



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

## What happens to pupils permanently excluded from special schools and pupil referral units in England?

**Citation for published version:**

Pirrie, A, Macleod, G, Cullen, MA & McCluskey, G 2011, 'What happens to pupils permanently excluded from special schools and pupil referral units in England?', *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 519-538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.481724>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1080/01411926.2010.481724](https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.481724)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

British Educational Research Journal

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

© Pirrie, A., Macleod, G., Cullen, M. A., & McCluskey, G. (2011). What happens to pupils permanently excluded from special schools and pupil referral units in England?. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(3), 519-538. doi: 10.1080/01411926.2010.481724.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## **What happens to pupils permanently excluded from special schools and Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) in England?**

**Anne Pirrie<sup>1</sup>**  
**Gale Macleod<sup>2</sup>**  
**Mairi Ann Cullen<sup>3</sup>**  
**Gillean McCluskey<sup>2</sup>**

Address for correspondence

Dr Anne Pirrie  
Reader in Education  
University of the West of Scotland  
School of Education  
Ayr Campus  
Beech Grove  
AYR KA8 0SR

Tel: 01292 886376 (voicemail)  
Email: Anne.Pirrie@uws.ac.uk

<sup>1</sup> University of the West of Scotland; <sup>2</sup> University of Edinburgh; <sup>3</sup> University of Warwick

**Introduction**

This article reports the main findings from a three-year longitudinal study of destinations and outcomes for a group of 24 young people permanently excluded (i.e. removed from the school roll) from a special school or Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) during the 2005-06 school year. The study was funded by the then Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in the wake of a specific recommendation in the report of the Practitioners' Group on School Behaviour and Discipline [The Steer Report] (DfES, 2005a). While recognising that 'there are occasions when it is necessary to exclude pupils [from specialist provision], the Practitioners' Group expressed concern about 'what alternative forms of education are available for these most vulnerable pupils, particularly in smaller authorities that may only have one PRU' (DfES, 2005a, p. 9).

The language of The Steer Report exposes some of the fault-lines that have arisen as a result of the rise of 'inclusive education' as a social reform strategy. Fundamental tensions have emerged between 'the will to punish' (Parsons, 2005), as evidenced by the (sometimes permanent) exclusion from school of young people who are variously described as 'troubled and troublesome' (McCluskey *et al*, 2004) 'difficult or challenging' (Parsons, 2005) or as having 'conduct problems' (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2009) and the inclusion agenda. Educational inclusion has been described by one prominent commentator as 'a political and social struggle which foregrounds difference and identity and which involves whole-school and teacher reform' (Allan, 2003). Yet as the philosopher Martha Nussbaum (2004) points out, liberal society and its legal institutions are cut through by deep tensions between

...support for punishments that humiliate and the general concern for human dignity that lies behind the extension of stigma-free status to formerly marginalized groups and, in general, between the view that law should shame malefactors and the view that law should protect citizens from insults to their dignity (p. 2)

These same tensions were evident in research reported below. In the context of this research project the focus on difference and identity manifested itself in the assumption that young people who have been permanently excluded from specialist provision are somehow different from those who have been excluded from mainstream schools.

There is widespread consensus in the research and policy-related literature over the last decade that young people who have been permanently excluded from *any* type of school are at a far greater risk of a variety of negative outcomes, including prolonged periods out of education and/or employment; poor mental and physical health; involvement in crime; and homelessness (Audit Commission, 1996; Donovan, 1998; Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; Lyon *et al*, 2000; Berridge *et al*, 2001; Coles *et al*, 2002; Daniels *et al*, 2003; Ofsted, 2004; Ofsted, 2005). Only about half of the 141 young people excluded from mainstream schools tracked in the study reported in Daniels *et al* (2003) were in education, training or employment two years after their permanent exclusion.

