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Abstract

This study explores the perspectives of education practitioners toward the process of reintegrating pupils (many of whom display Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties), from a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) to mainstream educational provision in a rural Welsh education authority and, examines the barriers and facilitators that they identified as evident within their individual schools and the catchment areas they serve, with regard to reintegrating pupils and their families. The study locates the process within the geographical context of the education authority to discuss whether there are specific reintegration barriers and facilitators inherent within the rural Welsh setting.

Patterns of pupil referral to, and reintegration from, the PRU and mainstream schools were first examined and analysed from ‘pupil tracking data’ which records and tracks pupils throughout an academic year from their arrival at the PRU. The perspectives of educational practitioners regarding the possible influence of these variables were gathered first through an expert sample postal questionnaire followed by a landscape sample postal questionnaire.

Interviews were subsequently conducted with respondents from Primary, Secondary and PRU settings to drill down into specific variables identified as influencing reintegration moves.

This study suggests that although there may be generic reintegration barriers and facilitators evident in all settings, there were specific variables inherent within the rural Welsh context which, were largely identified as barriers. For example, a lack of aspiration and narrow world views of many county residents.
Educational practitioners across mainstream and alternative settings provided feedback on difficulties inherent within the reintegration process and how these might be overcome to increase the rate of successful reintegration. The results of this study will be fed back into the professional practice community and to the Behaviour Support Service in the county where the research took place.
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Chapter 1 Research context

1.1 Identification of the issue

The concept of inclusion has been a dominant ideology underlying educational policy having strong links to social justice where inclusion may be viewed as an attempt to eradicate educational inequality.

Numerous policies have been introduced in the UK in an attempt to embed inclusion within practice, the most significant in recent years being the Every Child Matters legislation introduced by the UK government in 2003 (DfES, 2003).

Campbell (2002) described the key aspect of the inclusion debate as being about balancing individual needs against those of the majority where pupils have a right to receive their education within a mainstream school setting including those pupils identified as displaying special educational needs (SEN).

The 1996 Education Act identified a pupil as having SEN if they have a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for them i.e. provision that is additional to, or otherwise different from, that normally available in that area to children of the same age.

Within the diverse spectrum of SEN there is one group of pupils whom schools and teachers have deemed to be the most difficult to include, namely those labelled as having EBD (emotional and behavioural difficulties). Whilst government policy encourages all pupils with SEN to be included in mainstream educational provision, teacher responses to a survey by Goodman and Burton (2009) indicate that the experience of pupils with EBD in mainstream schools is far from consistent, ranging from full provision within a mainstream classroom to full provision within an on site unit. EBD pupils have been categorised as the most difficult to include in a mainstream environment due to their often
challenging behaviour yet, some schools are more successful in achieving than others.

In many cases the challenging behaviour has resulted in the removal of the pupil from mainstream education and often placement at a pupil referral unit (PRU).

PRUs are neither planned nor designed to provide a long term setting for pupils and should not be regarded by local authorities as fulfilling this role. Under section 19 of the Education Act 1996, Local Authorities have a statutory duty to make arrangements for providing education for pupils who are permanently excluded from school and are not on the roll of a school. Placements at a PRU should not be viewed as part of the range of SEN provision, rather should be used for relatively short periods of time whilst a more appropriate alternative placement is found or pupils should reintegrate to mainstream schools as soon as it is deemed suitable and possible for them to do so. However, there is evidence (Wilkin, 2003) that referral to a PRU will for many pupils not provide a short term respite from mainstream education, rather for a significant number of pupils remaining at the PRU for the rest of their school career is a more likely outcome.

Within a policy of inclusion it is deemed, by Garner and CSIE (Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education) for example, that pupils with challenging behaviour can be termed excluded if they remain at a PRU and, therefore, outside the mainstream education system. Yet others such as Keane (2008) suggest that PRU provision is an example of inclusion within the wider context of an educational system, as pupils are receiving an education.

1.2 Position as researcher

As Wellington et al (2005:21) state: ‘it is impossible to take the researcher out of any type of research or at any stage of the research process’. It is perhaps useful
to understand my position as the researcher which becomes a lens through which I view the world and construct my reality. At the start of this research journey I was employed by the Behaviour Support Service as a teacher within the SAGE (long term KS2/3 unit) for three years following a period of temporary employment as a supply teacher within West Wales, and seven years full time experience of teaching within the mainstream secondary school sector.

I began to reflect upon my attitudes as a teacher to pupils with challenging behaviours and felt that I had become more confident, positive and accepting of working with this group than I may once have been as a naïve inexperienced teacher in a mainstream school. I became interested in how my attitudes to these pupils may have an impact upon the working relationships we constructed and why only a proportion of pupils who were referred to the PRU would attempt reintegration to mainstream school and furthermore, why only a proportion of these attempted moves would be successful.

1.3 Research aims
As a result of my reflections on my own professional background and existing literature in the fields of reintegration, Pupil Referral Units and EBD, my overall research aim was to study the reintegration patterns of pupils within key stage one, two and three from the county PRU to mainstream school. The setting for this is a rural/semi-rural authority area in South West Wales (see appendix 1). Within the LEA there are a wide range of schools and communities supported by one PRU (please see appendix 2 for further details). I believed that there would be issues specific to the geographical location and rural nature of the area that would have an impact (either positive or negative) on pupils and the likelihood of them making a reintegration transfer and the chances of that reintegration being successful. These, for example, included transport issues, school size and the availability of specialist staff to support pupils and schools.
The 1996 study of small rural schools by Greenwald, Hedges and Laine suggested that such schools held many advantages over larger establishments in that they allowed teachers to spend proportionately more time with pupils due to smaller group sizes and were therefore in a position to offer greater assistance if required. They could also forge stronger working relationships which may act to negate the formation of behaviour problems. More recently, Sprager (2008) studied the effects of school size in the USA and concluded that smaller schools were more effective vis a vis larger schools in promoting pupil attainment and achievement. The National Behaviour and Attendance Review (NBAR, 2008) reported similar findings in Canada, Ireland and the UK. In contrast, a study by Morgan and Abbott (2006) in Northern Ireland concluded that small school size may act as a barrier to reintegration due to a lack of specialist staff to deal with challenging behaviour.

Within this area of Wales there were other issues which were of concern for example, relatively low socio-economic levels, and the language of the school, pupil and community which may have an impact in terms of habitus and related values, as there are marked differences between a predominantly English speaking, relatively more urban, south of the county as compared to the traditionally Welsh speaking relatively rural area to the north.

Within previous research relating to pupil reintegration and interventions there has been a tendency to focus upon an individual’s characteristics. The focus of the present research rests upon the situation of an individual rather than focussing upon factors relating to personality. It is the individual’s situation which I believe to be of greater importance in the process and experience of referral and reintegration which will then feed into and inform participant perspectives.

It is my belief that gaining an understanding of the systems and ways in which these systems operate is instrumental to identify key influences and variables which impact upon the success or otherwise of pupil transitions.
1.3.1 Research questions
The following research questions are answered within the thesis. Questions are listed in the order in which they were asked as answers received helped to inform subsequent questions rather than being listed in hierarchical order of importance.

(1) What is the historical pattern of pupil referral and subsequent reintegration to and from the Pembrokeshire PRU and mainstream schools?

(2) Are there factors evident within the data set which may offer explanations for these patterns?

(3) How do educational practitioners in Pembrokeshire define the term ‘reintegration’?

(4) How do educational practitioners in Pembrokeshire define the term ‘successful reintegration’?

(5) Which factors do educational practitioners in Pembrokeshire believe influence the success or otherwise of reintegration?

(6) Are there factors specific to a rural local authority such as Pembrokeshire which educational practitioners identify as exerting an influence upon the success or otherwise of reintegration?

1.4 Summary
Having described the aims of the study, a review of related literature will be presented in chapter 2 followed by a review of the methodological framework underpinning the study in chapter 3. Results drawn from data analysis will be presented in chapters 4, 5 and 6 and conclusions are presented in chapter 7.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a review of the literature considering the problems associated with the process of reintegrating pupils from a Pupil Referral Unit to mainstream schools within a rural authority in south west Wales. It includes the debate within contemporary literature concerning the notions of integration and inclusion and whether inclusion can only ever refer to education within a mainstream school setting.

It also examines the effects of labelling pupils, in particular the use of the label EBD (emotional and behavioural difficulties). Throughout the 1990s there was a rapid rise in school exclusions from approximately 3,000 in 1990 to 30,000 in 1998 (Vulliamy and Webb, 2000) many of which would have involved pupils labelled as EBD or displaying challenging behaviour.

The role and function of Pupil Referral Units (PRU) will be discussed and in particular factors which may act as barriers impeding a successful reintegration and factors which may increase the possibility of a successful outcome.

Finally, there is some discussion concerning the rural Welsh context of the study and how geographical and cultural factors may have an impact upon the reintegration process in particular and the education of pupils in the area in general.

2.2 Inclusion
Evans and Lunt (2002) highlighted that inclusion has been a dominant ideology underpinning social and educational policy whilst Campbell (2002) described the key aspect of the inclusion debate being about balancing the needs of the individual with the needs of the majority. Loreman (2007) believed the literature is
supportive of inclusion through the provision of social, academic and financial benefits to education systems and pupils allied to the moral, ethical and social justice origins of the ideology.

Hodkinson (2010) asserted that the current drive towards inclusive education was an example of a situation where policy, development and philosophy have outpaced practice.

The Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) confirmed acceptance of the ideology in that the special educational needs of children would normally be met in mainstream education yet, it appears (Hodkinson and Vickerman 2008) in practice inclusion is not universally achieved – it has limits.

The end point for inclusion is the school which is controlled by the staff and the community they serve. Clough and Garner (2003) noted that inclusion in practice is not achieved for all pupils as some educational establishments are not ‘fit for purpose’ to include all children due to a lack of knowledge, lack of vision, lack of will and lack of resources.

