact assessments (for example HO 2011) may be further complicated by the use of surveys from non-state organisations, especially the use of

politically-biased newspapers (ibid:9-10). This is further compounded, as previously discussed, by the state interest in wider public perception over minority community experiences and perceptions. On the other hand, community-focused research may be viewed as equally 'biased', the use of qualitative data arguably magnifying the dissent or dissatisfaction of small numbers in a manner disproportionate to the wider public viewpoint.

As such, rather than claiming false neutrality, empiricism or the elimination of bias, in revealing these weaknesses an analysis can strive to ensure a level of transparency and critical reflection which can reduce the impact of subjectivity. It is this approach that we have endeavoured to achieve throughout this paper.

2.1 KEY POINTS

- From the perspective of states and their institutions, impacts of counter-terrorism are often viewed in relation to the prevention of violence on the state itself -physically and symbolically- and public safety.
- Where counter-terrorism policy is interested in the impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism on communities, this is predominantly because of the ways in which communities are perceived as being functional to the prevention or escalation of violence.
- State-instigated counter-terrorism impact assessments and analyses often differentiate between the needs of the majority and the impact on the minority communities of Muslims, creating an inherent utilitarian value system in which 'positive impact' on the general public in terms of assumed higher levels of safety is valued over the 'negative impact' on minority communities.
- The impact of counter-terrorism on communities from a grassroots perspective has been given increasing exposure as a result of community activism, critical academic research and non-governmental concern. This literature is one in which the subjective perceptions and experiences of individuals and communities are explored, thereby helping to define a new concept of community impact. The impact of a range of counter-terrorism related issues included in this understanding are foreign policy, counter-terrorism laws, policing practices, and the public and policy discourse -including academic research- that arguably fuel Islamophobia by conceptually linking Muslims with terrorism and a responsibility to prevent or disrupt it.

2.2 QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- How might we better measure the impact -in all forms- of state counter-terrorism measures on communities?

- While broader public safety is often used to justify targeting 'suspect communities', it may be argued that community security and state security are, in the long term, not only mutually compatible, but interdependent. How might policy and practice develop to reflect this?
- In relation to impact, to what extent is it accurate or helpful to claim 'communities defeat terrorism'?

III. Challenges and issues

3.1 DEFINITIONAL CHALLENGES AND ISSUES IN THE CONTEXT OF RESEARCH ON TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

Wilkinson (2006) suggests that it is important to distinguish between labels and concepts when researching terrorism and counter-terrorism. Labels are often the result of the application of external interests in order to define a problem, they are usually political in nature, and so are not grounded in any kind of in-depth analysis or research (Sluka, 2002; Gunning, 2007a). As such, any strategies and actions to deal with terrorism planned on the basis of labelling may be catastrophic, in that terrorism and other forms of political violence may be assembled under the same label and managed in the same way, contributing to the commission of gross mistakes within domestic and/or international criminal justice systems (Jackson, 2008). For this reason, many researchers argue that terrorism should be approached as a concept and not as a label, whereby conceptualising implies a process of connecting various aspects and facts related to the phenomenon; establishing a notion, an idea, a definition. It is in this context that Wilkinson (2006, p.2) considers that "terrorism is not simply a label; it is a concept" and a concept whose definition addresses the research in the field, informs public opinions and perceptions and sets in motion counter-terrorism strategies and practices (Stern, 1999; Schmid, 2006; Jackson, 2008). Approaching terrorism as a concept involves the understanding that there are many state and non-state actors and agencies (e.g. policing bodies, government institutions, international bodies, researchers, community members and so on) who define terrorism and counter-terrorism differently, although there may be points of convergence as well as divergence. Interestingly, some academic definitions have been generated from the analysis of a considerable number of already existing definitions. For instance, Weinberg, Pedahzur and Hirsch-Hoefler (2004) analysed 73 definitions present in three scientific journals -*Terrorism and Political Violence, Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, and *Terrorism*- and considered that terrorism is "a politically motivated tactic involving the threat or use of force or violence in which the pursuit of publicity plays a significant role" (p.786).

For its part, Schmid and Jongman's (2005) definition is composed of the 16 most consensual elements between academics' views on what terrorism is. This results in the following definition, as offered by Schmid and Jongman (2005): "An anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent actions employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby -in contrast to assassination- the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The

immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat- and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organisation), (imperilled) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought" (p.28).

Both definitions above focus on terrorism as a means of violent communication (Schmid, 2004). However, Schmid and Jongman's definition broadens the spectrum of terrorist motivations, considering not only political factors, but also idiosyncratic and criminal ones. This definition also includes the state as a possible perpetrator, something that is often ignored by mainstream definitions of terrorism (Banks, 2008; Blakeley, 2007; Martin, 2013). Authors such as Jenkins (1980) and Stern (1999) also reinforce this idea, affirming that "governments, their armies, their secret police may also be terrorists" (Jenkins, 1980, p.3) and that "states and their leaders can and do unleash terrorist violence against their own civilians" (Stern, 1999, p.14). According to Jackson (2008: 27), however, many established scholars in the field of terrorism studies do not write about those atrocities committed by states as terrorism, but rather, viewing these as forms of political violence, such as repression. According to the terminology used by the EU, which all EU Member States have agreed to use, "terrorism is not an ideology but is a set of criminal tactics which deny the fundamental principles of democratic societies. Terrorist acts are those which aim to intimidate populations, compel states to comply with the perpetrators' demands, and/or destabilise or destroy the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organisation" (Europol TeSat, 2010: 5).

Critical terrorism studies and perspectives authors consider that the majority of terrorism definitions lack rigour and are partial in that they relate to Western interests (Jackson, 2007). Jackson (2008, p.28) also believes that it is impossible to objectively define terrorism, because it "lacks a clear ontological status". Nonetheless, it is possible to define what aspects differentiate terrorism from other types of political violence (Jackson, 2008). As such, this position resonates with those scholars who do not wish to ignore or give up defining terrorism, recognising that it can be a valid term, under which invaluable research has already been undertaken and which holds the opportunity for future research opportunities (Gunning, 2007a). Those scholars who might be located as working within critical terrorism studies approaches also point out that history, context and socio-political variables are often ignored in the terrorism research arena and consequently in its definitions (Gunning, 2007a; Jackson, 2007; Smyth, 2007; Zulaika, 2008). According to Jackson (2008, p.28), "terrorism is a social fact rather than a brute fact", and is created and re-created by the 'social and political discourse'. Therefore, historical and contextual analysis may also shed some light on the dynamics between the state and individuals, between the state and violent organisations, between individuals and violent organisations and between violent organisations and other social movements. This analysis might change the actor's place in the terrorist scenario, possibly placing

some states' actions at the origin of terrorism (Gunning, 2007a), in the sense that the line between terrorism and counter-terrorism acts is sometimes very tenuous (Jackson, 2008).

3.2 ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND ISSUES ON RESEARCHING TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

Ontology is about how we understand the nature of social reality; epistemology is about how we choose to know this reality (Snape and Spencer, 2004). Different epistemologies have different conceptions of the nature of reality, produce different knowledge about it and confer distinct roles to the researcher. Thus, research on terrorism and counter-terrorism, similar to research on any other social phenomena, results from the way in which the researcher sees and approaches reality.

Now, different epistemological approaches and their relationship to terrorism and counter-terrorism studies will be explored. A positivist approach considers the main characteristics of the phenomena, ignoring the role of its actors or its social, political, cultural and historical context, and testing different hypotheses and theories, whose main goal is to predict how and why terrorism occurs, producing causal explanations. This approach considers that reality is objective, it is independent of individual action and wider context, and that it is possible to scientifically test and measure terrorism (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). The positivist and the post-positivist approaches do not differ immensely. However, post-positivism considers that the reality is not independent of both the researcher and the researched and that scientific measurements are imperfect and probabilistic (Guba and Lincoln, 2005).

A different approach involves interpretivist and subjective epistemologies which, in the context of terrorism, gather individuals' perspectives about terrorism and counter-terrorism, using also the researcher's own interpretations of these perspectives. These epistemological approaches consider social reality to be embedded in interpretation and relativism (involving both the researcher and the researched) (Morgan and Smirch, 1980). Between positivist and interpretivist approaches there is social constructivism, which is concerned with individuals' perspectives and also with the context in which those perspectives take place. In this sense, social constructivism views terrorism as a social phenomenon, not an objective reality, but as a social construction (Turk, 2004; Spalek, 2008). Hülsse and Spencer (2008), alongside other critical terrorism studies authors such as Jackson (2008), go even further and believe that, instead of considering individuals' perspectives, a social constructivist approach must consider how those individuals are constructed in the social discourse and its metaphors. For Hülsse and Spencer (2008) this approach to social constructivism is much more effective because discourses reflect the effects that terrorism has in society in general and help to understand if terrorists' goals are being achieved or not (e.g. if fear and terror are being spread across society). In the view of these authors, this kind of information cannot be reached solely through understanding the individual perspectives of terrorists themselves.

In terms of epistemology, critical terrorism studies authors also highlight the importance of bearing in mind the existence of power relations and gender issues, the relevance of the historical context of events, and the existence of ethical concerns on conducting research posed by legal issues (Smyth, 2007). Concerns with "social justice" and "structural violence" may also be at the heart of epistemologies related to researching terrorism and counter-terrorism (Gunning, 2007a, p.376).

3.3 METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND ISSUES ON RESEARCH IN RELATION TO TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

The most significant critique of terrorism and counter-terrorism research comes from critical terrorism studies and other researchers holding critical perspectives. The main methodological criticism assigned to terrorism studies is that researchers largely rely on secondary data sources of analysis, which means on data and materials reached and produced by other researchers (Schmid and Jongman, 1988; Silke, 2001; Jackson, 2007; Gunning, 2007a). This practice poses questions regarding the reliability and validity of studies, as primary data sources might generate new insights and areas of analysis (Smyth, 2007). Related to this topic is the fact that, contrary to many other similar research areas, interviews do not have a primary place in terrorism studies (Gunning, 2007a). The lack of primary empirical data is due to both practical and ideological reasons. Practical issues that make collecting empirical data challenging include the researcher's security, a difficulty in accessing subjects, and the large amount of time and resources needed to arrange, conduct and analyse interviews (Kleinman and Copp, 1993; Silke, 2001). Research on terrorism can also raise various emotions (fear, condemnation, even compassion) in the researcher (Silke, 2001; Toros, 2008). At the same time, however, emotions can enhance the researcher's empathy and understanding with the research participant's responses and experiences (Kleinman and Copp, 1993; Holstein and Gubrium, 2004). The researcher's influence during the interview process may be also seen as something that disadvantages objectivity, with participants providing socially desirable answers (Silke, 2001). An ethical approach to research requires the researcher to conduct an honest and transparent process with him/herself and with the research participants (Gilham, 2005; Kvale, 2007; Macfarlane, 2010), even if methodologies need to be adapted to the constraints of the fieldwork (see Toros, 2008). Ideological constraints on terrorism research relate to preconceptions rooted in the demonisation of terrorism, whereby those committing acts of terrorism may be viewed as not being worthy to be heard, because they will lie, and so the argument goes that it is preferable to hear what the government and its representatives, such as the police, have to say (Gunning, 2007; Zulaika and Douglass, 2008). However, this position can be questioned in that interviews give voice to real actors, allowing them to freely speak from their own experiences and convey their conceptions in their own words (Kvale, 2007; Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). Two further methodological issues in relation to terrorism research, as identified by Silke (2001, p.8), are whether researchers use an 'opportunity sample' instead of a 'systematic sample', and whether to use qualitative analysis instead of quantitative analysis. An opportunity sample has no prior rigid structure regarding the selection of participants, and usually the criteria for this kind of sample is to

be related with the study and to be available to participate. Usually the studies composed by opportunity samples are not able to make general assumptions of their results. A systematic sample obeys a pre-determined structure in relation to the selection of participants, that safeguards the generalisation of the results. For Silke (2001), using an opportunity sample and a lack of sufficient quantitative analysis can raise questions about the reliability and representativeness of any piece of research. However, to counter this, it is worthwhile noting that terrorism participants are a hard-to-reach group, frequently refusing to talk to researchers, who may be very small in number, amongst many other issues, and so drawing a systematic sampling approach and using quantitative analysis may be almost impossible. It is also worth adding that statistical generalisation is not the only feature of representativeness; theoretical generalisation, which aims to support or develop a theory, can provide another means through which to achieve representativeness (De Vaus, 2001).