Visser *et al* (2005) note that pupils who have been permanently excluded from school also 'feature prominently amongst the "missing"' (p. 46) (see also Daniels *et al*, 2003). Young people's sense of alienation and rejection post-exclusion is also well documented in the research literature (Munn *et al*, 2000; Osterman, 2000). They find 'schooling irrelevant to their aspirations and experience teaching and learning at an inappropriate level of challenge' (Visser *et al*, 2005); and are more likely not to attend subsequent placements (Vincent *et al*, 2007).

## **The policy context**

The policy context in which the study was conducted is extremely complex. A strong theme is the need for child-centred thinking, and a renewed emphasis on transforming the lives of children and parents. There are a number of discrete but closely inter-related policy strands that have a direct bearing on this study of destinations and outcomes for children and young people permanently excluded from special schools and PRUs. The most significant are *Every Child Matters. Change for Children* (ECM) (DfES, 2004), which has been described as ‘the biggest shake up of statutory children’s services since the Seebohm Report of the 1960s (Williams, 2004, p. 406) and the associated *National Service Framework for Children, Young People and Maternity Services* (DoH, 2004a-d); the *Respect* agenda (Respect Task Force, 2006); the *Reaching Out/Think Family* policy suite (Cabinet Office, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008); and, finally, the *Children’s Plan. Building Brighter Futures* (DCSF, 2007) and the ensuing White Paper *Back on Track* (DCSF, 2008a). The latter, a strategy for modernising alternative provision for young people, is of particular relevance to the study reported here, as it underscores the need for a step change in improvement in alternative provision (in respect of both educational attainment and broader achievement); more effective planning and commissioning of services; and increased accountability. The overall aim of the above strategies, and of the raft of more specific policies associated with them, is ‘to provide effective services for vulnerable children through more coordinated and collaborative efforts between relevant organisations’ (Vincent *et al*, 2007, p. 284).

The four areas of action identified in ECM and reflected in subsequent legislation and guidelines including the Core Standards of the NSF are as follows: support for parents and carers; early intervention and effective protection; local, national and regional integration; and workforce reform, with an emphasis on better integrated children’s services and more effective multi-agency working involving a range of partners in education, health and social care. Support for parents has been a key plank of social policy since the advent of New Labour in 1997, and features prominently in ECM. Despite an apparent emphasis on support for all parents, ‘close analysis of this policy discourse reveals a class-specific concern with disadvantaged or ‘socially excluded’ families’ (Gillies, 2005). In the concluding stages of the research reported here, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) issued guidance to local authorities that encouraged them to ‘reform systems and services provided for vulnerable children, young people and adults’ according to a ‘Think Family’ ethos. This involved identifying and providing support to families at risk at the earliest opportunity (DCSF, 2009).

As we saw above, there has been a plethora of policies over the last decade aimed at improving outcomes for children, young people and their families, and repeated calls for early intervention throughout the life-cycle, for workforce reform and for addressing cycles of disadvantage (Cabinet Office, 2006; 2007a/b; 2008). Despite this, in a recent report prepared for the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health there have been renewed calls for ‘effective help for parents and families’ and ‘programmes aimed at prevention or early intervention at pre-school age’ (Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, 2009, p. 1). These are considered to be the most effective means of avoiding the adverse consequences of the ‘conduct problems’ that the report suggests are strongly associated with subsequent offending.

*The Children's Plan. Building Brighter Futures* (DCSF, 2007) can be regarded as the blueprint for the development of children's services for the next decade. It underlines the government's commitment to the eradication of child poverty by 2020. It also sets out a number of health and education targets for children and young people aged between 5 and 19, including a 25 per cent reduction in the number of young people receiving a conviction, reprimand or final warning for a recordable offence by 2020. One of the issues that we shall address below is the extent to which this 2020 vision is blurred by the renewed emphasis on targets and systems of accountability.

### **About the study**

The core objective of the study was to determine the immediate and subsequent destinations of a small group of young people after their permanent exclusion in the school year 2005-06. It was also part of our remit to examine the events and processes that led up to the young person's most recent permanent exclusion; and to identify the range and nature of the alternative provision available to them post-exclusion. The Department was also interested in 'best practice' in managing the exclusion process, particularly the extent to which young people and their parents were involved in the identification of subsequent placements.