Inclusion, it appears, is dependent upon the attitude of staff and their competencies to deliver the ideology in practice. Croll and Moses (2000) determined that the majority of teachers were supportive of inclusion but not in all cases for those pupils labelled EBD or who display challenging behaviour in the classroom. For these pupils exclusion rather than inclusion was commonly followed as a practical response to (not) dealing with issues. Cole et al (2003) suggested there needed to be reform of attitudes, ethos and curriculum within schools and development of staff skills to increase the likelihood of mainstream schools addressing the needs of and accommodating successfully pupils who display EBD and disaffection.
In their earlier 2002 study Cole et al were unable to identify any single approach which could be transplanted to all schools, to meet the needs of every pupil with EBD. However they identified features of school policy, practice and provision and, in particular interactions between all parties governed by intrinsic school and extrinsic factors, underpinned by values, attitudes and beliefs held by teaching staff and governors. The outcome of these interactions, forge the unique features of a school’s approach to meeting pupil need.

Fewer pupils should be excluded Cole et al (2002) suggested; and greater number of pupils with EBD could be included within mainstream settings; but it was unrealistic that all EBD pupils could have their needs met in a mainstream setting.

Schools demonstrating inclusive practice in relation to pupils who are difficult to include tended to be open, positive and diverse with a collaborative ethos. Key features they displayed were:
- effective leadership which generates direction for staff, sustains good practice and enhances commitment towards inclusion
- a ‘critical mass’ of staff committed to inclusive values and the encouragement of a climate of praise, high levels of expectations in academic progress and behaviour for all pupils
- SMT committed to the development of good quality teaching matching the learning styles and abilities of pupils including those with EBD and where staff were able to differentiate EBD from general misbehaviour
- capacity and readiness to access outside agencies to cultivate and sustain inclusive practice.

2.3 Integration versus inclusion

Within literature especially pre-2000, the words integration and inclusion often appeared to be used interchangeably. The government programme ‘Every Child
Matters’ (2005) aimed to provide a national framework for children’s services. The programme suggested that the terms should be seen as distinct.

Integration is used within education to describe the commitment to educating children with special educational needs (SEN) in mainstream schools wherever possible, whilst inclusion is used within education to describe the process of ensuring equality of learning opportunities for all children. It is a process of identifying, understanding and breaking down barriers to participation and belonging. It should be seen as being about much more than the type of school which the children attend. Rather, it is concerned with the quality of the experience and how the pupil is helped to learn, achieve and participate fully within the life of the school. It involves the adaptation of policies and practices within schools to remove barriers to learning so that no learner is marginalised. Inclusion is therefore a move away from the labelling of children towards creating an appropriate learning environment for all children (for example, Corbett and Norwich, 1997, Tomlinson, 1997).

McSherry (2000) believed that the two terms should not be considered interchangeable in that they discuss different concepts. She saw the language of integration as being associated with an assimilationist view of pupils and education in that it is imperative that the pupil is able to adapt their patterns of behaviour to fit in with the norms required by the mainstream educational system on offer to them in order to facilitate their inclusion within it. Conversely she suggested that the language of inclusion is associated with a transformative view of the issue where the educational system should adapt and respond to individual need in order to meet pupil need.

In 1997, Thomas suggested that inclusion had come to supersede integration within the vocabulary of special educators. He pointed out that proponents of inclusion argued that an inclusive school is one that is accepting of all pupils. The policies and practices of an inclusive school involve everyone and ensure that
everyone belongs. In contrast, integration views the physical movement of pupils as a fundamental core aim without a concomitant expectation of necessary change by the mainstream school. He argued that reintegration rested upon what Lipsky and Gartner (1996) termed a readiness model. Children had a need to prove their readiness for an integrated setting rather than the setting by default being expected to prove a readiness to provide for and accept them. It is this default position of acceptance which Thomas believed to be the defining characteristic of inclusion. Thomas noted another key difference between the two concepts in terms of where children learn. He felt that reintegration was usually used to describe the assimilation by the mainstream of what was assumed to be particular types of children such as those with learning difficulties or challenging behaviour, whilst the key aspect of inclusion is that children who are at a disadvantage, for whatever reason, are not excluded from mainstream school.

The Alliance for Inclusive Education, believe that all pupils should be educated within a single mainstream education system summed up the difference between the terms in that ‘inclusion is integration on our terms. You can do integration to us but there can be no inclusion without us playing a full part in the process’ (1998).

The literature (for example, Avramidis, Bayliss and Burden, 2000) describes three types of inclusion namely physical, instructional and social. Physical inclusion can be seen as the placement of pupils in a mainstream setting (often deemed to mean all pupils being taught within the same physical space or school), instructional inclusion refers to the extent to which pupils are engaged in learning activities within mainstream education, and social inclusion refers to the nature and number of personal interactions a pupil has with mainstream education peers. Equal status relationships are seen as key to social inclusion.

O’Brian and Forest (1989) argued that of the three, physical inclusion is the easiest to engender through legislative mandate whilst instructional and social inclusion require more commitment and hard work. They asserted that whilst
physical inclusion gave no guarantee of instructional or social inclusion it was a necessary precondition for them. Instructional inclusion is designed to meet the IEP goals of pupils within a mainstream education. This may be achieved through a standard or modified curriculum and is based upon the assumption that not all children need to be doing the same activities at the same time – varying degrees of participation are appropriate.

Norwich (2008) suggested than in the wake of the Warnock report (DES, 1978) government adopted an official policy of integration in the 1981 Education Act. Wedell (1996) also credits the Warnock committee with laying the basis for promoting the integration of children with SEN in mainstream schools subject to the requirement to meet their needs. The Act suggested that children with SEN were to be educated in mainstream schools subject to several provisos. These included for example that the child would receive the required provision that the education of other pupils would not be disrupted by the integration arrangements and that parents were supportive. The arrangements should also be consistent with the efficient use of resources.

The current conditions for placement at a mainstream school are that it is supported by parents and that it does not disrupt the education of others (Norwich, 2008).

Since the 1990s the literature has suggested a movement towards placing children with SEN in mainstream schools has been driven more by the notion of inclusion than integration. Inclusion has been promoted as a rights issue and about altering the system (Ainscow, 1999) in order to make schools more accommodating to those pupils who are ‘different’. Booth and Ainscow (2000) saw inclusion as involving the identification and minimisation of barriers to learning and participation and, the maximising of resources to support learning and participation. Integration has become about the placement of pupils in mainstream schools without any additional organisational accommodation.
Florian (2008) believed that worldwide inclusion is generally understood within the human rights agenda which demands access to and equality within education. Florian concluded the study ‘Special and inclusive education: future trends’ by drawing upon the work of Ainscow (2007) in that the concept of inclusive education has come to mean very different ideals from the specific such as the inclusion of children with disabilities into mainstream schools to a broad notion of social inclusion used by government as a way to respond to the diversity of learners.

A familiar statement of the rights-based notion for inclusion is the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994). The statement, signed by 92 governments suggested that children have 5 main rights in terms of their education namely:

A fundamental right to receive an education, every child has unique characteristics, abilities and learning needs, education systems should take into account and programmes should be implemented to take into account learner diversity, those with SEN must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them and, regular schools with an inclusive orientation are the most effective measures of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities and building an inclusive society (Salamanca Statement, UNESCO, 1994).

The House of Commons Education Select Committee report on SEN (House of Commons, 1996) urged the government to work harder to define what exactly it meant by the term inclusion. Norwich (2008) highlighted it was interesting that the government response produced a concept of inclusion that still did not clarify the extent to which children with SEN are to be placed in mainstream schools. The DFES proposed the following:

The government shares the committee’s view that inclusion is about the quality of a child’s experience and providing access to the high quality education which enables them to progress with their learning and
participate fully in the activities of their school and community (DFES, 2006, Section 28).

Authors including Warnock writing in 2005 rejected the idea that inclusion is about placement or location at all rejecting educational inclusion as being about ‘all children under the same roof’. She preferred a learning concept of inclusion which is about ‘including all children in the common educational enterprise of learning, wherever they learn best’. Norwich (2007) believed that Warnock’s views were compatible with those of many teachers who worked with children with SEN and saw a degree of withdrawal to a separate setting as being inclusive in the sense of making it possible for some children to engage in the same learning curriculum as others. In a similar vein, Gillinsoo and Green (2008) acknowledged that current concepts of inclusion fail to take into account what those with SEN themselves want. They concluded that the issue is not about treating everybody the same; rather what is important is treating everybody equally.

In 2003 Lindsay noted that inclusive education had been established as the main policy imperative with respect to children with SEN in the UK. He believed that although inclusion had been championed as a means to removing barriers, improving outcomes and reducing discrimination, it was still a complex and contested concept. There was a sense that in reality pupils more often than not were seen to be ‘included’ in the sense that school structures have become more flexible, yielding and therefore open to change in order to enhance the learning opportunities of children labelled as SEN.

McSherry (2000) had previously suggested that although this may be the case for some SEN pupils it was not the case for all, in particular, pupils attending a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) or specialist EBD school nor for those pupils labelled as displaying EBD (emotional and behavioural difficulties). For this group of pupils McSherry believed that schools still operated a predominantly
assimilationist stance. McSherry cited examples of numerous cases where a school would offer a pupil a trial placement with the school retaining the option of removing the pupil if their behaviour was deemed as unacceptable rather than accepting and including the pupil without such additional caveats and being prepared to adapt their structures and procedures to improve the chance of the placement being successful.

McSherry suggested a further distinction was necessary between the concepts of integration and reintegration. Reintegration, she suggests, is a far more difficult process to achieve successfully in that the pupil concerned may already have previously attended a mainstream school and been met with failure and therefore, the process was often fraught with prejudices from both school and pupil with generally low expectations of success held by both parties.