3.4 PUTTING RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE AND INTO POLICY: CHALLENGES AND ISSUES

Research often has to be funded. Any funder, governmental or not, has a specific agenda and purposes in mind, which may create difficulties and pose issues of confidence between the researcher and the participants, and may, in some circumstances, harm the researcher's and participant's/informant's integrity through the production of biased results (e.g. if the funder is the state, the state remains un-criticised and decides what results to put into practice and what policies to release) (Silke, 2001; Gunning, 2007a; Jackson, 2007; Smyth, 2007; Toros, 2008). In this sense, critical terrorism studies researchers argue that researchers must avoid working in environments where 'power relations' are deeply established. Moreover, partnerships between scholars, practitioners, communities and policy makers must happen in order to achieve effective 'impact' and 'change' (Smyth, 2007, p.262). Importantly, this kind of collaborative work is not something natural for scholars, in the sense that according to Silke (2001, p.12) "90 per cent of research studies are planned, conducted, analysed and then written up by just one person working in isolation". Putting research into practice and into policy is also closely related to respect for civil liberties and to the risk of creating suspicious communities (Smyth, 2007). Therefore, research on terrorism and counter-terrorism must support a criminal justice model, which considers terrorism as a crime against humanity and not as an act of war, conferring responsibility to law enforcement agencies and respecting prisoners' human rights (Banks, 2008). Research on counter-terrorism must be also concerned with the evaluation of real risks and should not contribute to the spread of fear and terror (Spencer, 2006; Smyth, 2007). In this sense, it is important to know if, in practice, counter-terrorism measures are reducing the fear of terrorism (Spencer, 2006) and what role is academia playing here? Is academia contributing to the assessment of the real threat of terrorism and impacting on the state's discourses, or is academia contributing to the 'reproduction and normalisation of the dominant discourse' of fear and terror (Smyth, 2007, p.261)? The impact of research into practice and into policies may be crucial in this context, because the way in which governments project threats and their assessments to the

population command the general perception of threat in society (Bassiouni, 2004; Zulaika and Douglass, 2008) and contributes to the segregation of suspicious communities and to the intensification of grievances within these same communities. In this context, it is worth referring to the important role that emancipatory approaches may play. Emancipatory research has as its fundamental principle stopping violence and creating "possibilities of change" (McDonald, 2007, p.254). Those possibilities may happen through the connection between moderate community voices and non-violent alternatives, which focus on the needs and voices of those more vulnerable and marginalised, including those directly or indirectly affected by terrorist violence or by responses to it (McDonald, 2007). Emancipatory approaches need only to be careful when dealing with communities who see violence as the only way to answer violence and violent states that justify their actions through lawful mechanisms (Gunning, 2007b). This is because, within these communities, an emancipatory approach may struggle to establish a confident relationship and to realise changes and have impact (Gunning, 2007b).

3.5 KEY POINTS

- The importance of definitions around terrorism. Terrorism as a concept that shapes public perspectives and counter-terrorism practices, which may include the possibility of state terrorism and gives relevance to contextual aspects.
- Ontological and epistemological positions impact the way in which terrorism is researched and theorised.
- Social constructivism looks at terrorism as a social construction rather than an objective reality, being concerned with its actors' perspectives and with the social discourses that surround them.
- The main methodological issues of terrorism and counter-terrorism studies are the use of secondary data analysis and the almost exclusive choice for an opportunity sample and for a qualitative methodology, while the main methodological challenges are the use of primary data, gathered, for instance, through interviews and the use of statistical analysis.
- Terrorism and counter-terrorism research must be concerned with the impact on practice and on policies. In this sense, it must happen in a respectful environment for the researcher, for the participants and for the communities involved in general and must support a criminal justice model.
- Academia must evaluate the real risk of terrorism and the real outcomes and consequences of counter-terrorism measures and not be influenced by the mainstream voices, which can spread fear and terror.

3.6 QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

- How important is it to have a consensual definition of terrorism? How does this affect counter-terrorism practices?
- One of the main methodological issues pointed at terrorism and counter-terrorism studies is the non-common use of quantitative analysis. In your opinion, how could quantitative methodologies work on the referred fields and what would be their advantages and disadvantages?
- How may academia impact positively upon discourses on terrorism and counter-terrorism?

IV. Potential challenges in comparative/multi-country studies

While much has been written about the globalisation of crime, little attention has been given to the potential for the globalisation of crime *responses* to have effects that transcend borders. For example, how has the influence of the UK Prevent strategy spread beyond the United Kingdom, and in a globalised law enforcement world, how has it had an effect on Muslims in other 'Western' countries? Inasmuch as police and researchers look at the effectiveness of specific police or criminal justice policies such as those in relation to the so-called 'War on Terror', we give scant attention to the globalisation of such law enforcement efforts, and even less space is reserved for candid discussions of the effect these globalised strategies have on communities. We therefore need to not only look at the impact of globalised *crime*, but also the impact of globalised *crime fighting strategies*.

This discourse must reside within some framework, which itself presents a challenge. Where are studies of terrorism, counter-terrorism, and the effects of counter-terrorism best situated? Certainly, in the end, it is a broad, multi-disciplinary effort. LaFree and Ackerman (2009) reinforce that the academic understanding of terrorism and counter-terrorism finds roots in a variety of perspectives including law and psychology, even while recognising that "individual- and group-level empirical data on terrorism are in short supply" (p. 347). This shortcoming can be alarming, given the influence terrorism prevention has on national policies and budgets, and especially given that research into the outcomes of counter-terrorism initiatives is scant, and limited in methodology: "research on the efficacy of counter-terrorism strategies has grown rapidly in recent years, it is still rarely evaluated with strong empirical methods" (LaFree & Ackerman, 2009, p. 364).

So how much of this research has been specifically targeted at measuring the effects of European counter-terrorism measures on communities? Insufficient work has been done, although there are some exceptions (for examples, see attention to this topic in Choudhury & Fenwick, 2011; Spalek & McDonald, 2009; Spalek & Lambert, 2008). Important as it is, research into the impacts on counter-terrorism on communities must not be limited in disciplinary scope or methodology, with any one academic arena expected to 'own the field'; a variety of academic specialties have much to offer. Indeed, some of the most cogent and challenging discussions on related topics may come from surprising sources in an area

dominated by criminology and criminal justice, such as philosophy (Wolfendale, 2007), anthropology (Sluka, 2010), and education (Silk, 2010).

Without placing undue emphasis on a requirement for solely quantitative data, a framework through which to understand research undertaken to discuss the effects of counter-terrorism on communities is needed. Especially important to acknowledge here is that individual human stories matter, and carry weight, especially in the aggregate. There are vital roles and purposes for both quantitative *and* qualitative analysis, and, as the potential for varied types of research becomes more likely, a model for comparative, international inquiry into this area is needed.

4.1 TYPOLOGY AND TERMS

Bennett (2006) suggests a useful typology for comparative and multi-national research in criminology and criminal justice, with special emphasis on comparisons within and between nations in the post-9/11 era, in which there has been "a shocking awareness that terrorism is international and inextricably linked to transnational criminal activity" (p. 8). Bennett's suggested framework (p. 5) utilises four dimensions, each with its own characteristics: Approach (descriptive or analytic); Scope (national, multinational, and transnational); Data (qualitative or quantitative); and Design (cross-sectional or longitudinal). Using such a descriptive framework for comparative studies on the effects of counter-terrorism offers both the writer and the reader a lens through which to view each work, and also facilitates comparisons with other research on related topics. Such a basic foundation of understanding proves quite useful as a starting point for further studies, used to ensure like studies are compared (also see Smith, 2009).

What is meant by the commonly used terms often found in comparative international criminology research? Several authors have suggested that the lexicon used in international criminology and criminal justice research needs more attention (e.g. Smith, 2009; Pakes, 2010). Part of the issue is apparently simple: "some of the confusion of the state of comparative or international criminology stems from a confusion of what they denote. Comparative is about method; whereas transnational, international and global is about object or subject matter" (Pakes, 2010, p. 19). However, other facets are much more complex, and the potential for confusion is real and worthy of further attention.

Smith (2009) offers useful, concrete definitions for comparative criminal justice research, and suggests necessary 'core terms':

- *Comparative method* is defined as the sum of traditional methods plus international methods plus placement of the research in a contextualised framework and global perspective.
- *Global* means taking into account the relevant world events and state-of-being and placing research in a contextualised framework.

- *International* means between nations, crossing boundaries and borderless. This definition adds to international criminology, which is the study of those crimes that would/should fall under international law.
- *Transnational* means across two or more countries, borderless.
- *Cross-national* means transnational or between two countries.
- *Cross-cultural* means between two or more cultures, borderless in terms of country boundaries. (Smith, 2009, pp. 223-224)

Smith also provides input into more nuanced challenges experienced in comparative research, emphasising the value of understanding equivalence between research sites: "The key to comparative methods is to achieve equivalency in design and methods" (2009, p. 214), and stressing *concept equivalence*, *cultural differences*, and *language differences* as central to effectively contextualised research. Pakes (2010) make a valid point, however, in stressing that the challenge is not just about distinctiveness of cultures, societies, and countries, but also in attending to the way in which "globalisation has altered states of isolation and self-containment to produce spheres of interrelation" (p. 17) "rather than crossing border comparative research requires us to be at home in an environment where fixed notions of borders and boundaries no longer apply" (p. 20).

Where research on the impact of counter-terrorism on communities is indeed qualitative, we again require a framework for sharing the stories of those affected in an accessible manner. Merriam (1988), summarising a variety of sources describing the nature of case study research, proposes four 'essential' characteristics (pp. 11-15) of a qualitative case study, which are applicable here: (a) particularistic and "focus on a particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon" (p. 11); (b) descriptive; (c) heuristic, hoping to "illuminate the reader's understanding of the phenomenon under study" (p.13), and (d) inductive. Merriam notes that "investigators use a case study design in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and its meaning for those involved", and importantly, 'the interest is in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation' (p. xii). The utility of such a lens is readily apparent, even if it is located outside of the normal criminology paradigm. When case studies are to be truly comparative, then they should "adhere to the rigor of comparative methods so that future comparisons between cases will have the same scientific rigor as other studies" (Smith, 2009, p. 214).

4.2 ETHICS, DATA, AND THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF FINDINGS

The emphasis noted above in collecting the experiences of those affected by counter-terrorism measures touches on an important ethical point: how do researchers sufficiently acknowledge that inquiry into this realm of personal and communal experiences is conducted and shared in an ethical way?

The academic field of anthropology has something important to offer here in the arena of research ethics, in particular as applied to the effect researchers may have on communities and individuals they seek to study. The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth elaborates:

> "Social anthropologists carry out their professional research in many places around the world; some where they are 'at home' and others where they are in some way 'foreign'. Anthropological scholarship occurs within a variety of economic, cultural, legal and political settings. As professionals and as citizens, they need to consider the effects of their involvement with, and consequences of their work for; the individuals and groups among whom they do their fieldwork (their research participants or 'subjects'); their colleagues and the discipline, and collaborating researchers; sponsors, funders, employers and gatekeepers; their own and host governments; and other interest groups and the wider society in the countries in which they work". (Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice, 1999, para. 1)

A difficult but worthwhile discussion in anthropology regarding the application of anthropological research to modern counter-insurgencies highlights a potential area of concern for criminology and criminal justice researchers investigating the impact of counter-terrorism activities on communities. Sluka (2010) asks tough but important questions regarding research ethics and the role of researchers working for institutions of the state. While absolutist in its moral stance and pertaining to other aspects of the 'War on Terror', the potential for similar questions to be raised in counter-terrorism research makes consideration of similar issues necessary. How, in the end, are people affected, how will research be used, and what effect will the utilisation of research on the effect of counter-terrorism on communities have on future researchers? Is there a chance they will be labelled as government spies? While there is certainly a compelling need for research into this area, these questions are worthy of deep consideration.

The potential for bias in research in comparative criminology exists on a multitude of planes. For example, Nelken contrasts the dangers of ethnocentrism and relativism:

> "On the one hand, there is the risk of being ethnocentric—assuming that what *we* do, our way of thinking about and responding to crime, is universally shared or, at least, that it would be right for everyone else. On the other hand, there is the temptation of relativism, the view that we will never really be able to grasp what others are doing and that we can have no basis for evaluating whether what they do is right". (Nelken, 2009, pp. 291-292)

In a similar spirit, Cain (2000) candidly speaks to orientalism and occidentalism in criminology research, and correctly acknowledges that "deep presumptions of Western theories may be harmful to non-Western consumers of them" (p. 239). Nelken charges that ethnocentrism colours the way in which we view 'what those in other places are *actually* trying to do' (2009, p. 291).

As several researchers have suggested, however, the question of international criminological comparisons may itself have become suspect as cities within countries, and communities within cities, may have vastly different experiences of life, social systems, law enforcement, and crime (see, for example, Pakes, 2010; Smith, 2009; Sheptycki, 2005). "The world according to criminology is no longer composed of neatly defined communities cut off from one another and ready for comparison between their pristine forms" (Sheptycki, 2005, p. 70). While it may go without saying that Polish and Bangladeshi diaspora communities have different experiences in the same city, it is worth emphasising that immigrant Bangladeshis and their theoretical geographic neighbours from Pakistan may too, despite nominal religious links or other common ties. A researcher may well be tempted to speak broadly of 'Muslim communities' and the effects of counter-terrorism agendas for example, in a certain locale, but the degree to which real differences in those communities are given attention may itself be a reflection of the willingness of researchers to understand and harness the voices and experiences of the subjects of study.

While we often acknowledge the growing globalisation of crime, we less frequently recognise that globalisation also has an effect on the conduct of criminal justice practices across borders, and there are no guarantees that the sharing of policing 'best practices' across nations will always result in ethical, human rights-compliant behaviours by police. As Chan asks: "If criminology has always been global in orientation, what about criminal justice policy and practice?" (Chan, 2005, p. 341). Researches must strive to objectively consider the good and the bad when inquiring into the impact of counter-terrorism measures, regardless of source. "The many cross-currents of globalisation exert strong pressures on societies around the world and some of the negative manifestations of this are within the purview of criminology" (Hardie-Bick, Sheptycki, & Wardak, 2005, p. 14). This is especially important to discuss as the effect of counter-terrorism policies and police practices throughout Europe are scrutinised. Lessons learned in programmes such as the UK Prevent strategy surely have much to offer to other nations, but there should be no illusions. There is just as much potential for the bad to be exported with the good, even while the most recent Prevent review (2011) is commendably reflective in its stance (see also Zimbada & Silk, 2012).

4.3 AREAS FOR EMPHASIS AND POTENTIAL CHALLENGES

If counter-terrorism has received insufficient attention, even less attention seems to have been paid to the effects of counter-terrorism on communities. As we move into what may be considered the 'next generation' of counter-terrorism research, several important questions must be considered by researchers and policy makers. Especially worthy of note are investigations into the following: How will access to government and community data sources be arranged? How do researchers seek objectivity and minimise the potential of allowing undue privilege to certain points of view (i.e., governments over communities)? How can researchers strike a reasonably objective balance between prioritising the security mission of the

state and protecting the rights and will of the people? And, perhaps most importantly, how does research into counter-terrorism have the potential to affect the subjects of research?