The study was conducted in three Government Office Regions: London, the South East and the North West. These areas were selected on the basis of the relatively high number of permanent exclusions from special schools as expressed as a percentage of the total population and detailed in the most recent statistics available at the time. Further criteria informing the selection of study areas were geographical distribution; and location (urban/rural). An outline sample of 56 young people who met the criteria for inclusion in the study was identified from the returns submitted to a short questionnaire sent to all the special schools (634) and PRUs (193) listed on a database provided to the research team by the Department. The final study sample comprised 24 young people, from whom written opt-in consent was received.

The original research design proposed three 'waves' of interviews with the young people, their parents/carers and four or five key service providers, e.g. social workers, members of the Youth Offending Team (YOT), Connexions Personal Assistants (PAs) etc at approximately nine month intervals. However, the process of ascertaining information about and negotiating access to the young people took longer than anticipated (see also Daniels *et al*, 2003, p. 13). Interviews were therefore conducted at shorter intervals, in ripples rather than waves. Data from the interviews were supplemented by information gathered by the research team in an extensive series of less formal contacts by telephone and email with a large range of service providers. Respondents included Connexions PAs, YOT workers, head teachers, attendance officers, educational welfare officers, social workers, child psychologists, psychiatrists, college placement officers, voluntary sector providers, prison officers, school and college administrators, student counsellors, work experience co-ordinators, etc. The range of service providers consulted is a reflection of the complex profile of needs of some of the young people who participated in the study.

### **Profile of the sample**

The final study sample comprised 24 young people who had been permanently excluded from school during the school year 2005-06 (see Table 1 below). Nineteen had been

permanently excluded from special schools, and five from PRUs during the reference period. The ratio of male to female in the final study sample was 23:1. The profile of the sample reflects the pattern evident in the statistics on exclusion from school: namely, that boys are over-represented amongst those permanently excluded from school; and that the majority of young people permanently excluded from school are between 12 and 14. The age range of those in the study sample was 9 years and 7 months to 14 years and 8 months. However, the majority (16:24) were aged between 12 and 14 at the time of their exclusion in 2005-06. Seven of the 24 were in the state care system during the period in which the research was conducted; and 8 of the 24 were from minority ethnic groups. These findings are broadly consonant with what is known from previous research about the unequal distribution of the chances of experiencing disciplinary exclusion (Parsons, 2005; Parsons *et al*, 2005; Munn and Lloyd, 2005; Brodie, 2000). However, it is also possible that this distribution is an artefact of the sampling procedure rather than a true reflection of the characteristics of the population of pupils permanently excluded from school.

Most of the young people had lived in family situations that were disrupted or challenging, and that were characterised by the complex interaction of a number of variables including family breakdown; low levels of parental employment; mental ill health (amongst parents and young people); paternal absence; and low income (see also Daniels *et al*, 2003 pp. 15ff). The fact that only 5 of the 24 young people were from a family where there was an adult in paid employment is also broadly consistent with the findings from the study reported in Daniels *et al*, 2003.

Many of the young people had multiple and complex support needs, with behavioural emotional and social difficulties (BESD) and moderate learning difficulties (MLD) the most common combination. Many were regarded by the service providers interviewed as being at the extreme end of a broad spectrum of need. For example, Mal was considered by a local authority service manager to be 'in the top 18 in terms of that type of need [for specialist BESD provision] in the city' [of just under 500,000 inhabitants]. By the time Isaac received his second custodial sentence (24 months) after his permanent exclusion in 2005-06, he was described by the head of an inner-London YOT as 'one of the twenty most prolific offenders in the borough'.