It appears in more recent literature such as Topping and Maloney (2003) that the term inclusion has superseded that of integration yet the term reintegration (suggesting pupils need to adapt to the mainstream school expectations) is still used rather than the term reinclusion (school system adapting to meet pupil need). Whether the terminology hints at underlying attitudes towards pupils or the term has become the general norm without the difference in meaning being noted is difficult to prove.

Despite the lobby for inclusion gaining popularity within the UK, Cole et al (2003) suggested that many LEAs struggled to educate a minority of pupils with challenging behaviour within mainstream schools and ploughed on with the establishment of PRUs. Meanwhile, other authorities were less convinced by the worth of these units, especially in areas where travel to and from the site would be costly in terms of time and money.
2.4 Pupil labelling

In their 1999 study Farrell and Tsakalidou suggested that there was evidence within the UK that mainstream schools were becoming openly hostile to the inclusion or reintegration of certain groups of pupils displaying SEN. McSherry (2000) felt that schools were particularly reluctant to take on pupils who displayed challenging behaviour and especially those given the label EBD.

Lauchlan and Boyle (2007) suggested providing a pupil with a label may be advantageous to them in some ways. In the first instance, the label may lead to treatment which would not otherwise have been forthcoming and as such may lead to the provision of additional resources to meet their needs. However, there is a counter argument which suggests that often the labels applied to pupil difficulties may be far too general to adequately inform the nature of any intervention for individuals. Such an argument had been espoused by Sangue-Burke (1998) who asserted that the EBD label was far too general and ambiguous to account for the full range of difficulties that the term encompassed. The UK government (1997) had also considered this an issue in that the label was not helpful in the provision and quality of intervention leading to a mismatch between pupil need and school provision.

A second possible benefit of acquiring a label suggested by Lauchlan and Boyle (2007) was that it may lead to an increased awareness of and better understanding of difficulties. Conversely, many, for example Norwich (1999) and Phelan (2002) believe the act of labelling may in reality lead to a stigmatisation and ostracisation of the child which may not have otherwise occurred.

There is evidence within the literature to suggest that once a label has been acquired it is very difficult to escape. In 1975, Rues, Henderson, Jones, Lachler and Williams viewed labels as psychologically harmful badges having a potentially long lasting life changing effect upon an individual’s life course. Their claims were acknowledged by Sutcliffe and Simons (1993) who noted that a label
(even one which is well intentioned) may lead to social disadvantage or exclusion of an individual from mainstream society. It appears, in the eyes of many, that the EBD label carries many negative connotations and may have a damaging effect on the preconceptions that people may hold towards the person so labelled.

Riddick (2000) expressed a contrary opinion and argued that stigmatisation can occur in the absence of or indeed precede a label. She challenged the view that a label automatically creates a stigma asserting that a pupil labelled EBD displaying challenging behaviour in the classroom for example may be stigmatised due to the behaviour they display rather than through the attachment of a label.

A third benefit of a label according to Lauchlan and Boyle (2007) is that it may reduce ambiguity and promote communication and professional exchange of information using a shared terminology. However, a counter argument is that there is often little agreement amongst professionals as to the meaning of some labels.

A final benefit to acquiring a label is that the child and their parents may receive comfort from the label in that it acts to explain the difficulties they experience. Yet, in many cases it can lead to a lowering of expectations for the pupil and may ignore factors that have contributed to the difficulties experienced. The Government appears to acknowledge this through the green paper on special educational needs and disability (2012) and it is also acknowledged by the Achievement for All scheme. The scheme is a national charity which supports schools to improve the aspirations, access and achievement of learners and young people. It works to identify why pupils are experiencing difficulties and providing targeted personalised pastoral care to overcome these rather than focussing upon a label.
Authors such as Goldstein (1975) suggested that certain labels could be seen as positive, for example Asperger’s Syndrome which may explain behaviours displayed by a pupil, yet many labels are based upon a notion of impairment evidenced by terminology such as ‘disabled’ or ‘emotional and behavioural disorder’. This, suggested Gillman, Haynes and Swann (2000) posited the difficulty as within the child and may ignore the influence of possible environmental contributory factors and lead to negative conceptions of the child in that the label suggests that the child is somehow to blame for the difficulties.

Finlay and Lyons (1993) suggested children in the UK labelled as experiencing learning difficulties generally experienced a negative social identity. During the early to mid twentieth century it was not uncommon for children to be assigned officially sanctioned labels such as ‘moron’, ‘imbecile’, and ‘educationally subnormal’. The label EBD today carries similar negative connotations serving as more of a hindrance than a help to the child. Historically, pupils who display challenging behaviour have been assigned negative labels. During the end of the Victorian era for example the term ‘maladjusted’ was coined to describe children with difficult behaviour similar to that which today would accrue the label EBD. The term acquired official sanction in the 1944 Education Act (section 8) which defined maladjusted as ‘pupils who show evidence of emotional instability or psychological disturbance and require special educational treatment in order to effect their personal, social or educational readjustment’. More recent labels and definitions suggest that we may not have travelled too far from such a view of some children.

### 2.5 Emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD)

Efforts of inclusion have been successful for many students with SEN. However, students with EBD have not met with the same level of success. Pupils with EBD have always presented a challenge to schools and teachers yet some schools appear much better equipped to meet these pupils’ needs (Cole et al, 2002).
The Statistics for Wales First Release (SDR 164/2011) suggested some 1750 pupils in maintained schools had a statement of SEN for EBD and a further 12666 had EBD but no accompanying statement. In total across Wales 13006 pupils were labelled as EBD.

There is continuing debate within the literature relating to what constitutes EBD, how those pupils labelled EBD should be educated and where indeed this education should occur. There are numerous studies in Europe and North America, for example Kauffman (2002) which have estimated the proportion of the school age population who experience EBD. The figures suggest within the countries studied that the prevalence of EBD is similar, in that it ranges between 3 and 11% of the school age population and according to Goodman and Burton (2010) numbers are continuing to increase. Three studies namely Cole, Daniels and Visser (1993), The Audit Commission (1999) and Cooper (1999) undertaken within England place the prevalence of EBD at the lower end of the spectrum on a par with data gathered in North America whilst, data from Scandinavian countries, for example Egelund and Hansen (2000) suggest a greater prevalence of EBD within their school age population. What is not clear however is the extent to which the difference in prevalence is related to differences in definition, improved detection and diagnosis rates or generally higher levels of challenging behaviours exhibited in schools. A summary of previous studies is found in the table below
### Table 1: Examples of previous studies relating to the prevalence of EBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year of study</th>
<th>Country studied</th>
<th>% of pupils (EBD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Daniels and Visser</td>
<td>1993 and 2003</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>4 – 5% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis and Bigard</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>c. 4% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Audit Commission</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>c. 5% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>4 – 6% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelund and Hansen</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>7 – 11% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelund and Hansen</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>c. 11% of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauffman</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3 – 6% of pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Every Child Matters documentation (2005) the term EBD is used when a child's ongoing behaviour difficulties appear to have their root cause in emotional or possibly social problems. The government suggested that pupils labelled as EBD may display a number of key characteristics including those outlined below.
Table 2: Key characteristics of pupils labelled as EBD

- find difficulty in forming friendships.
- often appear preoccupied and have difficulty in participating in activities.
- have difficulty keeping on task.
- have difficulty taking part in group activities.
- become tearful or have tantrums for little apparent reason.
- have psychosomatic illness.
- have low self esteem and become the victims of bullying.
- become bullies themselves.
- be aggressive and disruptive.
- find difficulty in conforming to school rules and routines.
- be excessively attention seeking.
- underachieve in many areas of the curriculum.

(Every Child Matters, 2005)

EBD is a generic term encompassing many other previously used descriptors of behaviour such as ‘delinquent’, ‘disaffected’, ‘disturbed’, ‘troublesome’ and ‘challenging’. There need not be a medical diagnosis for a child to be identified as EBD. In more recent years the term SEBD appears to have become more commonly employed with the letters standing for (S) social, (E) emotional, (B) behavioural and (D) difficulty. It is interesting to note that although SEBD is commonly used in the USA the D stands for disorder rather than difficulty which firmly posit the root of issues within the individual. There need not be a medical diagnosis for a child to acquire the EBD label.

There are issues concerning the terms (S)EBD in the literature. Smith and Thomas (1993), Winzer (2005) and Visser and Daniels (2008) have suggested a general confusion concerning classification, definition and intervention approaches. It is a broad term open to interpretation and used predominantly within education to refer to pupil difficulties related to behaviour, emotions and
relationships that are of such severity and persistence that they interfere with the individual’s learning and development.

Definitions of (S)EBD are often inadequate and context specific with research highlighting that government policy and practice (Ainscow, 1999) and parental pressures (Barlow, 1998) have influenced which pupils fall under any given definition and produced a fluctuating working definition and different practical applications of the term (Visser and Stokes, 2003).

Cole, Visser and Daniels (1999) suggested the most useful definition of the term be taken from Circular 9/94 (DFE, 1994) ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties range from social maladaption to abnormal emotional stresses. They are persistent (if not necessarily permanent) and constitute learning difficulties’ (DFE, 1994:7). However this was not the first attempt by Government legislation to define the term.

**Table 3: Selected official historical definitions of EBD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 1944 Education Act defined the maladjusted (precursor of EBD) as ‘pupils who show evidence of emotional instability or psychological disturbance and require special education treatment in order to effect their personal, social or educational readjustment’</td>
<td>(1944 Education Act, section 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 1981 Education Act which first introduced the generic term SEN led to the spawning of the term EBD by professionals. Circular 23/89 (DES 1989b) described EBD as ‘children who set up barriers between themselves and their learning environment through inappropriate, aggressive and bizarre or withdrawn behaviour [they have] developed a range of strategies for dealing with day to day experiences that are inappropriate and impede normal personal and social development and make it difficult for them to learn’</td>
<td>(DES 1989b:11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Cliffen (2000) EBD is a wide ranging spectrum of difficulties which can range from deviant to disturbed, from straightforward naughtiness to complex psychological disorders and from nuisance value to being challenging in the extreme.