4.4 COMPARATIVE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESEARCH ON THE IMPACTS OF COUNTER-TERRORISM MEASURES

Where possible, it is important to try and compare quantitative data in relation to the use of counter-terrorism powers across different international contexts. In order to try and compare 'like with like', as a first step it is important to collate a baseline understanding of what data is publically available, or may be made accessible to researchers, in relation to specific counter-terrorism powers and their implementation. There are likely to be significant differences between the levels of information regarding the use of counter-terrorism powers between different countries, making comparisons problematic. At the same time, within countries themselves, there are significant differences in the level of public scrutiny of particular counter-terrorism powers. For example, in the UK, whilst there has been more data and public scrutiny of police stop-and-search powers in relation to Section 44 of the Terrorism Act 2000, there has been much less scrutiny of Schedule 7 of the Terrorism Act 2000, which is considered to be the widest ranging stop-and-search power in the UK, yet is also the least transparent. Under this power, people can be detained at ports for up to nine hours, undergo a detailed search and questioning as well as have their DNA and fingerprint samples taken, even though they are not suspected of being involved in acts of terrorism or any other crime. Openly available data in relation to the use of Schedule 7 can be patchy, and whilst there may be the option for members of the public to make official complaints about their experiences to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), data on the number of complaints against each police service is not publically available. It may also be challenging to obtain data into the use of counter-terrorism powers for specific racial, ethnic and religious minorities. Often, the data is presented in very general racial categories in relation to White, Black, Asian, Mixed, Chinese or Other, and so it is difficult to obtain data in relation to specific ethnic and religious groupings. There may also be data that can be obtained through official independent reviews that have been conducted within nation states. For example, in the UK, there is an Independent Reviewer of Counter-Terrorism Powers, who can conduct investigations.

Quantitative data, although extremely useful and important, is unable to capture the cumulative and experiential aspects of the use of counter-terrorism powers on specific racial, ethnic and religious minorities. For example, a person of a racial, ethnic and/or religious group may be experiencing counter-terrorism powers and operations in multiple and complex ways, particularly if they belong to a group that is viewed as being 'suspect'. Qualitative research can help capture the disproportionate impacts of counter-terrorism measures on particular groups of individuals -those most likely to be experiencing these- through a case study approach that could be applied across wide-ranging international contexts. For example, it might be useful to think about documenting the experiences and perspectives of particular

groups of individuals who are most likely to be experiencing counter-terrorism measures on the basis of their age, ethnicity and other markers of identity. Thus, in what ways are young Somali Muslims across Europe experiencing and perceiving counter-terrorism policies and strategies? How might we understand the impacts of counter-terrorism measures better on these young people by also taking into consideration broader economic, political and social factors that impact on their lives? Also, is there a sense in which experiences and particular narratives are shared across particular diasporas within Europe? This kind of approach makes the case for qualitative research that reaches into those specific groups of individuals who are most likely to experience counter-terrorism measures, understanding their lives in relation to local, national and global dynamics.

4.5 KEY POINTS

- Research into the impact of state counter-terrorism measures on communities is best framed as a broad, multidisciplinary effort, and should seek methodological foundations in a variety of academic areas, including criminology and criminal justice, but perhaps also law, psychology, anthropology, philosophy and education.
- While recognising the potential contribution of a variety of disciplinary approaches, comparative and international criminology and criminal justice studies offer a useful typology (Bennett, 2006) and definitions (Smith, 2009) for understanding and framing the challenges posed by this type of research.
- Researchers must be aware of differences not just between countries, but also within countries and even communities within cities (Pakes, 2010; Smith, 2009; Sheptycki, 2005) as they seek to compare counter-terrorism approaches and their effects.
- Research itself has the potential to affect the people and communities being researched (see Sluka, 2010). Researchers have an ethical obligation to recognise this potential, even while trying to avoid absolutist stands and negotiate competing political interests.
- Where possible, it is important to try and compare quantitative data in relation to the use of counter-terrorism powers across different international contexts. However, there are likely to be significant differences between the levels of information regarding the use of counter-terrorism powers between different countries, making comparisons problematic.
- Quantitative data, although extremely useful and important, is unable to capture the cumulative and experiential aspects to the use of counter-terrorism powers on specific racial, ethnic and religious minorities.
- It might be useful to think about documenting the experiences and perspectives of particular groups of individuals who are most likely to be experiencing counter-terrorism measures on the basis of their age, ethnicity and other markers of identity. Thus, in what ways are young Somali Muslims across Europe experiencing and perceiving counter-terrorism policies and strategies?

How might we understand the impacts of counter-terrorism measures better on these young people by also taking into consideration broader economic, political and social factors that impact on their lives? Also, is there a sense in which experiences and particular narratives are shared across particular diasporas within Europe?

4.6 QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- Research into the effects of counter-terrorism on communities is clearly best situated as a multidisciplinary effort. Which academic areas are best positioned to be helpful in this arena?
- Research into the effects of counter-terrorism on communities has the potential to affect the communities it seeks to study, and researchers therefore have an ethical obligation to consider the impact of their work. What are ethical considerations researchers should keep in mind? How can researchers seek to minimise any potential negative impact on communities?
- Quantitative and qualitative research methodologies both have the potential to play important roles in research into the effects of counter-terrorism on communities. How are these each best used, and how will results be compared and, if possible, generalised?
- Does this research need to be conducted in a way so as to be considered broadly 'representative' of the experiences across Europe in order to be useful, or can the stories of individuals and communities serve an important purpose as well ?

V. Challenges and issues that arise from involving individuals from minority groups

5.1 DOMINANT KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTIONS AND THE MARGINALISATION OF RACIAL, ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES

As a starting point, critical perspectives within the social sciences offer some important insights into the challenges and issues that arise when involving individuals from minority racial, ethnic or religious groups in research. Critical scholarship emphasises that the perceptions and experiences of minorities are often marginalised by social scientific discourse and by wider society (Collins, 1998; McClaurin, 2001; Garland et al. 2006). The term 'minority' is taken to mean that which lies outside dominant, and often mainstream, cultural, social and political structures in relation to 'race'/ethnicity, gender, faith, sexual orientation, disability, age and class. According to Felsenthal (2004), oppositional binaries like male/female, white/black, straight/gay or normal/deviant underpin Western culture, constructing taken-for-granted assumptions and norms about the world. Whilst one side of these oppositional binaries is dominant, the other side is often stigmatised. Focusing specifically on 'race', ethnicity and religion, researchers have emphasised how Black, Asian, minority ethnic and religious communities have often been stereotyped and 'otherised' by wider society and by dominant knowledge constructions. For

example, Brah (1996: 24 in Mohammad, 1999: 221–2) maintains that Asians in Britain have been regarded as being 'outsiders', as 'undesirables' who practise 'strange religions', and that the use in research of the general category 'Asian', a category associated with these negative connotations, may therefore serve to reproduce, rather than undermine, these prejudices. Gunaratnam (2003) asserts in relation to 'race'/ethnicity, the seemingly unavoidable use by researchers of outdated or inadequate terms for racial and ethnic backgrounds can generate simplistic or -perhaps even more worryingly- deterministic assumptions about the behaviours or experiences of such groups.

These assumptions can inadvertently lead to the reproduction of existing, dominant power relations between different social groups that may be the opposite of what well-meaning researchers had originally intended the consequences of their research to be. Religious communities have traditionally attracted little research and policy attention, perhaps due to the dominance of secularism, which may be understood as an integral part of modern Western society, where religious considerations are often excluded from civil affairs, and issues in relation to equality are viewed largely through the secular framework of multiculturalism (Caraballo-Resto, 2006). The philosophical and historical underpinnings of secularism lie within the European Enlightenment, where scientific reasoning increasingly replaced theological frameworks of understanding. At the same time, the influence of religious institutions on civil society declined with the emergence of modern institutions and professional bodies which came to be separated out from their religious roots (Beckford, 1996). As a result, religion has not kept its central position within social theory (Beckford, 1996), and sociologists have assumed that religion is a declining phenomenon and therefore requires little attention (Lyon, 1996). Nonetheless, Beckford (1996) has argued that despite the effects of the Enlightenment, religion continues to be used as a cultural resource, and, as such, warrants attention from social scientists. Moreover, some researchers argue that religion has undergone a resurgence in late modern society, as evidenced by the rising numbers of people joining new religious movements, or practicing 'New Age' forms of spirituality (Heelas, 1996; Lyon, 1996; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). With growing numbers of Muslim minorities in Europe, this further points to the importance of including religious identities and groups in research.

5.2 INCLUDING RACIAL, ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Given the marginalisation and potential stigmatisation of racial, ethnic and/or religious minorities, as highlighted in the above paragraph, this raises the question of what strategies have researchers taken in order to be more inclusive of minority perspectives and experiences? Some researchers have adopted a 'post-modern paradigm' that challenges a taken-for-granted assumption within the social sciences that the proper end of social research is the production of objective knowledge (Lundy & McGovern, 2006). Within this post-modern paradigm there has been a critique of 'catch-all' racial and ethnic classifications like 'Black', 'Asian' or 'Black and Minority Ethnic' (BME) when researching 'race'/ethnicity in relation to

crime, victimisation and other social issues, for these serve to obscure the distinct experiences of specific racial and ethnic and/or religious groups. For example, the category 'Asian' obscures significant cultural, religious, economic and other differences between Pakistanis, Indians and Bangladeshis (Garland, Spalek & Chakraborti, 2006). Phillips and Bowling (2003) have proposed that researchers place a greater emphasis upon developing a 'minority perspective' within social science disciplines like criminology; one which articulates the experiences of specific communities and takes into account their histories and identities. Phillips and Bowling (2003: 271) also argue that a core component of the development of a minority ethnic perspective is the documentation of difference, consisting of a movement away from 'essentialist categorisations of racial and ethnic minorities'. Phillips and Bowling (2003) advocate adopting a method that documents people's specific experiences but which acknowledges that aspects of these can be shared by other minorities due to broader structures of 'race', ethnicity, religion and so forth; so-called 'unities within diversity'. This reflects the epistemological approach of 'perspectival realism'. 'Perspectival realism' claims that different social identities constitute different social locations through which the world is experienced and viewed so that, at any given moment, the social world can be viewed rationally in more than one perspective. However, power relations in relation to 'race'/ethnicity, religion and so forth can influence knowledge production, as well as the legitimacy granted to any knowledge claims. In particular, the perspectives and experiences of those individuals whose identities lie at the margins, occupying disempowered positions, are likely to be hidden as their claims may appear to be less rational than those claims produced by dominant discursive practices (Fricker, 2000). Within the perspectival realist approach, it is therefore important to gain access to those people who occupy marginalised positions, as through the narratives that these individuals tell about their lives it may be possible to develop a critical understanding of the social world, since people in disempowered positions can bring insights into, and shed light upon, dominant social processes that serve to create and perpetuate discrimination and oppression. This epistemological position draws heavily upon feminist standpoint theory (Fricker, 2000), in that it incorporates specificities of experience whilst at the same time acknowledging any shared experiences of racial, ethnic and/or religious minorities as a way of challenging dominant norms in wider society. This would suggest that critical researchers should be aware of the limitations of broad social categories, whilst at the same time using these strategically in order to challenge dominant power relations in society. For example, in relation to Islamism, this is a diverse category that encompasses many different movements and ideals (Silvestri, 2009). Any research examining the impacts of counter-terrorism policies and practices on Islamists would need to take into account different groupings and experiences within Islamism whilst, at the same time, including a focus on broader power relations in relation to the post 9/11 context and the increased securitisation of Islamists and Islamism. It is also important to note that Islamist groups may be viewed threateningly by the state because, according to Cesari (2005), Muslims' settlement in Europe and their claims for public recognition can be viewed as a threat by Western secular states which separate politics from religion.

Within quantitative data on counter-terrorism policing and policing in general, the intersectionality of groupings within any population is not accounted for, so that nuances relating to multiple differentiating factors such as ethnicity, religious sect, cultural attitudes, gender and age, which in combination may create great variations or subtle nuance, are not represented. This is of particular relevance to understanding Muslim community attitudes to counter-terrorism policing; at the most fundamental level there is a lack of research around the subject, which has resulted in a dearth of methodologically appropriate quantitative data. For understanding issues in the context of counter-terrorism policing, this presents a particular challenge; while 'average' attitudes recorded within Muslim communities may be available within national data sets, it is clear that these may be less important than specific populations with whom counter-terrorism policing may have greater interest or contact. There is also an argument for focusing upon specific geographical locations in relation to understanding the impacts of counter-terrorism policies and practices, as a way of developing a more inclusive approach to understanding impacts of counter-terrorism on minorities. In Britain, a project by West Midlands Police called Project Champion generated substantial local and national criticism. In late 2007, West Midlands Police began creating a vehicle movement net involving CCTV cameras around two geographical areas within the city of Birmingham, Alum Rock and Sparkhill. The wider context for this was two significant terrorist plots in 2007, which had raised the national threat level to critical. Two hundred surveillance cameras were placed in predominantly Muslim areas, some of which were hidden (Thornton, 2010). It would seem logical to suggest that it is important for research to focus on specific locales, and in the Birmingham area in Britain this would mean a focus on the Alum Rock and Sparkhill areas. Importantly, it would be important to access young Muslim men aged between 16 and 24 from within these locales (as quantitative evidence would suggest that this group has low trust levels in the police) in order to properly understand their grievances in relation to policing and counter-terrorism policing, to ensure that there is evidence-based policy and practice within these specific local areas. Currently, it appears that analyses of trust and confidence in policing with respect to Muslim, and indeed other, populations are rather too general, so they obscure important specificities of experience. Gathering locally specific data about key groups of Muslims in relation to the impacts of counter-terrorism policies and practices should be seen as a priority, especially when the wider political and social context may be supportive of security approaches that focus on intelligence gathering and terrorism prevention initiatives being directed at Muslim populations. The importance of understanding the local context to violent radicalisation is a theme that underpins the work of Innes et al. (2007; 2011), Lambert (2010), Githens-Mazer & Lambert (2010) and Baker (2011), all of whom write about the significance of locales for identifying specific vulnerabilities.