### **Main findings**

The main findings from the study are reported below. These are drawn from repeated interviews with front-line service providers, during which it emerged that many of those interviewed had a fairly limited view of the case. For example, a YOT worker would be familiar with a young person's history of offending, but would have little knowledge of their educational history. Social workers were primarily concerned with a young person's home circumstances; teachers focused on enabling young people to achieve their potential by meeting targets relating to attainment and achievement, and in developing more harmonious relations with their peers.

We begin by exploring the assumptions relating to the young people in this study and taking a closer look at their trajectories pre- and post-exclusion.

### ***Disrupted educational pathways***

Some of the assumptions that underpinned this study are open to question. The first assumption was that young people who have been permanently excluded from special schools or PRUs have different pre- and post-exclusion trajectories from young people excluded from mainstream schools; and that they are inherently more 'vulnerable'. However, as can be seen from Table 1 below, the majority of the young people in the sample (16) had started their education in a mainstream primary school, and many had experienced a mixed economy of provision, having attended both mainstream and specialist provision. This may be an indication that in some cases the process of reaching a diagnosis can be very protracted indeed. It also suggests that some of the young people's difficulties had become more complex and intractable as they moved through the education system; moreover, that young people can and do outgrow educational settings that initially appeared to meet their needs. The interview data certainly suggested that the process of identifying a suitable placement for a child with complex needs (and in some cases a reputation that preceded them) could be very time-consuming and challenging for all parties; and that there was an exponential increase in the level of challenge in the case of young people with multiple permanent exclusions. Phil's mother described the impact of his permanent exclusion as follows: 'now that he's got permanently excluded from a National Autistic Society school on his record, nobody wants to touch him.' Lastly, there were indicators in the data that disrupted educational pathways and poor attendance further exacerbated pre-existing learning and social difficulties. As is also evident from Table 1, some of the young people had complex trajectories that were often difficult to piece together (reference supplied).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

The second assumption that underpinned the research specification was that the permanent exclusion in the school year 2005-06 was a marked rupture that stood out in the young person's educational history. However, it soon became evident that many of the young people had experienced severely disrupted educational pathways (including permanent exclusion) *prior* to their exclusion in 2005-06; and that this was a pattern that persisted post-exclusion (see Table 1).

#### **Vignette 1: identifying a placement for a child with complex needs**

Leo was diagnosed with autistic spectrum disorder (ASD) at 2 years and 7 months. At 13, he had a managed move from an out-of-authority placement in a special school for young people with moderate/severe and complex learning difficulties. This school had been his eighth placement since pre-school, not including two extended periods of over 6 months when he was at home with no educational support. His mother, a single parent who was also caring for elderly parents, reported that 'it had been difficult every step of the way', and that she had struggled to find the right school for him. He seemed too able for schools providing for those with severe learning difficulties, and yet his difficulties were too complex for an MLD school. His mother had applied to 15 schools and visited 5, but none was prepared to take her son. At interview, Leo had just started a programme of gradual integration into a school for pupils with SLD after spending 18 months at home with some outreach provision (4 hours per week) from a local PRU. His mother explained that the 'choice' of school came down to the fact that this was the only school in this outer-London authority that he had not attended before. She was not convinced that this school could meet his needs either.

It emerged in the course of the study that some young people had not been in receipt of any form of education for extended periods, often at more than one point in their educational history. Some had had a mere three or four hours of outreach tuition from a local PRU per week after their permanent exclusion in the school year 2005-06. However, it would be misleading to attribute the cases outlined in Vignettes 1 and 2 entirely to systemic failures. Rather, they are also perhaps an indication of the severity, complexity and intractable nature of some young people's difficulties (see below); and of the complex interaction between a number of different variables, for example family circumstances, a constantly evolving profile of needs, and the (lack of) availability of local options for subsequent placements, even in urban areas.