The revised SEN Code of Practice (DFES 2001b, section 7:60) provided a protracted definition including the terms withdrawn, isolated, disruptive, disturbing, and hyperactive, lacking concentration and challenging behaviour and (DfES, 2001:69) talks of ‘persistent emotional and/or behavioural difficulties which are not ameliorated by the management techniques usually employed in the school’.

According to the 2001 SEN Code of Practice, LEAs must identify and make a statutory assessment of those children for whom they are responsible who have special educational needs and who would probably need a statement. The LEA should seek evidence of factors that could impact upon learning outcomes, including:

Evidence of significant emotional or behavioural difficulties, as indicated by clear recorded examples of withdrawn or disruptive behaviour; a marked and persistent inability to concentrate; signs that the child experiences considerable frustration or distress in relation to their learning difficulties; difficulties in establishing and maintain balanced relationships with their fellow pupils or adults; and any other evidence of a significant delay in the development of life and social skills (DFES, 2001:83).

The category of (B)ESD can be used as noted to describe and label pupils who display a wide range of behaviours. The category is to be reformulated by the Department for Education (DfE) as over 52% of respondents to the Green Paper ‘Support and aspiration: a new approach to special educational needs and disability’ (2011) viewed the category as too broad and unhelpful to teachers in identifying the underlying needs of a pupil which may be displayed as BESD in the classroom.
2.5.1 Causes of EBD

The literature suggests that there is a tension between three perspectives of EBD namely biological, medical and socio-cultural. This is evident within the potential attributed causes of EBD. Raynor (1998) spoke of three established ways of producing a definition which were to view the issue from a psychological perspective which will offer an explanation based upon human behaviour, an aetiological perspective which will identity causation factors and finally, to refer to official documentation and take an establishment perspective viewing the issue from governmental perspectives.

Cooper (1999) indicated that children with EBD presented special challenges to parents, teachers and schools and noted that the term itself was a generic catch-all covering a range of behaviours. He felt that there was a common factor linking all children so labelled whether or not the problems originated from within the child or the environment, the development or alleviation of difficulties depended upon the dynamic intervention between the individual and their environment.

Research conducted by The Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties Association (SEBDA) in 2000 suggested that the prevalence of such difficulties varies according to gender, age, health and domicile. In general, their research concluded that EBD rates were higher in inner city areas, amongst children from socially deprived backgrounds, boys rather than girls, adolescents rather than younger children and, children with other learning, health or developmental issues. Cliffen, also in 2000, suggested a causal link between EBD and other biological or genetic conditions including ADHD and Asperger’s Syndrome. The symptoms and effects of these conditions, he argued, may cause the child frustration and distress and may subsequently be acted out as EBD. Generally Cliffen believed that the causes of EBD could be placed into three categories. These were firstly, family issues including divorce and separation, bereavement, conflict, violence, mental health issues and abuse of the child. Secondly, environmental issues including; inadequate housing, vandalism, drug use, theft
and assault and thirdly, personal difficulties including sensory, physical and developmental impairments. Research by Evans et al (2003) also highlights a higher incidence of EBD occurring within areas which are socially or economically deprived.

What is evident within the literature is that perspectives of professionals working with the EBD labelled child will influence the course of action they will follow and subsequently affect the child and their difficulties. Croll and Moses (1985) reported that teachers ascribed the causes of challenging behaviour as originating from within the child (38% of responses) and to parental/home factors (44%). Miller (1996) suggested teachers ascribed 46% of difficulties as originating from within the child and a further 33% from the home. Both studies, therefore, indicate that the majority of causation factors can be ascribed to the child and their home, suggesting they felt powerless to intervene, as the causes lay outside of their locus of control. However, parents feel that features of teacher behaviour, especially perceptions regarding unfair labelling are an equally major cause of difficulties (Miller, Ferguson and Moore 2002). It would appear that teachers attach labels to pupils which contribute to the development of difficulties and lead pupils to become disaffected with the education system.

Jull (2008) expressed concerns in that EBD is perhaps the only form of SEN which exposes a child to an increased risk of exclusion due to the identification and labelling of their SEN and suggests that such children are more likely to become increasingly marginalised and excluded from the mainstream than their peers. EBD pupils can often, as a result, miss out on opportunities that others take for granted and may not receive the support they need.

We can conclude that the causes of BESD are twofold encompassing both ‘within child’ factors which include learning difficulties or physical and mental disabilities and external situational factors. Although there is no automatic link
between specific social factors and BESD there is evidence that prevalence varies according to sex, age, health and income.

2.6 Pupil referral units (PRU)
Local Education Authorities have a duty of care for all children within their remit to provide a suitable education which is supportive of their welfare, health and safety. Educational provision can be provided within mainstream schools whilst education outside of this sector is termed alternative provision which provides for children who are without a mainstream school placement. Within this alternative provision many LEAs have established units for educating children who cannot be accommodated within the mainstream sector. These are called Pupil Referral Units (PRUs). A study by Cole et al (2003) reported that on 1st January 1998 there were 309 PRUs operating in England (DfEE, 1998d) educating 8,900 pupils, ranging from 1 to 351 pupils on roll. A 2005 survey by ESTYN (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales) of PRU provision in Wales found that LEAs provided part or full time provision for 1601 pupils in PRUs and unregistered units with two-thirds of these pupils placed in the fifty units which the LEAs classed as PRUs. Figures suggest that there are approximately 421 PRUs operating in England with 12,800 pupils on roll approximately, and 53 PRUs operating in Wales providing education for approximately 1154 pupils (January 2010) suggesting that in Wales the number of pupils attending a PRU has declined in recent years. Figures for England (DfE 2011) show 14,050 were being educated in PRUs with these children being twice as likely as their mainstream peers to receive free school meals and have poorer attendance.

A Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) is legally both a type of school and provider of education other than at school. They are not subject to all the requirements that apply to mainstream and special schools. Ofsted (2000) suggested that PRUs in the UK generally differ from mainstream education settings in that they operate
with a management committee rather than a governing body, many pupils may be dual registered with a mainstream school, there are differences within the level of qualifications and duties of staff, the PRU need not deliver the full National Curriculum and differences concerning premises and facilities for example, a PRU need not provide a staff room. A PRU does have to offer a broad relevant curriculum and one which will address pupils’ particular needs focussing upon literacy and numeracy skills and improving behaviour and social skills. The PRU came into being following the publication of government circulars collectively titled ‘pupils with problems’ (DES 1994a – 1994e). These included Circular 11/94 which was devoted to the topic of education in PRUs.

The Cole et al (2003) study had found there to be no common definition of PRUs adopted across all LEAs. PRU was within some LEAs used as a generic term to describe multi-site services whilst in others it described discrete sites provided by behaviour support services. In 2005 the Welsh assembly Government stated that PRUs are maintained by Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and are specifically organised to provide education outside of the mainstream school setting for pupils who may not otherwise receive an appropriate education. These units are diverse and LEAs in Wales are free to operate different models of provision designed to meet local need and circumstance and meet statutory requirements. There are a number of models of provision which can be included under the term PRU who may provide for a range of pupils. These are summarised in the tables below:
Table 4: Models of provision included under the umbrella term PRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models of provision included under the umbrella term PRU may include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single site provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple site provision under a single management structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic pupil referral services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-learning provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and home tutoring provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for teenage mothers/expectant schoolgirls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella provision to register pupils following individual programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Types of pupils catered for under the umbrella term PRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of pupils who may be referred to a PRU may include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils excluded from school (permanent or fixed term greater than 15 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant girls and teenage mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious and vulnerable pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School refusers, school phobics and young carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils unable to attend mainstream school due to medical conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children entering local authority care or moving placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pupil who has moved into an LEA and is unable to secure a school place due to shortages and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers and refuges with no school place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A report by Taylor (2012), the UK Government’s expert advisor on behaviour suggested that many children referred to a PRU come from the most deprived backgrounds often, from chaotic homes in which problems including alcohol and drug abuse, mental health issues, domestic violence and family breakdown are common. Such children are often stuck in complex patterns of self-destructive negative behaviour. Helping such children is neither easy nor formulaic as the range of PRU provision may suggest.
A suitable education can be defined as ‘efficient education suitable to the age, ability, aptitude and any special educational needs a child may have’. A PRU should provide an education for pupils who have been excluded, who are at risk of exclusion or disaffected, have social and behavioural difficulties or who suffer from anxiety. The criteria however can vary between local education authorities. A key aim of a PRU is to return pupils to mainstream school whenever this is deemed appropriate. Yet evidence within the literature as suggested by Fletcher-Wilkin and Campbell (2003) shows reintegration of pupils i.e. return to mainstream school provision is by no means guaranteed and is difficult to achieve.

Generally studies written in the 1990s concerning PRUs tended to be critical of the institutions and the opportunities and provision they afforded their pupils. This headline from the Times newspaper dated 20th December 1995 ‘Expelled pupils being failed by special units’ is characteristic of the images held of PRUs at that time.

Garner explored PRU provision in the mid 1990s and published three articles between 1996 and 2000. He studied a number of PRUs which were newly established in that era and compared them to the so called ‘disruptive units’ which he saw as a precursor to the PRU which were common in England and Wales in the 1970s – 1980s These ‘disruptive units’ or ‘sanctuaries’ were established to cater for a new category of children labelled in the 1970s as ‘disruptive’. Garner noted that contemporary authors viewed these units as nothing more than ‘dumping grounds’ for difficult pupils and were viewed as being established more to allow mainstream schools the opportunity to rid themselves of disruptive pupils and their problematic behaviour than to provide an appropriate education for those pupils referred to them. Basini (1981) was scathing of such units suggesting they were characterised by poor accommodation, informal modes of referral, poorly resourced curriculum opportunities and generally well meaning but inexperienced staff.
Garner (1996) termed the new PRUs ‘son of sanctuary’ as he felt that they were merely a continuation of the poorly managed unacceptable units in operation in previous decades which would do little to educate or socialise the children placed in their care.