When thinking about how to be more inclusive of minorities in the research that they do, social researchers have also raised the issue of whether minority ethnic researchers are best placed to understand the lived experiences of minority communities. Some argue that even as 'outsiders' researchers holding non-minority social identities and positions can legitimately study such issues, but that this requires active involvement with minority organisations and individuals in order to understand and portray their

worldviews and lifestyles (Gelsthorpe, 1993). Others, such as Papadopoulos and Lees (2002), argue that as 'insiders' minority researchers are better placed to do this work since they have greater awareness and understanding of minority issues and so can provide accounts of experiences and perceptions that are more genuine and legitimate. Spalek's (2005) work builds on a point raised by Gelsthorpe (1993), that in order to comprehend how racisms are produced this requires theoretical and personal reflexivity. Thus, Spalek (2005) highlights how a white, Eurocentric perspective has underpinned much feminist work, even though black women writers and researchers have, particularly since the 1980s, produced a large volume of work about their lives. Spalek (2005) argues that whilst some aspects of the researcher's self can be linked to marginalised, outsider positions, helping to produce oppositional knowledge, other aspects of a researcher's self-identity can serve to maintain and reproduce dominant power relations. Reflexivity is therefore a key aspect of researching with minorities, for this means that the researcher is reflecting upon their own multiple subject positions and how these may potentially be influencing the research process and the research data that is being gathered.

5.3 INCLUDING RACIAL, ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN COUNTER-TERRORISM RESEARCH POST 9/11

The above analysis is a short discussion of some of the ways in which researchers have utilised more inclusive approaches to minorities. Within a counter-terrorism research context, this raises the question of whether to be more inclusive of minorities' perceptions and experiences; is it important for researchers to take into account other issues that are of significance, over and above counter-terrorism policies and practices ? Being inclusive may mean researchers going beyond simply examining the impacts of counter-terrorism. This is because there is a real risk that issues of security that matter at the individual and community level, including experiences of violence, inter and intra community tensions, social and economic exclusion, racism and so forth, are overlooked through the state-led focus upon the prevention of terrorism. Indeed, according to Schmid (2007, pp. 13–14), "a disproportionately large number of European Muslims feel they are underprivileged. Not feeling accepted by host societies, some of the young Muslims have been radicalised by Muslim clerics who warned them against integration and offered them a Salafist or even jihadist version of Islam." It is therefore important to consider the structural experiences of alienation and marginalisation amongst Muslim minorities when researching counter-terrorism, to situate the impacts of counter-terrorism measures within a broader understanding and analysis of social and economic and other forms of exclusion. It may be that research should be interested in understanding the cumulative impact of exclusion and counter-terrorism policies and practices, rather than only specifically focusing on the latter.

Recent events and recent research (Kundnani 2012; Fekete 2012; Lehr 2013; Gable and Jackson 2011; Allen 2011; Lambert and Githens-Mazer, 2010; Lambert 2013) suggest that much anti-Muslim violence is not being systematically recorded and is not being taken sufficiently seriously by governments, security

services and police in countries throughout Western Europe. In addition to a neglect of criminal offences against Muslims and mosques that are generally thought of as 'hate crimes', there has also been a widespread failure to classify appropriate cases of serious violence against Muslims and mosques as terrorism and political violence. In a nutshell Islamophobia, in the sense of a failing to afford a fair and equal service to Muslims, has often had an adverse impact on Muslims when they have been the victims of serious crimes that would otherwise attract a priority response from police, security services and governments. In such difficult circumstances, Muslims are often exhorted to do more to root out violent extremism in their own communities while experiencing a lack of equal concern when far right extremists attack them.

In consequence, in addition to the fact that Europol's most recent Terrorism Situation and Trend Report (TE-SAT) shows the majority of recent terrorist attacks in Europe are linked not to Islamists but to separatist groups, we should add that a significant number of terrorist offences by the far-right either against Muslims, immigrants or (as in Breivik's case) against a state target inspired by an anti-Muslim agenda, are slipping beneath Europol's and all other official European radars.

A double failing ensues; a failure to afford due attention to anti-Muslim hate crimes in general and a failure to afford 'terrorism' status to appropriate crimes committed by far-right activists against Muslims, mosques and immigrants. Closely allied to this is an additional failure to treat non-violent far-right extremist groups such as the English Defence League (EDL) in the same way as non-violent extremist Muslim groups such as Hizb ut Tahrir (Lambert and Githens-Mazer 2010). Thus, in the UK, to be designated a 'non-violent extremist' Muslim organisation is to be deprived of legitimacy and status and to be subject to potential intrusive surveillance which, in the case of Hizb ut Tahrir, might arguably be justified but, when extended to mainstream Muslim organisations, becomes unjustified and counter-productive in terms of effective counter-terrorism (Lambert 2011a and b). Such unfair treatment towards Muslim organisations is compounded when far-right organisations that seek to intimidate Muslim communities are treated, or perceived to be treated, in an opposite way and with kid gloves.

Whilst terrorism is a phenomenon that can be found within wide-ranging social and political contexts, involving wide-ranging state and non-state actors, the particular counter-terrorism focus within the EU, US, Canada, Australia and other regions is very much on preventing Al Qaeda-linked terrorism, which means that Muslims, as racial, ethnic and religious minorities, have borne the brunt of counter-terrorism policies and practices. Post 9/11, from the very initial inception of the US-led response to Al Qaeda-linked terrorism, the language of war has been used, as well as orientalist discourse around the threat of Muslims to Western values. In the aftermath of 9/11, the US declared a 'War on Terror', which was very much shaped by President George Bush's political discourse against "those who envy Western values and

Western freedom"[2]. By taking this stand, not only did President Bush offend the feelings of Muslim populations around the world, he also recalled the history of some of the worst conflicts between the Christian and the Muslim worlds through reference to the Crusades[3]. Alongside the 'War on Terror', the notion of 'new terrorism' has entered into public discourse, used by security experts and government officials, whereby 'Islamist' terrorism was declared an unprecedented and unpredictable global danger. This has greatly contributed to the construction of Muslim minorities as 'suspect', necessitating their state surveillance and control (Mythen and Walklate 2006; Poynting and Mason 2008; Spalek and McDonald 2010). A number of researchers have argued that in the context of 'new terrorism', Muslim communities have become the new 'suspect communities' (Spalek, El-Awa & McDonald, 2009; Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009; Hickman & Silvestri, 2011; Choudhury & Fenwick, 2011). In a recent report by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in the UK, into the impact of counter-terrorism legislation on Muslim communities, it was highlighted that:

> "When it comes to experiences of counter-terrorism, Muslims and non-Muslims from the same local areas who participated in this research appear to live 'parallel lives'. Counter-terrorism measures are contributing to a wider sense among Muslims that they are being treated as a 'suspect community' and targeted by authorities simply because of their religion. Many participants, while not referring to specific laws or policies, felt that counter-terrorism law and policy generally was contributing towards hostility to Muslims by treating Muslims as a 'suspect group', and creating a climate of fear and suspicion towards them" (Choudhury & Fenwick: 2001: v).

Due to the breadth and depth of wide-ranging new laws and state powers in relation to the perceived threat from 'new terrorism', the potential to criminalise vast sections of Muslim communities has been highlighted (McGovern 2010). However, Greer (2010) has suggested that due to the diversity of the Muslim population in Britain, it is problematic to think about the experiences of some Muslims as equating to all Muslims being 'suspect'. Indeed, particular religious and political identities related to Islam, notably Salafists and Islamists, as well as specific ethnic groupings that intersect with Islam -in particular, Black Caribbean and African Muslim converts, and Pakistani, Yemeni and Somali ethnic Muslims- have been securitised. Securitisation is the instigation of emergency politics whereby a particular social issue that becomes securitised is responded to above and beyond established rules and frameworks that exist within what might be termed 'normal politics' (Jutila 2006). The breadth and remit of some of the counter-terrorism measures in the UK have generated considerable controversy. Whilst the dominant policy rhetoric may be that communities can be engaged and partnered in countering terrorism, in reality there is substantial journalistic and other commentary about the extensive 'use' of informants by the

[2] Bush's public speeches immediately following the 9/11 attacks e.g. Bush, George W. "Remarks upon arrival at the White House," September 16, 2001, White House News Releases, http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html# [19/12/08]
"President Bush, Colombia President Uribe Discuss Terrorism," September 25, 2002, White House News Releases , *http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020925-1.html* [19/1208]
[3] Bush, George W. "Remarks upon arrival at the White House," September 16, 2001, White House News Releases, *http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010916-2.html* [19/12/08]

police and security services (Kundnani, 2009). The lack of clarity over, and considerable debate regarding, the question of 'who is my enemy?' has contributed to a situation where some Muslims, who have partnered police agencies for counter-terrorism purposes, have found themselves simultaneously monitored by security and other agencies, and viewed as potential 'dangerous others' (Silk, O'Rawe & Spalek, 2013). Thus in a recent research report by Spalek & McDonald (2011), examining police and community engagement post 9/11, it was highlighted that:

> "In areas deemed at 'high risk' of violent extremism -by the authorities or communities- it is likely that both overt and covert policing is taking place. This creates a tension and challenge for community members who may be engaging with overt police officers whilst also believing that they are the subject of covert observation and other operations" (Spalek, & McDonald:2011:6).

The dominance of 'new terrorism' discourse within security strategies by states raises the question of whether it is at all appropriate to conduct any research with or about Muslim communities in relation to questions of security, for there is a danger that such research will be used in order to further promote and propagate state-led agendas which may at times involve the violation or suspension of human rights, particularly those of Muslim minorities. However, it may be the case that within a 'new terrorism' context, a context often characterised by fear, suspicion and distrust between Muslim communities and the state, there is space for critical scholarship, not only to challenge those state-led agendas that are inappropriate but also to consider ways in which communities can be empowered within the context of a response to 'new terrorism', exploring dynamics between communities and the state that can be characterised as being based on trust and partnership, where these exist (Spalek, 2010; 2011).

The wider context referred to above is likely to have had an impact on the nature and extent of trust between researchers and members of Muslim communities. It may be that trust between academics and Muslim communities has been eroded, particularly as 'new terrorism' has generated an unprecedented level of interest in Muslim communities. Researchers can be viewed as being part of wider state-led dynamics who do little to empower specific communities, especially those communities deemed suspect and constituting part of the problem of 'new terrorism'. Individuals may feel that, while 'new terrorism' in relation to Muslims has been over-researched, community-focused concerns over issues such as racism and/or Islamophobia have been under-researched. Indeed, the 'new terrorism' context might be considered to be a 'low trust' environment (Spalek, 2010). It may therefore be the case that to be inclusive of the perceptions and experiences of Muslim minorities, it is of critical importance for researchers to build trust with potential participants.

One aspect to trust-building that features in the research literature, is that of the interpersonal characteristics of the researcher and researched, and the notion of reflexivity. As highlighted in the previous section, increasingly within discussions of insider and outsider status there is an acknowledgment of the multiple identities that both researcher and researched occupy, so that it is argued that, while some

aspects of a researcher's identity might help to establish rapport and trust, and to gain access to research participants, other aspects of that identity might work against them (Garland et al., 2006). Reflecting upon the researchers' as well as the participants' multiple identities is therefore a critical part of researching within very sensitive contexts, as a post 9/11 counter-terrorism context is. This is a powerful mechanism through which to non-essentialise individuals who are taking part in research; this can serve to create knowledge that moves beyond essentialist discourses and thereby effectively challenge the wider essentialising discourse of 'new terrorism' and its potential to homogenise all Muslims. Indeed, according to Body-Gendrot (2007), Muslims, as a faith community, are deemed an 'at risk' group, with little attention paid to the complexities of multiple communities, or to differentiating between a terrorist threat and Muslims in general.

As a further way of building trust, it is important for researchers to be open and honest about the research project they are undertaking with participants, and to fully disclose what body is funding the research (Spalek, 2011). It is also important, and especially within particularly sensitive contexts, for researchers to develop contingent trust with participants, which is about researchers engaging in activities that serve to demonstrate their trustworthiness (Goldsmith, 2005). Researchers can have access to various social and economic resources, for example, obtaining research money through various research councils and other funding bodies, writing academic and other publications, and being invited to present papers at various conferences. Reciprocity may be one way of building contingent trust; for minority/Muslim communities to work with researchers, it is important for researchers to reciprocate efforts by helping communities tackle issues of concern to them. This may involve helping organisations write material that helps them access resources, or it may involve including community members as co-authors of various academic, policy-oriented and other publications. Through building contingent trust in this way it may then become possible to develop implicit trust, which is a more advanced type of trust that can be found in committed, stable relationships (Goldsmith, 2005). Through building implicit trust between the researcher and researched it may be possible to create working partnerships for future work that has the core aims of generating new research as well as empowering research participants. Developing implicit trust is especially important if attempting to access Muslim minorities who have, in particular, been linked to 'new terrorism'; Salafi and Islamist groupings, alongside Somali, Yemeni and Pakistani Muslims (Spalek, 2011).