### **Vignette 2: identifying a placement for a child with complex needs**

Joe's mother was frustrated by the discontinuities in her son's education. He had been reinstated after his first permanent exclusion (from Y1 in a mainstream primary). However, his father did not want him to return to the same school and he had received home tuition for a few months. When his parents separated, Joe and his mother moved to a neighbouring borough, and his case was referred to the new LA at the end of the summer term in 2004. According to Joe's mother, the LA 'was slow to pick up' and she felt that the onus was on her to identify a school. She suffers from bi-polar disorder, and the strain of having Joe at home for six months took a toll on her health. The Community Psychiatric Nurse intervened and put pressure on the LA. Prior to his next placement at a Primary PRU, Joe was involved in a voluntary sector project that focused on helping young children manage their behaviour. Joe's mother felt that she had no choice but to accept the placement. 'Surrounded by naughty boys', Joe's behaviour deteriorated rapidly and he was permanently excluded again in December 2005 for breaking the head teacher's finger. Joe had another extended period out of provision before beginning a placement in a small psychiatric day unit in November 2006. He was making some progress educationally, and was also benefitting from specific therapeutic interventions. His mother also felt supported in this environment.

### ***Reasons for exclusion***

In the majority of cases where the reasons for the young person's permanent exclusion in the school year 2005-06 were known, the final catalyst was a violent assault on a member of staff. There was also evidence that persistent disruptive behaviour, often involving persistent bullying of younger children, instances of physical assault against other pupils and/or members of staff and damage to property were contributing factors.

Not surprisingly, there was substantial variation in the perspectives of staff and students. For example, Tom seemed unable to recall the events that had precipitated his permanent exclusion, although this might be attributed to poor memory, a feature of his complex disability. However, the headteacher of Tom's school recalled the events vividly and in great detail, even although they had occurred some 18 months prior to the research interview.

He got a brick and tore a large piece of wood from the fence to use as a weapon. It was horrific, quite unprecedented in the life of the school.



As we saw above, the events that precipitated the exclusion did not stand out for many of the young people in the study reported here, where only a very small minority appeared to feel that their exclusion had been unjust. This is in marked contrast to the findings reported in Munn and Lloyd (2005), who report that the ‘sense of being singled out, of the unfairness of the exclusion, is a common theme in pupils’ views’ (p. 207). This suggests that in the current study young people’s sense of agency was compromised long before their exclusion, and that their exclusion ‘came about because of dim future prospects and not just because of current circumstances’ (Munn and Lloyd, 2005, p. 206).

### *Destinations post-exclusion*

Table 2 below indicates the approximate length of time the young people in the study were not receiving any educational provision following their permanent exclusion in 2005-06. As we saw above, outreach tuition from a local PRU for up to six hours a week was a common form of provision in the immediate aftermath of the permanent exclusion. This accounts for the relatively high number of young people who fell into the first category.

<i>Time out of provision</i>	<i>Number of young people (n=24)</i>
<i>Less than 2 weeks</i>	8
2 weeks to 3 months	3
4-6 months	3
6 months – 1 year	5
More than a year	4
Not known	1

For some young people, particularly those who were aged over 13 and had a history of violent behaviour (for example, Rob, Isaac and ‘KC’, see Table 1), such arrangements persisted for long periods. Rob received about 6 hours per week outreach provision for 23 months during Yr 9-10, before taking up a placement at an additional resource centre. It is important to set this in the context of Rob’s educational history. This was a young man who had had multiple placements prior to the 15 months spent in the provision from which he was permanently excluded in March 2006, aged 13 years and 11 months. Isaac had a rather similar profile, as he had also had multiple placements since beginning his education in a mainstream primary school. His attendance at the BESD special school in the three years prior to his permanent exclusion had been at around 40 per cent, and his education effectively came to an end when he was 14. Isaac’s history of knife carrying and early involvement in criminal activity made him the subject of lengthy risk assessments, which further delayed his subsequent placement (in a PRU). This broke down in a matter of days, and Isaac received two custodial sentences during the period in which the research was conducted. ‘KC’ (his preferred code name) did not attend any educational provision for 22 months following his permanent exclusion from a special school he had attended for three and a half years. Cases like Isaac and KC are of particular concern, given that ‘we know that 60 per cent of excluded young people report having offended in the last 12 months compared with 26 per cent in mainstream

education (DCSF, 2008a, p. 18).