In his 2000 paper ‘PRU – a policy and practice paradox’ Garner remained critical of PRUs, however, conceded that improvements in provision they offered had been made. He viewed their continued existence as running contrary to the spirit of inclusion and that they remained an unwelcome replica of the earlier unsuccessful segregated provision criticised by many. He suggested that the continued role of the PRU stood as confirmation that, in the case at least of pupils labelled as EBD, inclusive thinking had yet to be established in practice.

Not all opinion expressed in the literature is damning. In the same year Kinder et al recorded an opposing view to Garner. After studying PRU provision in thirty English LEAs they suggested that the PRU for many pupils were a positive experience and highlighted a number of positive PRU characteristics which can be summarised as ‘PRU staff exhibited specific qualities and displayed a commitment to working with these challenging pupils and built positive relationships with them whilst the PRU itself, was able to offer an appropriate curriculum sufficiently flexible to cater for individual need, an ethos which provided a safe calm and ordered environment and opportunities for pupils to achieve success leading to educational remotivation of the often-disaffected pupils’.

The study suggested that what the most successful PRUs offered to pupils was a ‘second chance’ in education and through the setting of high but realistically achievable expectations pupils gained an increase in self-confidence and image, improved attendance and ultimately greater levels of achievement.
The more recent 2005 ESTYN survey of PRUs in Wales was also more complimentary of their work than authors including Garner had been in the 1990s. The survey highlighted many positive features of PRUs including affording pupils access to all areas of the curriculum, effective discipline and behaviour policies accepted and understood by pupils, effective individually tailored programmes of study and strong positive links with schools and parents/carers.

The National Behaviour and Attendance Review (NBAR) by Reid (2008, 2009, 2011a) was also positive concerning the work of PRUs noting that they offered pupils specialist support and work set at an appropriate level within a supportive environment. This appears to mirror findings from the 2006 study by Morgan and Abbott concerning inclusive schooling in Northern Ireland which concluded that special school settings (which I would extend to incorporate PRUs) offered many advantages to their pupils including a focus upon teaching and learning, small group sizes with intensive support and increased pupil self esteem through pupil grouping which led to less frustration and less resulting challenging behaviour which may have been evident in the mainstream classroom. Indeed, in the last academic year 65% of PRUs were judged by Ofsted to be good or outstanding compared with 52% of mainstream schools.

Despite more recent studies suggesting that PRUs were more positive sources of provision than the earlier pessimistic studies had suggested, issues still remain.

A 2007 report by Ofsted in England identified barriers that PRUs faced in providing pupils with a good education which included inadequate accommodation, limited numbers of specialist staff delivering areas of the curriculum and the difficulty in reintegrating pupils back into the mainstream education sector. It was on this last issue that the report suggested that LEAs often displayed a gap between intention and practice as a large number of pupils
remain within long term PRU provision and for many, a reintegration is unlikely to ever occur.

2.7 Reintegration

One of the largest studies of reintegration in the UK was conducted by GHK Consulting in 2004 which surveyed 150 LEAs in England. The authors suggested that reintegration should be viewed as the efforts made by schools, LEAs and other agencies to return pupils who are absent, excluded or otherwise missing from mainstream school provision. Reintegration could be attempted for a diverse range of pupil groups including those permanently excluded, those with persistent unauthorised absence, those not attending school due to medical issues or carers responsibilities and pupils with mobility issues including gypsy/traveller children and those placed into local authority care.

The study concluded that although there were generic concerns and issues apparent across pupil groups each had a range of distinct reintegration needs including requiring a change in educational delivery, additional support to maintain school placement, help to catch up with work after interruptions in their education and securing access to education (in some cases for the first time). Consensus suggested children absent from mainstream education rarely faced a single set of issues rather they experienced combinations of problems which caused or exacerbated their absence. A postal questionnaire undertaken by GHK Consulting which received a 58% response rate produced data summarised below.
Data suggests reintegration is not attempted to the same degree across all pupil groups or school sectors, neither is the likelihood of reintegration being successful a universal given. There are groups of pupils for whom the opportunity to reintegrate is higher than others; equally, the success rate of reintegration varies by pupil group and school type. For all categories of pupils except asylum...
seekers/refugees, the rate of successful reintegration is lower at secondary school compared to primary schools. For the permanently excluded, long term truants and those with medical conditions, the percentage of pupils given the opportunity to attempt reintegration is similarly lower at secondary level. There may be many reasons for this, including that a PRU classroom setting is similar to that of the primary school. The pupil is based in one classroom where there is likely to be LSA support, so they will return to a familiar setting which they may be comfortable within, as compared to secondary aged pupils who are expected to move between classrooms and experience a range of teachers and expectation levels on a daily basis.

From the mid 1990s authors published studies concerning reintegration. Farrell and Tsakalidou (1999) reported that research to that point concerning the reintegration of pupils with EBD displayed mixed results. They noted the earlier research of Lloyd and Padfield (1996) in Scotland which showed a disappointingly low proportion of EBD pupils at approximately 6% were reintegrating and of these pupils, around one third had been permanently excluded again within two years of the reintegration commencing. Shapiro et al (1999) highlighted that the reintegration of EBD pupils lagged behind every other SEN pupil group such as those displaying learning difficulties whilst Downing, Simpson and Myles (1990) found that at any given time less than half of students identified as EBD have been reintegrated for all or part of their education to a mainstream education setting.

Farrell and Tsakalidou discussed a more optimistic study undertaken by Jenkins and Miller (1995) who confirmed there had been a fourfold increase in the number of pupils being reintegrated between 1987 and 1992; however the total figures were only around 5% of pupils, so again consistent with the findings of Lloyd and Padfield. Despite an apparent positive trend in the figures, Farrell and Tsakalidou concluded that once pupils with EBD in particular had been referred to a special school/PRU it was likely that they would remain there for the
remainder of their school career. Their review (1999) highlighted that the available figures concluded that the most likely age at which reintegration occurred was between 11 and 13 years of age. The majority of pupils who did reintehe did so to a new school rather than to the one from which they had been referred and pupils had an increased chance of reintegrating successfully if the process was attempted within their first two years of attending the special school/PRU. This fell dramatically if they remained at the alternative placement for between three and five years and was virtually impossible after six years of placement. This research analysis of Pembrokeshire PRU pupil tracking data suggests the majority of pupils who reintegrate do so to the mainstream school from which they were referred, therefore, do not experience the benefit afforded by a fresh start at a new school. This may be a reason to suggest why some pupils are repeatedly referred to the PRU across their school career. The majority of referrals will also take place after at least one year at the PRU and this length of time away from mainstream may hinder the process making success less likely to occur.

Tootill and Spalding (2000) undertook a study which tracked the progress of a reintegration initiative at a special school in the North West of England between 1994 and 1998. They too agreed with the notion that the possibility of a successful reintegration diminished with increased time spent within an alternative provision setting i.e. time spent away from mainstream schooling and in particular, that the participation of EBD pupils within the mainstream education system was the greatest challenge facing the inclusion movement. Visser also reporting in 2000 agreed that reintegrating EBD pupils was especially difficult and that there were large differences in the ability of schools to accommodate such pupils.

Tootill and Spalding (2000) suggested the likelihood of a successful reintegration may be increased through for example, raising the expectations of pupils, parents and staff to the likelihood of a successful conclusion, for the reintegration
to take place at a school different to the one from which they were excluded to allow the pupil a fresh start, reduce negative perspectives of the pupil which may have blighted their previous school career and break a cycle of negative experience and that the process needs to be planned and promoted as a positive experience to which the pupil has earned the opportunity to participate in.

Visser (2000) commented that schools had an important role in promoting a successful outcome and as such needed to promote certain values including effective leadership, a commitment from a majority of staff to inclusion and the ability to access additional support and services as required.

Within schools demonstrating these qualities there was an increased likelihood of teachers having a clear definition of EBD and an ability to differentiate between general naughtiness and transient misbehaviour. Teachers would also demonstrate a professional commitment to these pupils, a consistent approach in their dealings and a flexible skilled response matching pupil need. Visser concluded that schools which successfully promoted reintegration viewed all pupils as part of the community which the school served, were sharing in that staff, parents and pupils were able to share concerns and strategies and were diverse and open aiming to reduce barriers to EBD pupil participation such as dealing with behaviour issues by confronting the deed rather than the individual.

McSherry (2001) highlighted that dealing with EBD pupils and those with challenging behaviours was a frustrating and intractable task but like Visser suggested that schools and staff responses may have a significant effect upon pupil difficulties and could serve to both alleviate and exacerbate issues.

In 2003 Fletcher-Campbell and Wilkin reported on their study of 15 LEAs in England which concluded that pupils with challenging behaviour were the most difficult to reintegrate. The study concluded that an environment-initiative approach was the most common approach used in the majority of schools and at
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primary school level the focus was on attempting to maintain these pupils in the mainstream classroom setting, whilst at secondary school level there was a shift of focus to dealing with the manifestations of negative pupil behaviour.

In 2004, Islington LEA published guidance concerning the transfer, transition and reintegration of pupils with EBD. The authors suggested that education was ‘organised change in the pursuit of development’ and that during the course of an education career pupils may need to make and cope with three types of move – transfer (move between schools), transition (from primary to secondary school or between key stages) and reintegration (return to mainstream schooling following a period of time away). The report highlighted that whilst there was considerable literature concerning transfer and transition there was a paucity of information concerning reintegration. From what was available they concluded that not only are pupils with EBD/challenging behaviour the hardest to reintegrate successfully but the fact that the pupil displays these difficulties makes the process increasingly traumatic and lowers the likelihood of a successful outcome. In 2004 Maag reported that although most children were able and willing to conform to school cultural norms there were a proportion of students who were unable/unwilling to do so. They may display their own behavioural norms and as a result there is conflict. It is likely that this situation is applicable to many pupils with EBD.