Building contingent and implicit trust between researchers and researched within the context of 'new terrorism' may be an important vehicle through which to develop a 'methodology of attentiveness' so as to create "an engaged ethnographic process wherein researcher and subjects of study come to share, at least in part, in the lived reality of crime and criminality" (Hamm: 2005: 243). This is an important point, given that within counter-terrorism arenas research has often been dominated by state-centric perspectives founded on secondary sources and lacking the input of primary data collection and analysis. For this reason, the traditional practice of terrorism studies has been criticised for being analytically and

methodologically weak, for relying too heavily on secondary information and for failing to understand terrorism and counter-terrorism through the perspectives and experiences of practitioners and those experiencing state repression (Breen Smyth, 2007; Jackson, 2007).

Linked to the above, how to go about accessing and researching individuals from those minority communities that traditionally have not engaged with wider society is an important question. This issue is made all the more challenging within a counter-terrorism context, a secretive and sensitive arena. Baker (2011) stresses the importance of using a participant observer's insider perspective, which he draws on to examine a convert community's approach to tackling violent extremism during the early 1990s to 2009. Baker (2011) argues that his community of orthodox Salafists have been labelled as extremists due to their adherence to the orthodox Salafist branch of Islam. Baker (2011) further suggests that the inability of many authors to obtain sufficient primary empirical data from this particular, very insular, section of the Muslim community leaves a significant knowledge gap which has failed to record the experience of British Salafi Muslims in addressing violent extremism. For Baker (2011), a way of generating primary research data from amongst hidden or ostracised communities is through the involvement of community and practitioner 'insiders' who may have access to individuals and experiences that counter-terrorism academics may not have any access to. Lambert (2011) also provides an 'insider account' of the work that he engaged in as a counter-terrorism police officer. Being a former practitioner, this enabled Lambert (2011) to have access to data not normally available to academics. This discussion raises the question of whether involving community members and practitioners in the collection of sensitive data might be a sensible approach to take when researching the impacts of counter-terrorism policies and practices. It is also worth highlighting a recent study by Lister and Jarvis (2012). Lister and Jarvis (2012) used focus group discussions as their main methodological approach when researching citizenship and counter-terrorism. Lister and Jarvis (2012) argue that the focus group approach can offer considerable methodological advantages over competing research strategies. These include the ability to analyse group dynamics that evolve within vernacular conversations, a capacity to study the flexibility of articulated perspectives, an opportunity for exploring shared sources of knowledge within different communities (and differences across them), and offering scope for, "providing insights into the sources of complex behaviours and motivations". Lister and Jarvis (2012) used open-ended questions so as to maximise the extent to which individuals' own attitudes came to the fore. Participants were asked to discuss how they felt anti-terrorism measures impacted upon themselves, their communities, and the UK more widely. Importantly, Lister and Jarvis (2012) included non-Muslim minorities in their study, as they were interested in discovering whether there are differences between non-Muslim communities and their experiences of counter-terrorism measures, and whether non-Muslim ethnic minorities (black communities in particular, with their difficult historical relationship with policing due to the use of inappropriate policing tactics) feel similarly targeted by the current raft of anti-terrorism measures.

5.4 KEY POINTS

- Critical perspectives within the social sciences offer some important insights into the challenges and issues that arise when involving individuals from minority racial, ethnic or religious groups in research. Critical scholarship emphasises that the perceptions and experiences of minorities are often marginalised by social scientific discourse and by wider society.
- Within this post-modern paradigm there has been a critique of 'catch-all' racial and ethnic classifications like 'Black', 'Asian' or 'Black and Minority Ethnic' (BME) when researching 'race'/ethnicity in relation to crime, victimisation and other social issues, for these serve to obscure the distinct experiences of specific racial and ethnic and/or religious groups.
- Phillips and Bowling (2003) advocate adopting a method that documents people's specific experiences but which acknowledges that aspects of these can be shared by other minorities due to broader structures of 'race', ethnicity, religion and so forth; so-called 'unities within diversity'.
- Within the perspectival realist approach, it is important to gain access to those people who occupy marginalised positions, as through the narratives that these individuals tell about their lives it may be possible to develop a critical understanding of the social world, since people in disempowered positions can bring insights into, and shed light upon, dominant social processes that serve to create and perpetuate discrimination and oppression.
- It would seem logical to suggest that it is important for research to focus on specific locales in which counter-terrorism policies and practices have been disproportionately targeted. For example, in the Birmingham area in Britain, this would mean a focus on the Alum Rock and Sparkhill areas. Importantly, it would be important to access young Muslim men aged between 16 and 24 from within these locales (as quantitative evidence would suggest that this group has low trust levels in the police) in order to properly understand their grievances in relation to policing and counter-terrorism policing, to ensure that there is evidence-based policy and practice within specific local areas.
- Reflexivity is a key aspect of researching with minorities, for this means that the researcher is reflecting upon his/her own multiple subject positions and how these may potentially be influencing the research process and the research data that is being gathered.
- Being inclusive may mean researchers going beyond simply examining the impacts of counter-terrorism. This is because there is a real risk that issues of security that matter at the individual and community level -including experiences of violence, inter and intra community tensions, social and economic exclusion, racism and so forth- are overlooked through the state-led focus upon the prevention of terrorism.
- It may be that research should be interested in understanding the cumulative impact of exclusion and counter-terrorism policies and practices rather than only specifically focusing on the latter.

- It may be that trust between academics and Muslim communities has been eroded, particularly as 'new terrorism' has generated an unprecedented level of interest in Muslim communities.
- It is important for researchers to be open and honest about the research project they are undertaking with participants, and to fully disclose what body is funding the research. It is also important, and especially within particularly sensitive contexts, for researchers to develop trust with participants, which is about researchers engaging in activities that serve to demonstrate their trustworthiness. A way of generating primary research data from amongst hidden or ostracised communities can be through the involvement of community and practitioner 'insiders' who may have access to individuals and experiences that counter-terrorism academics may not have any access to.
- It may be important to include non-Muslim minorities in any study, as it might be worth discovering whether there are differences between non-Muslim communities and their experiences of counter-terrorism measures, and whether non-Muslim ethnic minorities feel similarly targeted by the current raft of anti-terrorism measures.

5.5 QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- To what extent is it possible to gain specific data relating to the use of counter-terrorism powers for specific minorities? For example, is nuanced data available according to ethnicity, age, gender, and religious and political strands within Islam and the use of counter-terrorism powers?
- Is it possible to gather information on, or is there available data on the use of, counter-terrorism powers and local, specific areas? Moreover, what are the intersections between age, gender and local areas in relation to understanding the impacts of counter-terrorism measures? For example, it might be worth focusing on Muslim men aged between 16 and 24 from within areas that have experienced a disproportionate use of counter-terrorism policing and powers.
- To what extent should the notion of reflexivity be adopted in any research that is undertaken? This involves the researcher reflecting upon his/her own multiple subject positions and how these may potentially be influencing the research process and the research data that is being gathered.
- How might a study focusing on the impacts of counter-terrorism measures include issues of security that matter at the individual and community level, including hate crimes, Islamophobia, inter and intra community tensions, social and economic exclusion, racism and so forth ?
- How might trust be built between researchers and research participants, given the sensitive area of study being undertaken?
- How might community members and practitioners be involved in the collection of sensitive data?
- What qualitative approaches might be taken to understanding the impacts of counter-terrorism measures? Semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, case studies?

- Might non-Muslim minorities be included, to see whether non-Muslim ethnic minorities feel similarly targeted by the current raft of anti-terrorism measures?

VI. Issues relating to ethics of research

Many ethical issues appear in the sections above and so for the purposes of this section, a summary of some of the key ethical issues that have been identified so far will be presented.

6.1 ETHICAL ISSUES OVER DEFINITIONS OF TERRORISM

Critical terrorism studies and perspectives authors consider that the majority of terrorism definitions lack rigour and are partial in that they relate to Western interests (Jackson, 2007). Jackson (2008, p.28) also believes that it is impossible to objectively define terrorism, because it 'lacks a clear ontological status'. Definitions may also exclude states as possible perpetrators. This is an important point, for understanding any impacts of counter-terrorism measures on minorities may be problematic if some individuals from within those minorities perceive their experiences of counter-terrorism as a form of state-perpetrated terrorism.

6.2 ETHICAL ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PRACTICALITIES OF DOING RESEARCH ON TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

Those practical and ethical issues that make collecting empirical data challenging include the researcher's security, a difficulty in accessing subjects, and the large amount of time and resources needed to arrange, conduct and analyse interviews (Kleinman and Copp, 1993; Silke, 2001). Research on terrorism can also raise various emotions (fear, condemnation, even compassion) in the researcher (Silke, 2001; Toros, 2008), and so when managing teams of researchers exploring the impacts of counter-terrorism measures it is important to consider how this research is impacting on those involved in collecting data. Emotional and practical and other kinds of support must be provided. Furthermore, it is important to consider how access to government and community data sources will be arranged.

6.3 ETHICAL ISSUES IN RELATION TO TRUST

The post 9/11 'War on Terror' context may be one characterised by suspicion, and so it may be key for researchers to build trust with research participants. It is therefore important for researchers to be honest and transparent with research participants as to the aims of the project and the methods used (Gilham, 2005; Kvale, 2007; Macfarlane, 2010). It is also important to be clear about the purposes for which the project is being undertaken. For Baker (2011), a way of generating primary research data from amongst hidden or ostracised communities is through the involvement of community and practitioner 'insiders'

who may have access to individuals and experiences that counter-terrorism academics may not have any access to. This is also an approach taken by Lambert (2011), a former counter-terrorism practitioner.

6.4 ETHICAL ISSUES IN RELATION TO RESEARCHER REFLEXIVITY

It is important for researchers to be reflexive practitioners themselves and to ask searching questions about whether their work is contributing to the assessment of the real threat of terrorism and the effectiveness of counter-terrorism measures, and impacting on the state's discourses, or whether the research is potentially contributing to the "reproduction and normalisation of the dominant discourse" of fear and terror (Smyth, 2007, p.261)? It is also important for researchers to reflect upon the consequences of their work and how to negotiate potentially challenging power structures. How do researchers seek objectivity and minimise the potential of allowing undue privilege to certain points of view (i.e., governments over communities)? How can researchers strike a reasonably objective balance between prioritising the security mission of the state and protecting the rights and will of the people? There is also the ethical question of whether to be more inclusive of minorities' perceptions and experiences, is it important for researchers to take into account other issues that are of significance, over and above counter-terrorism policies and practices? Being inclusive may mean researchers going beyond simply examining the impacts of counter-terrorism. This is because there is a real risk that issues of security that matter at the individual and community level -including experiences of violence, inter and intra community tensions, social and economic exclusion, racism and so forth- are overlooked through the state-led focus upon the prevention of terrorism.

VII. Involvement of key stakeholders

Within the realm of community and stakeholder outreach work with communities on matters relating to counter-terrorism, words such as 'community consultation', 'partnership led', 'collaboration' and 'community organisation' are increasingly used interchangeably by the UK Government in its official documents (Home Office 2011), to positively indicate the preferred notion that communities are the front line in fighting the scourge of terrorism and extremism. This shift has been noted by its delivery partners (Home Office 2008 and Home Office 2011) in terms of how the government's partnership work with key stakeholders is implemented and structured, and how different types of mechanisms can be utilised to ensure community involvement to secure a broad response, and a type of community consent, in the fight against terror.

Admittedly, there are a few caveats that apply in this paper; whilst the overall recommendations and suggested strategies may be laid out by the national government in its Prevent strategy with the tacit approval and strategic guidelines detailed through national bodies such as the Home Office, ACPO, DCLG and so forth, much of the delivery does differ from region to region. This section will seek to

provide an overview that captures broader experiences in the counter-terrorism arena and particularly of Muslim communities' experience[4]. Such observations will draw on the fact that mechanisms of Prevent have evolved from its first delivery phase (2008-11) and the current delivery phase (2011 -) and as partnerships adjust in a climate where less resources are being provided.

Within the counter-terrorism realm three key stakeholder groups will be referred to; the broad spectrum of Muslim communities[5], the police and public agencies such as local authorities who have prescribed Prevent roles.

7.1 BACKGROUND

Representation and confidence issues played out more challengingly for communities when it came to partnership work in Prevent's first phase. With the backdrop of headlines emerging after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in America, the 7/7 London underground bombs and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, a common feeling that emerged in community discourse was often that of a war being waged by the US/UK governments on Muslims as punishment for the professed faith of the 9/11 terrorists. In the UK, this feeling became further compounded with the Forest Gate incident involving two Muslim brothers (June 2006), the police shooting of the Brazilian Jean Charles de Menezes while travelling on the London Underground (July 2005) and the 2007 plot to behead a British Muslim soldier in Birmingham[6], when plots, numerous arrests of Muslim suspects, the involvement of police and the intelligence community, and media attention led to widespread feelings of fear and victimisation becoming more localised. More so in the sense that, as Muslim communities felt targeted and more visible, the competing pressures to have to do something led some to feel that disengagement from a government-led (Prevent) process was no longer an option, especially when government stakeholders and local police forces became more involved (House of Commons: CLG Select Committee 2010). The outline below shows how such processes unfolded.

7.2 ISSUES TO CONSIDER

Identifying partners: the community or the stakeholder?

There is a need to better define the difference between stakeholders and communities, as both words are used interchangeably. Understanding this within the counter-terrorism arena helps, as it gives a better understanding of why consultations need to happen, which individuals are important and which are required, and allows a more refined approach in acquiring knowledge of local dynamics. The stakeholder might be viewed as being the individual who is engaged and engaging by virtue of their professional or

[4] In the Government's counter-terrorism strategy -also known as the Prevent- it is recognised that the greater threat is from Al Qaeda inspired acts.
[5] This incorporates the wider spectrum of race, ethnicity, gender and the broader strands of Islam etc.
[6] Terri, J 2008, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/man-admits-plot-to-behead-british-muslim-soldier-775588.html

community interests, and the community is the collective or the group they can be identified with based on geography, ethnicity, police, local authority or religious group, amongst others.