### ***Range of provision, achievement and attainment***

Table 3 below shows the range of provision accessed by 23 of the 24 young people after their permanent exclusion in 2005-06. This is a testament to the creativity and determination of service providers in negotiating placements that involved input from private and voluntary providers as well as statutory services. In addition to local authority PRUs and special schools, some of which provided outreach or temporary 'hosting' arrangements, independent special schools and providers in other local authorities were used, with residential provision as a last resort. There was evidence that a wide range of 'packages' were being built up around the needs of individual young people. These included outreach tutoring, shared placements between school and college, work experience and regular sessions with support workers and/or therapists in the statutory and voluntary sectors. The data on achievement and attainment summarised in Table 3 need to be viewed in the context of the young people's disrupted educational pathways. However, they also illustrate the scale of the challenge in 'bringing about a step change in improvement' in terms of pupils' performance (DCSF, 2008a, p. 10). It should be borne in mind that there are other gains that are more difficult to quantify but just as important in terms of getting 'back on track'. These include levels of positive engagement with peers and adults in the educational setting, and with friends and family in the wider community. The head of a small special needs school set the issue of attainment of achievement in context:

What you've got to recognise when you're looking at the really, really sharp end is that provision will not be sitting in a classroom learning their numeracy lesson. It might be taking the dog for a walk with a learning mentor, or travelling independently across town.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

### ***Placement decisions and individual agency***

It was evident that clear service protocols came into operation once a young person had been permanently excluded from school. Papers relating to the case were sent to a range of schools or alternative providers prior to a decision being made on whether or not to offer a placement. Pending a decision, interim arrangements (such as placement in a PRU or outreach tuition) are made. In addition to the availability of places, factors reported to influence placement decisions included whether the young person and their parents agreed to the placement; the cost to the local authority of placements in other authorities; the profile of the student population in the proposed destination; and the number of referrals rejected. Given the profile of the young people in the sample, it is not surprising that placement decisions were often contingent, and that young people, their parents and indeed the service providers themselves experienced no real sense of agency (see for example Vignettes 1 and 2). Indeed sometimes the only way in which a parent of a young person could exercise agency was to decline the offer of a place. As Mal's mother explained: 'I got a call saying this is the only school we've got. You either take it or you don't. They gave me, what, a week to decide, and it was like, well, I've got no choice.' As the headteacher of the school attended by Mal explained

... there is an expectation that we pick up on all sorts of problems that we were never designated for in the first place.

In a number of cases, service providers described the process of searching for the next placement as ‘trawling in ever widening circles’. In situations where local authority day provision rejects applications, schools or units in other authorities are considered until such times as a placement is found, or the young person reaches an age at which they become eligible for different types of provision, such as a place at college. The local authority in which three young people were excluded from the same school has a policy that prior to the permanent exclusion of a young person with a statement of SEN, a multi-agency meeting is called for an emergency interim review of the statement. In other areas, decisions seemed to be more *ad hoc*. In a number of cases, the level of violence displayed during the period preceding their permanent exclusion (and indeed in earlier permanent exclusions) resulted in the re-classification of the young person’s main area of difficulty. This meant that some young people became eligible for a placement in a BESD special school, sometimes as a matter of priority.

These findings offer a reality check for the strategy set out in *Back on Track* (DCSF, 2008a), which is based on the principle that ‘we should start from what will work best for each young person, taking account of his or her different needs and in consultation with parents and carers’ (p. 5). Although the interviews with service providers reflected this renewed emphasis on ‘starting from the child’, the reality was that it was often difficult to identify provision that would enable young people to receive intensive therapeutic support in an environment that offered some contact with peers, or to engage in flexible work-based programmes.