2.8 Perspectives and perceptions of pupils and staff

The 2003 study by Swinson, Woof and Melling drew upon the earlier work of Croll and Moses (1985) and Miller (1996) which focused upon staff perspectives towards pupils with EBD. The study involved staff at a mainstream comprehensive school which was accepting a group of pupils from a special EBD school which was shutting and compared the perspectives of staff prior to the transfer of pupils and again after they had attended the school for a period of time. The study highlighted that initially there was a reluctance to accept these
pupils due to a preconceived notion that they would be disruptive and difficult to manage. If staff either implicitly or explicitly transmitted these fears, then this could influence the perceptions and behaviours of the pupils. However, over time the behaviour of the pupils compared favourably to that of peers and staff perceptions of the pupils became increasingly positive as a result.

Miller (1996) had earlier concluded that following a successfully implemented strategy or intervention staff attitudes became more positive and staff became increasingly aware of factors within the school environment that impacted upon behaviour. Prior to successful interventions staff ascribed 29% of behaviour influences to the school environment compared to 43% afterwards.

It is possible to infer from these studies that as teachers feel more empowered to deal with challenging pupils and see positive changes in their behaviour, their attitude towards them resultantly becomes increasingly positive and can forge positive relationships between pupil and staff.

In 1999 Wise published her study concluding that the perspectives pupils held concerning the factors they believed impacted upon their behaviour were associated with the social, economic and cultural aspects of their lives. However, the majority of factors were located within what they deemed to be negative characteristics of mainstream schooling. These related to school structure such as the size of the school, large class sizes with a high pupil: teacher ratio and curriculum and school practices such as ethos, support and discipline policies. Wise advised schools to make pupils feel welcome and valued as a means to improve perceptions and to offer therapeutic support and guidance.

Tootill and Spalding (2000) highlighted that pupils have many concerns regarding reintegration, in particular emphasising social concerns such as difficulties in forging friendships and being accepted by peers. Fisher (2001) maintained the importance in accounting for pupil perspective concerning reintegration as it has
an increased likelihood of success if it is a process in which pupils feel that they have a vested interest and why the pupil is involved rather than simply reintegration being done to them. Fisher felt that many pupils were reluctant to return to mainstream settings due to a combination of previous negative experiences there, in contrast to the positive experiences encountered at the PRU. As a result pupils often entered into a reintegration with a brooding sense of impending failure, schools need to allay these concerns prior to the onset of the process.

2.9 Barriers to successful reintegration

Studies by Farrell and Tsakalidou (1999), Wise (1999), Fisher (2001), Tootil and Spalding (2003) and GHK Consulting (2004) all report on barriers to (successful) reintegration. Farrell and Tsakalidou compiled a list of the ten most common barriers to reintegration which they listed in order of importance as:

1. Pupils are often seen as being too disruptive for mainstream schools.
2. A lack of staff to support reintegration programmes.
3. Pupils find it hard to cope with work in mainstream schools.
4. A lack of funding in mainstream schools to support EBD pupils.
5. A lack of training for mainstream teachers.
6. Mainstream schools are reluctant to accommodate these pupils.
7. Such pupils often prefer the PRU/alternative provision setting.
8. A lack of links between PRU and mainstream school.
9. Parents generally prefer the PRU/alternative provision setting.
10. Transport difficulties.

(Farrell and Tsakalidou, 1999; 330).

Of these ten issues, four are linked to perspectives and values, five to the education system and one to wider environmental difficulties. Such issues were also evident in the studies by Wise and by Fisher who noted that these were
issues inherent within the education system which served to hamper reintegration, for example, some schools are too large, impersonal and institutionalised. Fisher discussed the notion of reluctance on behalf of the school to accommodate pupils for fear of being blamed for any breakdown in the process. This reluctance, he believed, led to the process becoming overly exaggerated and drawn out leading to the pupil becoming increasingly disengaged and dislocated from mainstream school rendering the process increasingly difficult. The attitudes of teachers towards the reintegration of EBD pupils and their general presence in their classrooms tend to be overwhelmingly negative (Avramidid, Bayliss and Burden, 2000).

The Tootill and Spalding 2003 study focussed upon barriers emanating from within the pupil rather than the school. They asserted that the pupils may often unintentionally erect barriers by drawing negative attention to themselves through poor levels of independence and personal organisation. Skills such as bringing books and equipment to school are essential to ensure learning, especially within mainstream secondary schools, yet many reintegrating pupils lacked these skills with staff citing poor punctuality and attendance which can spiral to leave the reintegration process in jeopardy. There is a link between low feelings of academic competence and low academic ability and behaviour problems of pupils with EBD (Miles and Stipek, 2006).

The GHK Consulting study (2004) highlighted a series of generic barriers to reintegration which the authors grouped as follows:
Table 8: Generic barriers to reintegration identified by GHK Consulting, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School based barriers to reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A reluctance from schools to accept pupils, limited awareness of the needs of reintegrating pupils, insufficient school resources to support the process, a lack of alternative options and inflexible curriculum and negative effects of the school lighting such as secure storage and lighting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact and communication barriers to reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of individuals and agencies, ineffective communication and lack of continuity of contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External barriers to reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lack of parental support, home-based factors including bereavement; ineffective assessment procedures; poorly planned reintegration and limited external services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Factors increasing reintegration success (facilitators)

The 1999 report produced by The Audit Commission ‘Missing out’ suggested that the ultimate success of a reintegration rested upon three key factors – a close partnership between relevant agencies such as schools and education welfare officers, the effective use of available data and proactive management of the process including the appointment of a ‘champion’ within the LEA to track pupil progress and the effectiveness of reintegration programmes.

Fisher (2001) discussed the notion that success factors were located within three areas. Firstly, he concluded that the LEA held a pivotal role in the process in that they were tasked with the dedication of additional resources to accommodate the pupil within a mainstream school, supporting the parents and focussing the role of the PRU as being a short term and temporary placement rather than morphing into a long term permanent alternative provision.
Secondly, the receiving school played an important role and needed to focus upon offering the pupil a fresh start and looking forward rather than focussing upon past difficulties, which could have a negative impact upon their perceptions of the pupil, yet, remaining realistic in their expectations of the pupil.

Finally, the pupil needed to approach the move with a positive attitude and focus upon their past experiences and issues and use these to inform the way forward. Students who reintegrate successfully will display a high academic self concept and an ability to meet expectations within a new setting (Craven and Debus, 1999). McSherry (2001) felt that whilst pupils were generally positive and excited to be reintegrating many were apprehensive and found the move difficult. She believed all pupils should reintegrate with an IRP (individual reintegration plan) in place. This would include the steps to be taken, duties for the LEA officer to review the plan, the name of the target school and a proposed date for the return. This would serve to reduce ambiguity and allow the pupil to feel more confident in the process in that it was set within a concrete framework. McSherry viewed the key to any successful reintegration to be providing appropriate data to the receiving school. She believed the following information to help engender successful reintegration:

Table 9: Information required by schools to reintegrate pupils (McSherry, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Required</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The amount of time out of mainstream school as teachers need to understand the apprehension pupils may feel and the type of induction package they may require.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The reasons why the pupil was attending the PRU as for example a teenage mother may need different support to a pupil with EBD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The programmes and support the pupil accessed at the PRU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The type and amount of reintegration preparation the pupil has received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Baseline academic data as well as information regarding readiness to reintegrate, strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ways of working with the pupil and family which proved successful previously.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the UK, OFSTED (2004) suggested in guidance to schools that successful reintegration was dependent upon preparation of the pupil by the PRU and the induction package offered by the receiving school, an agreed reintegration timetable, careful organisation of teaching groups and general staff and pupil support. Most important was the desire and determination of the pupil, parents and the school to make the process successful with a positive first day essential in ensuring a successful longer term outcome.

An example of an LEA which has issued reintegration guidance to its schools is Islington (2004). Pupil reintegration should be guided by specific considerations. Firstly, pupils needed to be working towards reintegration from the outset with the identification of a target receiving school and return date being a part of the PRU admissions procedure. Secondly due to the fact that pupils may feel they failed in their previous setting, like Fisher (2001) they suggested it be made explicit to pupils what had changed in their time in alternative provision which would make the new placement successful, and that a new start need not be a perfect start otherwise it is possible that previous negative patterns of behaviour can resurface if something goes wrong.

Similar to that advocated by McSherry (2001) the LEA suggested that whilst attending the PRU pupils should formulate a ‘statement of success' which would include what they had tackled during their time away from mainstream school and their achievements and targets for their new school. Schools should pay attention to this and pupils’ academic achievements and view their time spent at the PRU as a time during which the pupil would have been tasked with making a serious commitment to change and should be valued by the school and used to inform their own planning regarding the pupil. Time spent at the PRU should not be viewed as ‘dead' or 'wasted' time.
Guidance from Merton LEA in 2007 emphasised the importance of schools in making the reintegrating pupil feel welcome. Pupils will only reintegrate effectively if they feel wanted by the school. Their emotional response will be one of rejection unless they feel it is safe for them to try and achieve success at the school because others want them to be part of the school community and succeed. For EBD pupils in particular, their relationships with adults and peers are critical. They may have been punished by school in the past through exclusion, and relationships need to be rebuilt especially if they are returning to the same school which referred them to the PRU. As noted earlier a move to a new school is advocated by many as preferable to a return to the old in that it may engender a fresh start, a notion that has gained further credence following a High Court ruling in 2000. In this instance, a High Court judge overturned a reintegration panel ruling suggesting that a pupil be returned to the school from which he had been excluded. The judge felt that this was against the best interests of the pupil and stated:

If I make an order for reinstatement in the present school, not only would he face teachers who have strong views against him being there but they would all be constantly aware of his behaviour and he would be at increased risk of exclusion if he misbehaved (reported in the Times newspaper, 1st August 2000).