Whilst there are some excellent and positive definitions of communities, some caution against seeing communities as an absolute solution to societal problems needs to be factored in. Communities are often seen as neat subsections of a row of terraced houses, within which order, hierarchy and care are maintained for the purpose of mutual harmony and understanding. Communities or the notion of belonging or neatly being identified with a particular group (or faith group) is, by itself, a romanticised version that can imply an innocence of righteousness. Often, this is due to a perceived collective identity, and through the notion that the will of the majority is expressed through community leaders, leaders that wider society has not had a role in creating. The job of these leaders is to reflect the selfless desire to protect one's own community, as they are seen to have an ownership of insight in providing answers and solutions, which outsiders may not always consider.

In reality, communities, by their very nature, remain complex; this further differs from what a stakeholder can be. Whilst communities are fluid, stakeholders are those with a real interest in the outcome of any decisions they have a stake or interest in; quite often by being heavily involved themselves either directly or indirectly. Stakeholders are often seen as individuals who are able to articulate differing opinions, but quite often these may reflect a variety of views without knowing what the definitive course of action may be. This is why real partnership-led work involving diverse local stakeholders , local authorities and police is very important and must underpin counter-terrorism work, even if that means working with personalities that aren't liked but have leadership reach within their community.

As consultation and outreach work is underpinned by a high level of trust and confidence between people (and organisations) -especially if prior relationships were not already in place- perceived deception and rumour can quickly undo a lot of this hard work which requires constant maintenance (Thornton 2010). Stakeholders may often grapple with the following points:

- 'I want to work in partnership with organisations such as the police, local authority or named persons as I want to protect my community'.
- 'I want to have input at the table as I am a community representative/leader'.
- 'I do not want to accept any Prevent related funding, but I may interact with counter-terrorism officers'.
- 'Do I trust the police and do I have confidence in how they work?'
- 'Are the police targeting Muslim communities due to the high number of stop-and-searches and the high level of terrorist arrests impacting on this group?'
- 'How do I ensure the police remain accountable to the community?'

- 'Are the police only interested in policing the political and religious thoughts of a particular ethnic/religious group? What about the threat from the far-right?'
- 'How do I test the notion of partnership working and accountability?'
- 'By cooperating with counter-terrorism police, will I be perceived as a "sell out" to my community?'

Whilst many of these questions reflect a sense of fear (founded and unfounded), specifically of the police, the need to occupy the space of inaction and distance is important for all partners to consider if credibility and trust are to be important facets.

Mechanisms for involvement[7]: gauging or measuring?

Listed below are some examples of the types of counter-terrorism engagement tools primarily designed to engage local communities within the UK[8] by regional police forces and local authorities. It is important to note that partnership mechanisms around Prevent have continued to evolve since 1998 based on local experiences, understanding what does and does not work and by re-establishing the purpose and rationale behind groups in order to establish trust and confidence principles from the outset.

The diversity of consultation tools reflects that no one formula can be, and should be, used to consult. Different mechanisms function in two key ways; gauging views or measuring opinions. Depending on the type of stakeholder involvement, engagement can exist to gauge opinions and smaller consultation meetings can act as a barometer to measure opinions, as a tool to challenge and engage. Engagement can also act as a form of influence by both the police and local authority, so that they can understand the nature of whom they need to engage, who they must engage and how to share wider messages with the wider community.

Mechanisms used by the police

Counter-terrorism police tend to use approved and existing practices based on what works, and what existing mainstream procedures and boundaries may already be in place[9]. Where possible, police forces are encouraged to build in partnership work using existing force-wide mechanisms and networks to minimise replication.

Examples are:

- Key Information Network (KIN)

[7] Many of the actual names of groups in this section vary from region to region and refers the reader to the general UK picture.
[8] Whilst the revised Prevent strategy addresses all forms of extremism, most consultation and engagement mechanisms still overwhelmingly concentrate on building relationships with Muslim communities.

[9] An example is the guidance documents provided by National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA)

KIN's are often mass-collated names of local people, constituency based, who are seen as key active individuals whose details are stored on a police database with the idea that if details of an event, arrest or information need to be mobilised quickly within communities by the police, then the KIN's would be informed e.g. via emails or text messages. Since the start of Prevent, many of the previous names have been refreshed using current knowledge of local police officers, and replaced with the names of relevant stakeholders and residents. The KIN's primary role is to help communicate with communities, advise and support in providing reassurance[10], and act as 'critical friends' to help tailor responses to community needs.

- Independent Advisory Group[11] (IAG)

  IAG's are consultative community groups made up of key local individuals whose primary function is to assist in providing strategic tactical assistance to develop solutions to reduce crime such as race and faith hate crime, and countering the threat of terrorism. Within the counter-terrorism realm, IAG's have been established in order to address trust and confidence within which communities feel the policing relationship is being affected. The groups are requisitioned to meet around specific topics with a defined purpose as opposed to being a general consultation group per se. Senior police officers recognise that, as this needs to be a partnership-led service, senior officer involvement and community buy-in are important factors in making the groups work[12].

- Channel Panels

  Channel[13] is a controversial national scheme established to support those individuals vulnerable to recruitment by violent extremists using the resources and experience of professionals who provide an ongoing support package. Described as a multi-agency process with a diverse grouping involving police, social services, health, youth offending team workers and community individuals, the group is mostly chaired by a local authority employee or a community person with sensitive case details provided by the police. Whilst some Channel Panels have community involvement, issues around security clearance, data protection (around legislative impact), confidentiality and extent of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks means police nervousness due to the sensitive casework data of vulnerable individuals being shared in a non-police domain, even if they are counter-terrorism partners (Kundnani 2009).

- Counter-terrorism local profiles (CTLP's)

  This is primarily a resource filled with counter-terrorism information around current threats by the police that contains intelligence and detailed assessment of local vulnerabilities on a ward-by-

[10] In the early days of Prevent, communities expressed their concern about media groups often turning up enmasse on their doorsteps when CT arrests were about to be made leading to anger, hostility and feelings of media intrusion. Depending on the operational sensitivities, KIN's are now usually informed of imminent CT arrests minutes before the media press release to enable planning and clear information flows.

[11] Also referred to as Community Reference Groups

[12] Some examples of IAG's are targeted groups such as the "Airport Reference Group (In one force area, this stakeholder group dealt with concerns relating to the disproportionate stop and searches affecting British Pakistani Muslim groups and airport scanners)

[13]http://www.acpo.police.uk/ACPOBusinessAreas/PREVENT/NationalChannelReferralFigures.aspx

ward basis. Previously, full access was granted only to police personnel, but current guidance issued is seeking to encourage police to widen access [14] to key approved strategic partners, but again, only on a need-to-know basis.

- (Toolkit) Community sessions

  These are specially designed interactive consequence management exercises developed by the ACPO Prevent delivery unit, often for a range of stakeholders around the topic of counter-terrorism for police, communities and targeted stakeholder partnership networks. Using real-time, scenario-based issues in a table-top exercise format, the purpose is to encourage communities and statutory partners to understand the difficulties around police dynamic decision making tools, whilst helping communities to discuss and understand the difficulties of working in a threat, vulnerability and risk situation.

- Muslim Contact Unit (MCU)

  The MCU is a unique, stand-alone organisation set up by the UK Metropolitan Police, staffed by specialist Muslim and non-Muslim police officers who identify and work with local Muslim individuals, community groups and organisations in London to engage on the Prevent agenda. For external police forces, the MCU is not seen as a positive example that should be replicated in their areas, as they feel that it operates too independently of the Metropolitan police force by not sharing its information, lacking accountability and often being seen to be too empathetic to Muslim community concerns.[15] This view is not shared by many grassroots Muslim community organisations which feel that the MCU does not carry the stigma and problems often associated with the Metropolitan police.

Mechanisms used by the Local Authority

- Prevent Board or Local Authority Strategic Board

  Usually set up as a strategic delivery group and chaired by a senior figure or elected member from the local authority, the delivery group is represented by figures from the local authority, police, community groups, health bodies, universities and prisons. As local authorities are conduits for national government funding for locally commissioned projects, the delivery group provides oversight and accountability over the systems used for commissioning projects as well as subsequent transparency of process. Their role is to oversee the local delivery of Prevent in accordance with the three strategic objectives of Prevent and the guidance set by the national strategy. The board is multi-agency and has citywide responsibility. The delivery group is also a

[14] In order that local partnership work can become more aligned.

critical conduit between the Home Office, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and other government departments.

- Local Community Safety Panel
  The principle objective of the panel is to provide a strategic assessment on all community safety matters affecting local residents. Objectives are rated on a priority level by partners sitting on the group. Most authorities utilise and incorporate CTLP information which enables Prevent safety objectives to be mainstreamed in local safety planning processes.
- Prevent Operational Group
  In light of the revised Prevent changes, some local authorities have established an operational working group that brings together leads from the different service areas and partnerships to coordinate Prevent delivery on behalf of the Prevent Board. The working group is intended to act as a collective partnership hub providing up-to-date information on risks and vulnerabilities related to Prevent. The group remains an internal knowledge hub for the local authority and its partners with accurate and up-to-date information being provided via the police and the Office for Security and Counter Terrorism at the Home Office. It is responsible for identifying gaps and opportunities for the delivery of awareness-raising products and contributing to wider workforce development in the field of Prevent.
- Local Delivery Group (LDG)
  These are localised constituency-targeted and partnership-led groups involving key local people and diverse faith groups under the umbrella of the local authority. They have good community involvement of Muslim and non-Muslim partners, police and local stakeholders, and the meetings are led by a staff member from the local authority.
- Community events
  Many local authorities have taken the lead in keeping their communities informed of the Prevent agenda by holding open sessions in a variety of venues to ensure community awareness and community fears can be addressed publicly. As time has progressed and as funding has diminished, many local authorities tend not to hold big events, but communicate through smaller existing community networks or convene one-off network meetings when required.

Whilst diverse mechanisms used by both the police and local authority have been outlined above, further research exploring the reach, effectiveness and detailed analysis of four specific mechanisms needs to be explored. These are Channel Panels, CTLP's, Local Authority Strategic Board. This is especially important, since many of these counter-terrorism structures have been operating in local areas for over three years with a significant number of locally-engaged communities and stakeholder input, but with very little evaluative open source data available.

The work of IAG's and Prevent operational groups also requires urgent research because, again, there exists very little analytical information that explores wider trust and confidence issues as well as the

availability of more critical information to explore if the partnership is top-down in style, the type of information shared and the effectiveness of accountability within its structures. In effect, the question remains: who is accountable to whom in the absence of a clear framework?

Issues to be borne in mind

With counter-terrorism issues having a significantly different impact on different stakeholders, there can be a natural tendency to sometimes opt for a top-down management style (in both the police and local authority) in order to prioritise targets and delivery timeframes over partnership work, undoing the hard work of attempting to build solid relationships. Some of these challenges are inescapable realities of the wider political impact, but useful to discuss if only to emphasise the challenges of considering communities -and especially wider Muslim minority communities- as critical partners in making these types of programmes successful.

However, two key tendencies need to be borne in mind when undertaking stakeholder work. Firstly, that if partnership work is to succeed, then some dissent needs to be understood in a non-criminal context, as working with communities can expose a huge array of opinion and opposing tendencies; the challenge being to find middle-ground views. Secondly, to recognise the role of connectors[16] -those individuals who are able to negotiate and navigate the complexity of community memberships- so that they are better utilised as a tool by police and local authorities, as a positive way of humanising counter-terrorism relationships and recognising the oft-unrecognised work of mid-to-lower ranking officials (Limbada and Silk 2012).

The three points below consider some of the more general difficulties and issues that tend to arise within the partnership and engaged 'connectors' arena.

i) The type of police-stakeholder relationship

The role of counter-terrorism has complicated the simplicity for some people in terms of how the Muslim community had its relationship with the government and the police politicised and securitised (House of Commons: CLG Select Committee 2010) post 9/11 and post 7/7 by seeing relationships with the police being framed within a 'policed community' context, as the numbers of stop-and-searches, media arrests of Muslims by counter-terrorism officers is seen through the lens of terrorism. Some people feel a slight unease at working with the police as they feel the police use partnership work as a veil to conduct spying on the community, by adding the thin veneer of respectable partnership.

The other key local stakeholder is often local authorities. Their importance is reflected in a number of ways and none more so than in how they are seen as the legitimate counter-balance to the power of the police, a wider coordinator of community views and the facilitator of relationships between communities

and the government[17]. Whilst the police are seen as the enforcers of government legislation, local authorities are not, which gives them some neutrality in not being attached to a police tag.

ii) Maintaining partnership legitimacy through better information sharing

In any democratic society, communities function around leaders and activists whose role is to demand goals that better improve their community outcomes and address perceived wrongs. Within the counter-terrorism arena, partnership challenges can occur when partners treat such tensions with suspicion, or when there are attempts made to control tensions without addressing core issues. Previous experiences have indicated that, whilst most engaged organisations recognise the importance of stakeholder involvement, continued suspicion around the other partner's agenda still remains a worry for many individuals and activists. Communities continue to feel that the police are more interested in gathering intelligence and awareness of community counter-terrorism issues, and are less inclined towards sharing real information, catching criminals per se or addressing perceived negative injustices around disproportionate impact of stop-and-search on Asian members[18].