### ***What worked?***

Some of the best examples of successful placements (as measured by levels of satisfaction expressed by young people and their parents/carers), improved attendance and a reduction in the incidence of challenging behaviour) were a small specialist autism unit catering for 6-8 young men aged 16-19 located within a special school; and special schools or specialist units with facilities for teaching small groups of young people with BESD, attention deficit disorder (ADD) and ASD in a nurturing environment. Young people and their families derived clear benefits from established relationships with a service provider who ‘held their story’, who knew them well, and had a clear holistic overview of how their needs had evolved over time and of their history of engagement (or lack of engagement) with services over time. One young man described his Connexions PA in the following terms:

Julie has helped me a lot. I’ve met no-one like Julie. She’s helped me to move steps forward, not just sit around waiting for them.

In some cases, the transition between placements was made easier for the young person by the fact that familiar people came into their lives a second time, in a different role, thus providing some sense of continuity.

### **Conclusion**

It is evident that all the young people in the study had had severely disrupted educational pathways prior to and after their permanent exclusion in 2005-06. Many had experienced family breakdown, or had grown up in family circumstances that were extremely challenging. Several parents described how they found themselves at breaking point partly as a result of their children being excluded from school repeatedly, often with minimum educational provision for many months. Several had suffered periods of mental

ill health that were the result of and/or the catalyst for their children's difficulties. It is important to bear in mind that these were parents who were prepared to engage with the research team. The circumstances of those with whom it was not possible to engage may have been more difficult still. Many of the front-line service providers from education, health social work and social care made a strong impression on the research team by virtue of their creativity, perseverance and commitment. Many were working in extremely challenging circumstances in which contingency, unpredictability and instability were the norm.

It is clear that we were dealing with young people who were at the very margins of the system. Moreover, the causes, origins, present nature and projected evolution of their difficulties were often obscure. In some cases difficulties may have been exacerbated by the nature of the educational provision these young people had received, and by multiple discontinuities in service provision. We take the view that the intractable difficulties experienced by the young people and their families are unlikely to be resolved by making adjustments to systems of accountability. It seems likely that complex social problems can only be addressed by large-scale social reform that goes far beyond making further additions to the substantial raft of current policy relating to children and families, and to specific policy initiatives relating to exclusion from school. Neither, it appears, are they likely to be alleviated by focusing exclusively on rights and entitlements.

It was clear from the interviews with the young people, their parents and carers and a wide range of service providers that what made the difference was not whether or not a subsequent placement had been secured within six days, but the quality of personal relationships. It was the person who 'held the story', and for whom the young person was visible in their full humanity, that ultimately made the difference. The corollary of this is that it is simply not possible to legislate human kindness into existence. We thus conclude not with a set of recommendations to policy makers, but with a plea for respect, construed as attention and observance rather than simply as a series of modifications to the Respect Action Plan. Construed in this way, respect is about far more than access to services, goods and opportunities on the part of young people and their families; and about compliance with policy and procedural changes on the part of service providers. One of the main conclusions from the study reported here is that policy aimed at bringing about 'a step change in improvement' (in terms of educational attainment and achievement) (DCSF, 2008a) cannot provide adequate conceptual resources fully to embrace young people who would challenge the boundaries of any educational system.

## References

- Audit Commission (1996) *Misspent youth: young people and crime* (London, Audit Commission).
- Berridge, D., Brodie, I., Pitts, J., Porteous, D. & Tarling, R. (2001) *The independent effects of permanent exclusion from school on the offending careers of young people*. RDS Occasional Paper 71 (London, The Home Office).
- Brodie, I. (2000) Children's homes and school exclusion: redefining the problem, *Support for Learning*, 15(1), 25-29.
- Cabinet Office (2006) *Reaching out: an action plan on social exclusion* (London, Cabinet Office).
- Cabinet Office (2007a) *Reaching out: progress on social exclusion* (London, Cabinet

Office).

Cabinet Office (2007b) *Reaching out: think Family. Analysis and themes for the families at risk review* (London, Cabinet Office).