From the literature review there appears to be a relative paucity of studies regarding reintegration practices but what emerges is that there is no one-size-fits all approach that will guarantee success for all pupils, and often packages on offer need to be individually tailored and specific to meet pupil need and as to what type of reintegration package is most likely to lead to success.

Concerning this last point McSherry (2001) believed full-time reintegration was preferable to part-time. However, she asserted, in certain circumstances split attendance between the PRU and school could be advantageous to the pupil by allowing time for reflection, to concentrate on social skills and catch up with work. Such arrangements require careful consideration such as time spent travelling
between separate sites and obviously work best when the PRU and school are in close proximity. OFSTED (2004) recorded a wide range of practice evident in schools with some reporting a gradual reintegration or an initial part time attendance at the mainstream school to be particularly effective whilst others preferred to reintegrate pupils on a full-time basis from the outset.

There is debate as to whether or not reintegration is appropriate for all pupils or if some are better served outside traditional mainstream education (but still within the wider education system). Lindsay (2007) asserted that we should view the notion of inclusive education in the broadest sense. It is more than simply a question of mainstream versus special school/unit rather we should view any pupil receiving an education anywhere within the education system as inclusion. Indeed, the Scottish Executive (2006) recorded the ‘Silver Surf’ programme as an instance in which exclusion from mainstream school for EBD pupils in an island community was the mechanism through which they accessed provision which met their needs and in the longer term achieved the broader aim of social inclusion within their community. Although they had been excluded from mainstream school, they were still included within the wider education system and accessed provision better suited to their individual needs.

PRUs have been attacked by opponents such as Garner for promoting pupil segregation and it remains evident that reintegration is a complex process. Studies, for example Ofsted (2007) and Travers et al (2010) have suggested generic success factors and reintegration barriers but it could be argued that the reintegration process is unique to each individual undertaking such a move and therefore needs to be individually tailored.

2.11 Gaps in the literature
What is lacking within the literature is any study of PRUs (and reintegration) undertaken within a rural setting and in Wales. The NBAR (2008) noted that the
level of reintegration to mainstream school of pupils in Wales was low. However, evidence of explanatory reasons remained unclear. A low number of pupils reintegrating to mainstream schools may be due to positive factors within PRUs which offer some pupils an environment which best meets their needs, where they feel valued and comfortable and do not as a result wish to return to mainstream school, or conversely, numbers may indicate a failure within PRUs to improve pupil behaviour which would increase the likelihood of reintegration. The report itself suggested a need for WAG to commission further research into the role and work of PRUs such as to the number of and extent of pupils which they cater for, their purpose and how reintegration could be more successfully pursued.

Previous studies such as that by GHK Consulting (2004) gathered data from PRUs in urban, suburban and rural LEAs in England. However, the data was amalgamated rather than compared and published for different geographic areas.

The NBAR (2008) posited that although Wales has many similarities to England, it does have sufficient unique features which may warrant further investigation, such as provision for the Welsh language, the rural dimension of the country and in places pockets of deprivation and poverty.

As noted in the introduction this piece of research was undertaken within a rural bilingual Welsh setting. As such I have attempted to discover factors specific to the cultural and geographical setting from within which data was gathered which may have acted as facilitators or barriers to successful reintegration.
Chapter 3 Methodological perspectives

3.1 Introduction
The purpose of the research was to investigate from the perspective of mainstream school and behaviour support practitioners the factors that lie behind successful reintegration and to determine whether there were factors inherent within the geographical context which may act as specific contextual success factors or barriers to such a move.

3.2 Research context: education services in Pembrokeshire
The Pembrokeshire LEA recognises that all children have the right to receive a good education and the opportunity to fulfil their potential. The LEA is committed to inclusion in mainstream schools for all children where possible but recognise that for a small number of pupils this may not be feasible, and these pupils may receive more specialist provision for all or part of their school life. To this end, the county provides a range of such provision including a special school, an infant assessment unit and specialist units attached to mainstream schools which cater for pupils with autism, learning difficulties and speech, language and communication difficulties.

The county also provides, a range of support services including a Learning Support service, Pupil Support service, Behaviour Support service, Educational Psychology service, Home Tuition and Teams around the Child (TAC).

3.2.1 Families of schools
Figure 1: A map of catchment areas of Pembrokeshire families of schools

Schools in Pembrokeshire work on a ‘family of schools’ basis to ensure close cooperation between them. The family comprises a secondary school and their associated partner or feeder primary schools.

The secondary schools in the county and the feeder primary schools are placed into 1 of 8 families of schools which I have categorised for the purpose of this research as (A) Bro Gwaun (Fishguard area), (B) Dewi Sant (St. Davids area), (C) Sir Thomas Picton (Haverfordwest area), (D) Tasker Millward (Haverfordwest area), (E) Milford Haven, (F) Pembroke (Pembroke and Pembroke Dock area), (G) Greenhill (Tenby area) and (H) Preseli (Crymych area). It is possible that some primary schools may feed more than one secondary school where catchment areas overlap.

At the start of September 2010, there were sixty one primary schools and eight secondary schools serving Pembrokeshire. Of these, twenty six primary schools had referred at least one pupil in key stage 1 or 2 to the PRU over the period of study whilst seven secondary schools had referred at least one pupil over the same period. (Please see appendix 1 and 2 for additional information regarding context of the study and services operated by the PRU).
3.3 Research paradigms

The literature identifies two main research paradigms: qualitative research and quantitative research, with a third approach, namely mixed method research becoming increasingly evident in recent times.

Bazeley (2003) suggested that qualitative and quantitative research have been defined upon the basis of – the type of data they employ (textual and numeric), the type of investigation (explanatory or confirmatory), the method of analysis (variance theory or process theory) and on their underlying research paradigm (positivistic, interpretive, critical and naturalistic).

3.3.1 Qualitative research

Qualitative research according to Bazeley (2003) is a generic term for methods of investigation that rely upon ethnographic, naturalistic or field/participant observation methods as a means of data collection. These methods emphasise the importance of studying variables within the natural settings in which they occur.

Firestone (1987) suggested that definitions of qualitative research tended to be imprecise but that their underlying methods were bound to a post positivistic, phenomenological world view that assumes reality is socially constructed through the individual or collective definitions of the situation. Firestone asserted that the purpose of qualitative research was to understand the current situation from the perspective of participants.

Rolina (2002) echoed these thoughts and suggested that qualitative research shares the same theoretical assumptions as the interpretive paradigm, which is based on the premise that social reality is created and sustained through the experience of those people involved and that qualitative research is actively
involved in trying to observe, decode and interpret the meaning of phenomena occurring within their natural setting.

3.3.2 Quantitative research

Quantitative research can be seen as dealing with quantitative data i.e. data that can be sorted, classified and measured in a more objective way. Firestone (1987) viewed quantitative research as attempting to explain social changes through the use of objective measures and statistical procedures.

These can be accordingly described by a set of formulae or rules or statistical procedures which then make their definition unambiguous and independent of researcher influence i.e. free from bias (Harvey, 2002). Such an approach is seen as systematic and the data it yields should be replicable and directly comparable. Harvey (2002), however, suggested that quantitative data is not always necessarily comparable as it is highly dependent upon the circumstances and contexts of collection and, upon the characteristics of the researcher (bias).

Rolina (2002) believed that the fundamental positivist paradigm which guides quantitative methods of inquiry is based upon the assumption that social reality has an objective, ontological structure. The assumption behind the paradigm is that there is an objective truth existing in this world that can be measured and explained scientifically. Being deductive and particularistic, quantitative research is based upon the formulation of research hypotheses and upon verifying them empirically as a specific set of data (Frankfort-Nachmias, 1992). Scientific hypotheses, suggested Rolina, are value free with the researcher’s own values, bias and preferences having no place within this approach. However Ahern (1999) and Finlay (2002) mention the importance of reflexivity in research i.e. the awareness of the researcher’s contribution to the construction of meaning throughout the research process (through insights, beliefs, experiences) and an acknowledgement of the fact that it is impossible to remain totally outside one’s
subject matter when conducting research. This is an issue I have acknowledged within this research as I may have a different perspective concerning reintegration than colleagues working within the mainstream education sector. I have taken steps, however, to reduce this bias such as redesigning the questionnaire to take into account information gathered in the expert phase.

Both types of research have strengths and weaknesses, with qualitative research having strengths including data based upon participants’ own category of meaning and being able to describe in rich detail phenomena as they are situated and embedded in local contexts. However, this knowledge may then be too specific and ungeneralisable to other contexts and may have a lower credibility within the research community (for example Woods, 2006) yet it generates theory which becomes available to others to test and apply and a single case study may contribute to archives of studies on a particular topic. Quantitative research meanwhile allows for testing and validity of already constructed theories about how and why phenomena occur and can generate research findings that are replicable with different populations. However, quantitative research may miss out on phenomena of interest which occur due to the rigid focus upon hypothesis testing rather than knowledge generation and the knowledge produced may be too general to be applied to specific situations.

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods are empirical observations which address research questions. Sechrest and Sidani (1995:78) note that both methodologies describe data, construct arguments from their data and speculate about why the phenomena they observed occurred as they did. Additionally, both sets of research incorporate safeguards into their inquiry in order to minimise bias and other forms of invalidity which have the potential to exist in, and distort, all research studies. This qualitative versus quantitative may be seen as a false divide therefore, and rather a matter of method and stance.
3.3.3 Mixed method research

Burke Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) suggested quantitative purists maintain social science should be objective i.e. time and context free generalisations are possible and desirable whilst qualitative purists argue that multiple constructed realities abound and that time and context free generalisations are neither desirable nor possible, as research is value bound and that it is impossible to fully differentiate between cause and effect.