Whilst good practices continue through the regular usage of specialised mechanisms like community forum meetings, trust and confidence /Independent Advisory Group meetings, and airport stop-and-search meetings, where smaller groups of individuals are able to directly challenge police on community concerns, the flow of information around why stop-and-search impacts on Asian Muslim communities continues to rise, or how threats around XFR are being proportionately policed, and better public data around interventions works, needs to be publicly shared. The point being that, whilst partnership work requires good dialogue, the absence of shared information (non-operational data) means that one partner retains more power or control over the vital currency of information they have, whilst the other partner relies on waiting for national headlines to better understand the bigger picture.

iii) Covert or overt relationships

For partnership delivery to succeed, active partnerships, especially between the police, local authorities (and other statutory partners) and communities have to been seen as a critical component in gaining legitimacy and acceptance. This functions in two ways. Firstly, there are the formal, visible partnership meetings where stakeholders meet to exchange views, receive information, share platforms and publicly share the key message of partnership engagement. Secondly, specifically policing and engagement tools have got to be absolutely transparent and clear in ensuring sensitive information is kept separate, if partnership work is intended to be successful.

[17] This role was previously played by the Government Offices of the regions but since 2010 these were abolished by the current coalition government. Whist local authorities operate within their city boundaries, the police are responsible for functions in the regional area.
[18] http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/may/23/counter-terror-stop-search-minorities

7.3 SUMMARY

When trying to understand the involvement of key stakeholders within the counter-terrorism realm, it is important to recognise that credibility is the most fragile asset. Working in the counter-terrorism arena where suspicion and mistrust are mutual allies, transparency and localised solutions based around partnership frameworks are pivotal in addressing some of these issues.

7.4 KEY POINTS

- Whilst the government has sought to address the concern around the 'securitisation' of policing relationships with Muslim communities, through making local authority partners a more important feature in the revised Prevent strategy, much of the power that affects and criminalises communities through prosecution and breakage of law ultimately resides with the police.
- Partnership work between local police, communities and stakeholders is an essential tool in countering suspicion, and in building mutually effective alliances. Better regard to transparency, legal dissent and fairness should be key operational values.
- Whilst partnership relies on one agency having an overall coordination role, partnership also recognises that decision-making functions need to be shared.
- Depending on the type of stakeholder involvement, engagement can exist to gauge opinions, and smaller consultation meetings can act as a barometer to measure opinions as a tool to challenge and engage.
- Not to utilise the same readily available and engaged partners at all decision making tables and the importance of engaging with critical voices.
- Ensure that overt (Prevent) and covert (Pursue) resources are kept separate and that public meetings are not utilised for intelligence-gathering.
- Agencies and their officers need to ensure that they are not there to police private and political thoughts and that the focus is on criminality and protecting communities.
- Not every member of the community wishes to engage around counter-terrorism issues and so awareness around locally-engaged leadership has to be critical.

7.5 QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- How are community partners and stakeholders identified within a trust and confidence context? Who defines when trust is high and low when communities and stakeholders are so diverse?
- Are community consultation tools a sign that police and communities better understand their roles in overt counter-terrorism relationships?
- Explore how dissent can be positively analysed and understood in a counter-terrorism context.

VIII. Summary: General discussion

8.1 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES

Are we to view terrorism as a definition, or as a concept, and therefore a social construct? This will influence how we approach the study of counter-terrorism. Are we approaching the study of the impacts of counter-terrorism as a study involving an analysis of any data that exists as to how key counter-terrorism measures are being implemented across Europe and whether there is, for example, statistical disproportionality in relation to the use of such measures upon minority communities? What differences are there between different countries in Europe regarding the disproportionality of counter-terrorism measures on minority communities? Is it possible to gain access to data and are we comparing like with like? It may be that different European contexts have different policies and practices, raising questions about whether comparative research can be undertaken. There may also be vast differences between recording practices between different European states as to how minority identities are conceptualised, thereby further complicating any comparative research that might be undertaken. It is important to note that within quantitative data on counter-terrorism measures, the intersectionality of groupings within any population is not accounted for, so that nuances relating to multiple differentiating factors such as ethnicity, religious sect, cultural attitudes, gender and age, which, in combination, may create great variations or subtle nuance, are not represented. This is of particular relevance to understanding Muslim community attitudes to counter-terrorism policing; at the most fundamental level, there is a lack of research around the subject, which has resulted in a dearth of methodologically appropriate quantitative data. For understanding issues in the context of counter-terrorism policing, this presents a particular challenge; while 'average' attitudes recorded within Muslim communities may be available within national data sets, it is clear that these may be less important than specific populations with whom counter-terrorism measures may have greater interest or contact.

8.2 QUALITATIVE ANALYSES

Are we also concerned to understand, rather than simply to measure, the impacts of counter-terrorism upon minority communities? How do we go about understanding any impacts? This would suggest drawing upon a qualitative approach that would complement the largely statistics-based approach identified above. Key questions regarding impacts would need to be identified and explored. For example, are counter-terrorism practices helping to generate fear and terror within certain sections of minorities across Europe and how might we go about documenting this? The fear of crime is a concept that has generated much criminological debate and research in terms of how to go about conceptualising and measuring this. Fear in relation to counter-terrorism measures is likely to be just as problematic. It may be that particular political, religious, ethnic, age and gender groups are seen as 'suspect' by authorities, and so gaining access to these groups to gather empirical data may be a priority. Research also

needs to take into consideration the multiplicity of identities, and therefore of experiences, in relation to understanding the impacts of counter-terrorism. Within catch-all phrases like Asian, Black, Muslim there are important cultural, religious, economic and other differences between people, and so if pursuing a 'minority perspective' in order to better understand any impacts of counter-terrorism measures on particular communities, underpinned by perspectival realism, it is important to explore counter-terrorism through the intersectionalities of 'race', gender, ethnicity, religion, class and so forth. It may also be important to think about this geographically; that there are areas across Europe in which counter-terrorism measures are particularly targeted. So it may be that any statistical analyses of counter-terrorism measures as highlighted above could involve looking at identifying those particular locations within cities across Europe which have experienced a disproportionate number of counter-terrorism measures and accessing individuals within those locations to be interviewed or to take part in focus group discussions or interviews. It may be that certain minorities are challenging to access and so it may be that a useful strategy is to include community and practitioner 'insiders' to help gather data. It is also important to consider whether to include non-Muslim minorities in any research study, as it may be worth exploring whether there are differences between non-Muslim communities and their experiences of counter-terrorism measures, and also, whether non-Muslim ethnic minorities feel similarly targeted by the current raft of counter-terrorism measures. The cumulative and experiential aspects to the use of counter-terrorism powers on specific racial, ethnic and religious minorities might also be considered. For example, a person of a racial, ethnic and/or religious group may be experiencing counter-terrorism powers and operations alongside racism, Islamophobia, social and economic exclusion and so it may be useful to examine the impact of counter-terrorism measures alongside other aspects of individuals' lives. It may be that a study could choose individuals as specific case studies in order to explore further how to understand counter-terrorism impacts in a more holistic way that takes into consideration other aspects of these individuals' lives. For example, in what ways are young Somali Muslims across Europe experiencing and perceiving counter-terrorism policies and strategies? How might we understand the impacts of counter-terrorism measures better on these young people by also taking into consideration broader economic, political and social factors that also impact on their lives? Also, is there a sense in which experiences and particular narratives are shared across particular diasporas within Europe?

This paper was written by Basia Spalek, Zubeda Limbada, Laura Zahra McDonald, Dan Silk and Raquel da Silva of ConnectJustice.

Further information on ConnectJustice: Our international team provides independent expertise to communities and states experiencing social and political conflicts. Our approach combines academic excellence with extensive practitioner experience in the fields of policing, security, grass-roots activism, psychology and integrative counselling, and is informed by our strong ethical framework and commitment to justice. www.connectjustice.org

Bibliography

Allen, C. (2011). Opposing Islamification or promoting Islamophobia? Understanding the English Defence League. *Patterns of Prejudice*. 45(4), pp. 279-294.

Ameli, S.R., Elahi, M. and Merali, A. (2004) *British Muslims' Expectations of Government – Social Discrimination: Across the Muslim Divide.* London: Islamic Human Rights Commission.

Amoore, L. and de Goede, M. (2005) 'Governance, Risk and Dataveillance in the War on Terror'. *Crime, Law & Social Change* 43: 149.

Bettison, N. (2009) 'Preventing Violent Extremism: A Police Response'. *Policing* 3(2): 129-138.

Baker, A. (2011) *Extremists in Our Midst: Confronting Terro*r Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Banks, C. (2008) Criminal justice ethics: theory and practice. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bassiouni, M. (2004) Terrorism: the persistent dilemma of legitimacy, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law,* 36, 299-306.

Beckford, J. (1996) 'Postmodernity, High Modernity and New Modernity: three concepts in search of religion' in: K.Flanagan & P.Jupp (eds) *Postmodernity, Sociology and Religion* Cambridge: Polity Press pp 30-47

Bennet, R. R. (2006). Comparative criminology and criminal justice research: The state of our knowledge. *Justice Quarterly, 21* (1), 1-21. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07418820400095721.

Blakeley, R. (2007) Bringing the state back into terrorism studies, *European Political Science,* 6, 228-235.

Body-Gendrot, S. (2008) 'Muslims: citizenship, security and social justice in France', International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 36, 4, pp. 247–56.

Breen Smyth, Marie. 2007. "A Critical Research Agenda for the study of Political Terror." *European Political Science* 6 (3): 260-267.

BRAH, A. (1996) CARTOGRAPHIES OF DIASPORA: CONTESTING IDENTITIES LONDON: ROUTLEDGE

MOHAMMAD, R. (1999), 'Marginalisation, Islamism and the Production of the Other's 'Other'', *Gender, Place and Culture,* 6/3: 221-240

Cain, M. (2000). Orientalism, occidentalism, and the sociology of crime. *British Journal of Criminology, 40*, 239-260. doi: 10.1093/bjc/40.2.239

Caraballo-Resto, J. (2006) 'The Rhetoric of Secularism among First Generation Muslim Migrants in Dundee' Paper presented at the 9th EASA Biennial Conference Bristol University September

Cesari, J. (2005) European Muslims and the Secular State (London, Ashgate Publishing).

Chan, J. (2005). Globalisation, reflexivity, and the practice of criminology. In Sheptycki, J, & Wardak, A. (Eds.), *Transnational and comparative criminology* (pp. 337-355). London: Glasshouse Press.

Change Institute (2009) *Understanding Muslim Ethnic Communities*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

Choudhury, T. & Fenwick, H. (2011) *The Impact of Counter-Terrorism Measures on Muslim Communities* London: Equality & Human Rights Commission

Choudhury, Tufyal 2010. *Muslims in Europe: A Report on 11 EU Cities*. New York: Open Society Institute.

Collins, P. (1998) *Fighting words*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2007) *Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds*. London: DCLG.

Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (2008) *Promoting good campus relations, fostering shared values and preventing violent extremism in Universities and Higher Education Colleges*. Available at: http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/migratedD/ec_group/22-07-HE_on

De Vaus, D. (2001) *Research design in social research*. London: Sage

DSTL (2010) *What Perceptions Do the UK Population have Concerning the Impact of Counter-terrorism Legislation Implemented since 2000?* Occasional Paper 88. London: Home Office.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) *Stop and Think: A critical review of the use of stop and search powers in England and Wales*. London: EHRC.

EUMC (2006a) *The Impact of 7 July 2005 London Attacks on Muslim Communities in the EU,* Vienna: European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice. (2009). The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and the Commonwealth. Accesses on June 18, 2012 from http://www.theasa.org/ethics/Ethical_guidelines.pdf/.

Fekete, Liz (2012) Pedlars of Hate: the violent impact of the European far Right. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Felsenthal, K. (2004) 'Socio-spatial experiences of transgender individuals', in Jean Lau Chin (ed) *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination: Bias based on gender and sexual orientation, volume 3*, London: Praeger, pp 201–25.

Ferguson, C. and Hussey, D. (2010) *2008-09 Citizenship Survey: Race, Religion and Equalities Topic Report.* London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

Fricker, M. (2000) 'Feminism in epistemology: Pluralism without postmodernism', in M. Fricker and J. Hornsby (eds) *The Cambridge companion to feminism in philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 146–65.

Gable, G., and Jackson, P. (2011). Lone wolves: myth or reality? London: Searchlight publications. Available to download: **http://www.lonewolfproject.org.uk/resources/LW-complete-final.pdf**

Garland, J., Spalek, B. and Chakraborti, N. (2006) 'Hearing lost voices: Issues in researching hidden minority ethnic communities', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol.46 pp 423-437

Gelsthorpe, L. (1993), 'Approaching the topic of racism: Transferable research strategies?', in D. Cook and B. Hudson (eds) *Racism and criminology*, London: Sage, pp 77–95.

Gilham, B. (2005) *Research interviewing: the range of techniques*. Berkshire: McGraw Hill Education.

Githens-Mazer, J. & Lambert, B. (2010) 'Why Conventional Wisdom on Radicalisation Fails' *International Affairs* 86 (4) pp 894-998

Goldsmith, A. (2005) 'Police reform and the problem of trust', Theoretical Criminology, 9, 4,

Greer, S. (2010) 'Anti-Terrorist Laws and the United Kingdom's "Suspect Muslim Community": A reply to Pantazis and Pemberton'. *British Journal of Criminology* 50: 1171-1190.

Guba, E. and Lincolns, Y. (2005) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (ed.) *The sage handbook of qualitative research*. Third Edition. Sage Publications

Gunaratnam, Y. (2003) *Researching 'race' and ethnicity: Methods, knowledge and power*, London: Sage.

Gunning, J. (2007a) A case for critical terrorism studies, *Government and Opposition*, 42(3), 363-393.

Gunning, J. (2007b) Babies and bathwaters: reflecting on the pitfalls of critical terrorism studies, *European Political Science*, 6, 236-243.