Cabinet Office (2008) *Think family: improving the life chances of families at risk* (London, Cabinet Office).

Coles, B., Hutton, S., Bradshaw, J. Craig, G., Godfrey, C. & Johnson, J. (2002) *Literature review on the costs of being not in education, employment or training at Age 16-18* Research Report No 347 (Nottingham, DfES).

Daniels, H., Cole, T., Sellman, E., Sutton, J., Visser, J. & Bedward, J. (2003) *Study of young people permanently excluded from school* Research Report No 405 (London, DfES).

DCSF (2007) *The children's plan. Building brighter futures*. Cm 7280 (London, DCSF).

DCSF (2008a) *Back on track. A strategy for modernising alternative provision* (London, DCSF).

DCSF (2009) *Think family: improving support for families at risk. Draft guidance (February 2009)* (London, DCSF).

DfES (2004) *Every child matters. Change for children* (London, DfES).

DfES (2005a) *Learning behaviour. The report of the practitioners' group on school behaviour and discipline* (London, DfES).

Department of Health (2004a) *CAMHS standard, national service framework for children, young people and maternity services* (London, DH Publications).

Department of Health (2004b) *Core document, national service framework for children, young people and maternity services* (London, DH Publications).

Department of Health (2004c) *Disabled child standard, national service framework for children, young people and maternity services* (London, DH Publications).

Department of Health (2004d) *Supporting local delivery* (London, DH Publications).

Donovan, N. (1998) *Second chances: exclusion from school and equality of opportunity* (London, New Policy Institute).

Gillies, V. (2005) Meeting parents' needs: discourses of 'support' and 'inclusion' in family policy, *Critical Social Policy*, 25, 70-90.

McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G. & Stead, J. (2004) 'It was better than sitting in a group and talking'. An evaluation of a film-making project with young people in trouble or 'at risk' in school, *Pastoral Care in Education*, 22 (4), 34-40.

Munn, P., Lloyd, G. & Cullen, M.A. (2000) *Alternatives to exclusion from school* (London, Paul Chapman).

Munn, P. & Lloyd, G. (2005) Exclusion and excluded pupils, *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 205-221.

Nussbaum, M. (2004) *Hiding from humanity: disgust, shame and the law*. (Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press).

Ofsted (2004) *Out of school*. A survey of the educational provision for pupils not in school (London, Ofsted)

Ofsted (2005) *Managing challenging behaviour* (London, Ofsted).

Osterman, K. (2000) Students' need for belonging to the school community, *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3) 323-367.

Parsons, C. (2005) School exclusion: the will to punish, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(2), 187-211.

Parsons, C., Annan, G, Cornwall, J., Godfrey, R., Hepburn, S.& Wennerstrom, V.(2005) Minority ethnic exclusions and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. Research Report 616 (London, DfES).

Pirrie, A. & Macleod, G. (2009) Locked out: researching destinations and outcomes for young people permanently excluded from special schools and Pupil Referral Units, *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 14(3), 185-194.

Respect Task Force (2006) *Respect action plan* (London, Home Office).

Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2009) *The Chance of a lifetime: preventing early conduct problems and reducing crime*. Available online at [http://www.scmh.org.uk/publications/chance\\_of\\_a\\_lifetime.aspx?ID=604](http://www.scmh.org.uk/publications/chance_of_a_lifetime.aspx?ID=604) (accessed 5 January 2010)

Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Truancy and school exclusion* (London, Cabinet Office).

Vincent, K., Harris, B., Thomson, P. & Toalster, R. (2007) Managed moves: schools collaborating for collective gain, *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 12(4), 283-298.

Visser, J., Daniels, H. & McNab, N. (2005) Missing. Children and young people with SEBD, *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 10(1) 43-54.

Williams, F. (2004) What matters is who works: why every child matters to New Labour, Commentary on the DfES Green Paper Every Child Matters, *Critical Social Policy*, 24(3) 406-427.