Hardie-Bick, J, Sheptycki, J, & Wardak, A. (2005). Introduction: Transnational and comparative criminology in a global perspective. In Sheptycki, J, & Wardak, A. (Eds.), *Transnational and comparative criminology* (pp. 1-15). London: Glasshouse Press.

Heelas, P. (2006) 'Challenging Secularization Theory: The Growth of New Age> Spiritualities of Life' *The Hedgehog Review. Critical Reflections on Contemporary Culture* (Issue on After Secularization) 8(1&2): 46-58.

Heelas, P. and Woodhead, L. (2005) *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion is Giving Way to Spirituality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

HM Government (2006) *Countering International Terrorism: The United Kingdom's Strategy*. Cm 6888. London: The Stationery Office.

HM Government (2008) *Preventing Violent Extremism: A Strategy for Delivery*. Available at: http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/violentextremism/preventstrategy/index.shtml

HM Government (2009) Pursue, Prevent, Protect, Prepare: A Strategy for Countering International Terrorism. Cm 7547. London: The Stationery Office.

HM Government (2011) Review of Counter-Terrorism and Security Powers: Review Findings and Recommendations. Cm 8004. London: The Stationery Office.

Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. (2004) The active interview, in D. Silverman (ed.) Qualitative research: theory, method and practice. Third Edition. London: Sage.

Hülsse, R. and Spencer, A. (2008). The Metaphor of Terror: Terrorism Studies and the Constructivist Turn. Security Dialogue, 39(6), 571-592.

Hemming, S. (2010) 'The practical application of counter-terrorism legislation in England and Wales: A prosecutor's perspective'. International Affairs 86(4): 955-969.

Home Office (2008) National Policing Plan 2005–08: Safer, Stronger Communities. London: HMSO.

Huq, A., Tyler, T. and Schulhofer, S. (2011) Mechanisms for Eliciting Co-operation in Counter-terrorism Policing. Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper Series Paper No. 340, The Law School, University of Chicago. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1757266#

Hickman, Mary and Professor Lyn Thomas (Institute for the Study of European Transformations, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, London Metropolitan University), Dr Sara Silvestri (Dept of International Politics, City University, London) and Dr Henri Nickels (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna, Austria) 'Suspect Communities' ? Counter-terrorism policy, the press, and the impact on Irish and Muslim communities in Britain. Available at: *http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/fms/MRSite/Research/iset/Suspect%20Communities%20Findings%20July2011.pdf*

Innes, M., Abbot, L., Lowe, T. & Roberts, C. (2007) Hearts and Minds and Eyes and Ears: Reducing Radicalisation Risks through Reassurance-Oriented Policing. Cardiff, UK: Cardiff University, Universities' Police Science Institute.

Innes, M. , Innes, T. & Roberts, C. with T.Lowe and S.Lakhani (2011) Assessing the Effects of Prevent Policing: a report to the Association of Chief Police Officers Universities' Police Science Institute Cardiff: Cardiff University

Jackson, R. (2007) The core commitments of critical terrorism studies, European Political Science, 6, 244-251.

Jackson, R. (2008) An argument for terrorism, Perspectives on Terrorism, II(2), 25-32.

Jenkins, B. (1980) The study of terrorism: definitional problems. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Jutila, M. (2006) 'Desecuritizing minority rights: against determinism', Security Dialogue, 37, 2, pp 167-85.

Kleinman, S. and Copp, M. (1993) Emotions and fieldwork. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Kundnani, A. (2009) Spooked! How Not to Prevent Violent Extremism London: Institute of Race Relations.

Kundnani, Arun (2012) Blind Spot? Security Narratives and Far-Right Violence in Europe. The Hague: ICCT http://www.icct.nl/publications/icct-papers/blind-spot-security-narratives-and-far-right-violence-in-europe Kvale, S. (2007). Doing interviews. Sage Publications

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. Second Edition.

LaFree, G., & Ackerman, G. (2009). The empirical study of terrorism: Social and legal research. Annual Review of Law in the Social Sciences, 5, 347-374. doi: 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.093008.131517.

Lambert, R. (2011) Countering Al- Qaeda in London:Police and Muslims in Partnership. London: Hurst and Company.
Lambert, Robert and Jonathan Githens-Mazer (2010). Islamophobia and Anti-Muslim Hate Crime: UK Case Studies. Exeter: EMRC, University of Exeter. Available to download: http://centres.exeter.ac.uk/emrc/publications/IAMHC_revised_11Feb11.pdf
Lambert, Robert (2011a). Countering al-Qaeda in London: Police and Muslims in Partnership. London: Hurst.
Lambert, Robert (2011 b). Competing Counter-Radicalisation Models in the UK. In Rik Coolsaet, ed., Jihadi Terrorism and the Radicalisation Challenge. European and American Experiences Ashgate, Aldershot. pp. 215-225.
Lambert, Robert (2013 forthcoming). Anti-Muslim Violence in the UK: Extremist nationalist involvement and influence. In Taylor, Max, P.M. Currie and Donald Holbrook (eds.) Extreme Right-Wing Political Violence and Terrorism. London: Continuum.

Lehr, Peter (2013 forthcoming). Still Blind in the Right Eye? A Comparison of German Responses to Political Violence from the Extreme Left and the Extreme Right. In Taylor, Max, P.M. Currie and Donald Holbrook (eds.) Extreme Right-Wing Political Violence and Terrorism. London: Continuum.

Limbada, Z. & Silk, D. (2012) Reflecting on the United Kingdom 'Prevent' counter-terrorism strategy. The Police Chief, 79, 34–40.

Lister, M. & Jarvis, L. (in press) 'Disconnected Citizenship? The Impacts of Anti-terrorism

Policy on Citizenship in the UK' Political Studies

Lundy, P. & McGovern, M. (2006) 'Participation, Truth and Partiality: participatory action research, community-based truth-telling and post-conflict transition in Northern Ireland' Sociology 40 (1)

Lyon, D. (1996) 'Religion and the Post-modern: old problems, new prospects' in: K.Flanagan & P.Jupp (eds) Postmodernity, Sociology and Religion pp14-29

Macfarlane, B. (2010) Values and virtues in qualitative research, in M. Savin-Baden and C. Howell Major (ed.) New Approaches to Qualitative Research: Wisdom and Uncertainty. Abingdon: Routledge.

Martin, G. (2013) Understanding terrorism. Fourth Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McClaurin, I. (2001) 'Theorizing a black feminist self in anthropology: Toward an auto ethnographic approach', in I. McClaurin (ed) Black feminist anthropology, London: Rutgers University Press, pp 49–76.

McDonald, M. (2007) Emancipation and critical terrorism studies, European Political Science, 6, 252-259.

McGovern, M. (2010) Countering Terror or Counter-Productive ? Comparing Irish and British Muslim Experiences of Counter-Insurgency Law and Policy Report of a Symposium held in Cultúrlann McAdam Ó Fiaich, Falls Road, Belfast, 23-24 June 2009 Lancashire: Edge Hill University

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mythen, G. & Walklate, S. (2006) 'Criminology and Terrorism' *British Journal of Criminology* 46 (3): pp. 379

Nelken, D. (2009). Comparative criminal justice: Beyond ethnocentrism and relativism. *European Journal of Criminology, 6* (4), 291-311. doi: 10.1177/1477370809104684.

Pakes F. (2010). The comparative method in globalised criminology. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 43* (1), 17–30. doi: 10.1375/acri.43.1.17.

Pantazis, C. & Pemberton, S. (2009) 'From the 'Old' to the 'New Suspect' Community: Examining the Impacts of Recent UK Counter-Terrorist Legislation' *British Journal of Criminology* 49 (5): 646-666.

Papadopoulos, I. and Lees, S. (2002) 'Developing culturally competent researchers', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol 37, no 3, pp 258–64.

Phillips, C. & Bowling, B. (2003) 'Racism, Ethnicity and Criminology: Developing Minority

Perspectives', *British Journal of Criminology*, 43: 269–90.

Pickering, S., McCulloch, J. and Wright-Neville, D. (2008) *Counter-Terrorism Policing: Community, Cohesion and Security*. New York: Springer.

Poynting, S., and Mason, V. (2008) 'The New Integrationism, the State and Islamophobia: Retreat from Multiculturalism in Australia' *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice* 36 (4): 230-246.

Quigley, N. and Pratten, B. (2007) *Security and Civil Society: The Impact of Counter- terrorism Measures on Civil Society Organisations*. London: National Council for Voluntary Organisations.

Rabby, F. and Rodgers, W.M. (2010) *The Impact of 9/11 and the London Bombings on the Employment and Earnings of U.K. Muslims*. Discussion Paper 4763. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labour.

Rudiger, A. (2007) *Prisoners of Terror? The Impact of Anti-Terrorism Measures on Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Britain*. London: Refugee Council.

Schmid, A. (2004) Terrorism: the definitional problem, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 36, 375-420.

Schmid, A. (2006) Magnitudes and focus of terrorist victimization, in U. Ewald and K. Turkovic (ed.) *Large-scale victimisation as a potential source of terrorist activities: importance of regaining security in post-conflict societies*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Schmid, A. and Jongman, A. (1988) *Political terrorism: a new guide to actors, authors, concepts, data bases, theories and literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishers Company.

Schmid A. and Jongman, A. (2005) *Political terrorism*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sheptycki, J. (2005). Relativism, transnationalisation, and comparative criminology. In Sheptycki, J, & Wardak, A. (Eds.), *Transnational and comparative criminology* (pp. 69-88). London: Glasshouse Press.69-88

Silk, P. D. (2010). Planning outreach between Muslim communities and police in the USA and the UK. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Silke, A. (2001) The devil you know: continuing problems with research on terrorism, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 13(4), 1-14.

Silvestri, S. (2009) 'Moderate Islamist groups in Europe: the Muslim Brothers', in K. Hroub

(ed.) *Political Islam* London: Saqi Books

Sluka, J. (2002) What anthropologists should know about the concept of terrorism, *Anthropology Today*, 18(2), 22 -23.

Sluka, J. A. (2010). Curiouser and curioser: Montgomery McFate's strange interpretation of the relationship between anthropology and counterinsurgency. *PoLar: Political and legal anthropology review, 33* (S1), 91-115. doi: 10.1111/j.1555-2934.2010.01068.x.

Smith, C. J. (2009). Comparative methods: Going beyond incorporating international research methods with traditional methods. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 33* (2), 211-228. doi:10.1080/01924036.2009.9678806

Smyth, M. (2007) A critical research agenda for the study of political terror, *European Political Science*, 6, 260-267.

Snape, D. and Spencer, L. (2004) The foundations of qualitative research, in J. Ritchie and J. Lewis, *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers.* London: Sage.

Spalek, B. (2005) 'Researching black Muslim women's lives: A critical reflection', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol 8, no 5, pp 1–14.

Spalek, B. (2011) 'New Terrorism' and Crime Prevention Initiatives Involving

Muslim Young People in the UK: Research and Policy Contexts, *Religion, State and Society,* 39(2-3), pp. 191-207

Spalek, B. (2010) 'Community Policing, Trust and Muslim Communities in relation to 'new terrorism' *Politics & Policy* Vol. 38 (4) pp 789-815

Spalek, B., & Lambert, R. (2008). Muslim communities, counter-terrorism and counter-radicalisation: A critically reflective approach to engagement. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 36* (4), 257–270. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2008.08.004

Spalek, B. & McDonald, L.Z. (2010) 'Anti-Social Behaviour Powers and the Policing of Security' *Social Policy and Society* Vol. 9 (1) pp 123-133

Spalek, B., El-Awa, S. & McDonald, L.Z. (2009) 'Engagement and Partnership Work in a Counter-Terrorism Context' Birmingham: University of Birmingham

Spalek, B., McDonald, L.Z. (2011) 'Preventing Religio-Political Violent Extremism Amongst Muslim Youth: a study exploring police-community partnership' University of Birmingham

Stanfield, J. (1993) 'Methodological reflections: An introduction', in J.H. Stanfield and R.M. Dennis (eds) *Race and ethnicity in research methods*, London: Sage, pp 3–15.

Spalek, B. (2008) *Communities, identities and crime*. The Policy Press, University of Bristol

Spencer, A. (2006) The problems of evaluating counter-terrorism, *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, 2, 179-201.

Stern, J. (1999) *The ultimate terrorists*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Thornton, S. (2010) *Project Champion Review* 30th Sept 2010

http://www.west-midlands.police.uk/latest-news/docs/Champion_Review_FINAL_30_09_10.pdf date accessed May 16th 2012

Toros, H. (2008) Terrorists, scholars and ordinary people: confronting terrorism studies with field experiences, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 1(2), 279–292.

Topping, John and Byrne, Jonny (2012) *Community Safety: A Decade of Development, Delivery, Change and Challenge in Northern Ireland*. Belfast Conflict Resolution Consortium (BCRC). BCRC.

Topping, John and Byrne, Jonny (2012) *Policing, Terrorism and the Conundrum of 'Community': A Northern Ireland Perspective*. In: Counter-Terrorism: Community-Based Approaches to Terror Crime. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 157-180. ISBN 9780230242135

Turk, A. (2004) Sociology of terrorism, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 271-286.

Weinberg, L., Pedahzur, A. and Hirsch-Hoefler, S. (2004) The challenges of conceptualizing terrorism, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 16(4), 777-794.

Wilkinson, P. (2006). *Terrorism versus democracy: the liberal state response*. Second Edition. Oxon: Routledge.

Wolfendale, J. (2007). Terrorism, security, and the threat of counter-terrorism. *Studies in conflict & terrorism, 30*, 75-92. doi: 10.1080/10676100600791231.

Zulaika, J. and Douglass, W. (2008) The terrorist subject: terrorism studies and the absent subjectivity, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 1(1), 27–36.