Mixed method research has been defined by Driscoll and Appiah-Yeboah (2007) as the class of research where the researcher combines qualitative and quantitative techniques, methods, approaches, concepts and language within a single study.

Burke Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) view mixed methods research as an attempt to legitimate the use of multiple approaches in answering preset questions rather than restricting the choice of the researcher through rigidly focussing upon a single research paradigm. It can be seen as inductive, pluralistic and complementary suggesting an eclectic approach to method selection.

3.3.4 Types of mixed method research

The qualitative and quantitative approaches can be mixed within or across the stages of the research process. It is a useful research approach which has gained increasing credence within recent years as qualitative and quantitative approaches can be mixed to complement and inform each other. Authors including Hanson (2005) and Crump (2008) have advocated the use of mixed method approaches.

There are two main forms of mixed method research - within stage methods and across stage methods (Burke Johnson et al, 2004). In within stage mixed
methods, both qualitative and quantitative methods are mixed in one or more research stage, for example a questionnaire employed for data gathering may include both closed questions and rating scales (quantitative data) and open ended response questions (qualitative data). In across stage mixed methods, methods will be mixed across at least two stages of the research and may, for example, include a quantitative phase which may be used to inform a later qualitative phase.

The strengths of mixed methods research include the generation and testing of grounded theories and formulation of strong conclusions through corroboration and convergence of findings yet it can be time consuming to undertake.

Some authors have taken issue with the term ‘mixed methods’ to describe research that deigns to concurrently blend both paradigms within or across stages of the research process. For example, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) suggested that a ‘mixed model’ is more suited to differentiate that research which incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data from those studies which merely employ both types of data.

3.4 Methods chosen
A mixed method approach has been chosen for this research. This started with a review of historical data to gather numeric data for analysis (quantitative), postal questionnaire (mixture of qualitative and quantitative) and semi-structured interviews (qualitative). The goal of the initial phase was to gain quantitative data concerning pupil movements over an historical timeframe to identify the potential relationship between several variables on the chance or otherwise of successful reintegration and to use the data to inform the next stage of the process namely the largely qualitative questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Thus, the study can be seen to include both within stage and across stage mixed methods.
The research was completed across three stages each of which was used to inform the next stage. The diagram below describes the timeline of the research.
Figure 3: Research data collection timeline

- **Historical tracking data**
  - Stage one 2008 – 2009

- **Postal questionnaires**
  - Stage two (A) June 2009 (B) September 2009
  - (A) Expert sample for face validity to test variables identified as being influential (educational practitioner views).
  - (B) Landscape exercise informed by expert sample to gather a broader range of educational practitioner views.

- **Face to face interviews**
  - Stage three June 2010
  - Expert sample to drill down into data identified as important during stage 1 and 2 to gather real life experience of reintegration in various educational settings.
Stage one consisted of an audit of historical pupil tracking data which displayed pupil referrals to the PRU and subsequent internal moves and reintegration from 2001 - 2008 for pupils within the KS1 – KS3 age range. This afforded the opportunity to search for concrete patterns of pupil moves and to identify a list of potential situational factors which influenced the processes.

This informed stage two which consisted of postal questionnaires of educational professionals.

Stage two (A) was an expert sample used for face validity to test whether potential variables identified within the historical audit were deemed to be influential by educational practitioners and their relative importance as well as giving an opportunity for respondents to suggest additional situational variables of influence. Responses informed the following stage.

Stage two (B) was a landscape sample to gather a broader range of educational practitioner perspectives.

Stage three consisted of face-to-face interviews with an expert sample designed to drill down into data gathered within the first two stages and to gain real life experience of reintegration within the context of the educational establishments of the interviewees. This allowed interviewees to identify situational and perspective barriers and potential success factors which had hampered or encouraged reintegration within their school context.

3.5 Research ethics
This research study under consideration could be viewed as an example of practitioner research as I (as researcher) am employed in a professional role which relates to the research topic and within the geographical context within which the research was conducted.
An important consideration prior to commencement of and during the research was that of ethics. Morrow and Richards, 1996; 90) defined ethics as a ‘set of moral principles and rules of conduct’ echoing the position of Seiber who suggested that ethics in research related to ‘the application of a system of moral principles to prevent harming or wrongdoing to others, to promote the good, to be respectful and to be fair’ (Sieber, 1993; 14).

Hammersley and Trianou (2012) suggested the principle ethical responsibility of the researcher is to pursue worthwhile knowledge yet the researcher is bound also by a duty of ethical obligation to their employers, professional colleagues and wider community. Researchers are ethically obliged to be honest concerning the aims and objectives of their work and their findings, to treat people equitably and to consider the potential impact of their work upon research participants and non-participants alike. In common with other educational research, this study was bound by the British Educational Research Association guidelines (BERA, 2004) which recommend that educational research be conducted within an ethic of respect for:

- the person
- knowledge
- democratic values
- the quality of educational research and
- academic freedom

(BERA, 2004; 5)

Prior to my commencing this research study there was a requirement to assess the need for formal ethical approval. All research within the school is governed by the University’s Code of Ethics with the process commencing with the completion of a self-assessed ethics checklist followed by a formal ethics review through the School of Education Ethics Committee as the study involved human participants.
Like fellow teacher-researchers there was an obligation to consider ethical issues across all stages of this research.

**Ex post facto** – Data was initially provided in hard copy format. The hard copies contained details including names of pupils within the KS1-4 age range who had been referred to the PRU between 2001 and 2008. My main ethical concern was to preserve the confidentiality and privacy of those pupils recorded within the data set. In the UK, formal guidance on issues concerning confidentiality is given in the Data Protection Act (1998) which as noted by Flewitt (2005) suggests data about individuals must be relevant and adequate for the purpose for which it was collected. Pupils were first anonymised and assigned an identification number (as names were not relevant and as a means of ensuring anonymity) and hard copies of data were collated and summarised into a new digital format with data stored on an encrypted USB memory stick accessed only by myself as researcher. Subsequently hard copies were shredded.

**Questionnaires** – Cohen *et al* (2005) noted questionnaires may be viewed as an intrusion into the lives of potential participants and that participants should not be viewed as passive data providers rather, they are subjects not objects of research. It is not possible to coerce participants into completing a questionnaire but it is possible that their completion be influenced by informed consent, a guarantee of confidentiality, non-traceability and anonymity, the right to withdraw participation at any stage for any/no reason and to not complete all items, beneficence (the potential of the research to improve their situation); and non-malefience (a guarantee that the research will cause them no harm).

The questionnaires required the participation of human participants who were education professionals. The principle ethical obligations governing this stage of research were those identified as the three tenets of ethical consideration by BERA (2004) namely: informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity and the avoidance of harm.
To ensure informed consent a covering letter was included with questionnaires. Informed consent relates to the condition in which participants understand and agree to their participation without duress prior to the commencement of their research involvement (BERA, 2004). The covering letter provided potential participants with information including the nature and aims of the research, who was undertaking it (my professional background and current employment), likely duration of the research and potential dissemination of research findings.

Participants were therefore able to understand the nature of the research and make an informed decision as to whether they wished to participate. Those education professionals who returned completed questionnaires did so of their own free will rather than as a result of coercion. Similarly potential participants were offered no inducements to take part but to try and maximise the response rates I focussed upon the notion of beneficence i.e. that research results would be shared with participants if they so wished to inform their own practice and that of their school regarding their reintegration practice.

To protect participant confidentiality and avoid potential harm of participation (for example the expression of contentious opinions), participants were not required to neither identify themselves by name nor identify the school in which they worked. Completed responses were assigned an identification number (known only to me as researcher) which I used to classify completed questionnaire responses by education sector in which participants were employed and in landscape questionnaires, were asked (if willing) to provide their job title which were used as a second means of classifying questionnaire responses.

**Interviews** - The in-depth nature of the interview which are semi-structured and follow a loose open-ended frame as in this study (Allmark *et al*, 2009) lies in the intention of the interviewer to uncover details of the interviewee’s experience that
may not be disclosed in detail for example in a questionnaire in this instance, their experience of reintegrating pupils within their school.

To ensure informed consent, as with questionnaires, potential interviewees received a covering letter along with a request to become involved in the study again outlining the nature of the research, reasons for conducting the interviews and for their inclusion as potential participants. Interviewees participated through free will rather than under pressure. Written consent was received by email from all participants along with their agreement to participate. Additional oral consent was received on the day of the interview including consent for the interview to be audio-recorded and, participants were able to exercise the right to not answer or answer questions as they saw fit.

Confidentiality is an important issue which can be threatened by the writing up of reports and especially, through the use of quotes (Allmark et al, 2009). Whilst individuals may not be identifiable to the wider public, it is a possibility that they may be identifiable to peers within their professional community. To avoid identification interviewees were not named rather referred to by pseudonyms such as Head teacher 1 for example in the thesis and, the identities of interviewees were not disclosed to fellow participants. Following transcription of the recorded interviews on the day on which they occurred, the audio-recordings were deleted and transcriptions stored on an encrypted USB memory stick. Interviewees were also offered the opportunity to receive a copy of their interview transcription to ensure that I had not misunderstood or misrepresented their responses.

3.6 Ex post facto data analysis
The first stage in the research process was to undertake ‘ex post facto’ document analysis i.e. ‘after the fact’ or ‘retrospective’ analysis of pupils who have been referred to the behaviour support service’s PRU. Documents consisted of a
spread sheet of information for each academic year (see appendix 6 for an example of the 2001-2002 data sets).

Data was gathered and interpreted for pupils referred to the PRU between 2001 and 2002 and 2007 and 2008 academic years. As the pupils I work with are primarily within the KS2-3 age range I decided to focus upon this age group rather than encompass the whole age range including KS4 and recent expansion into KS5 provision as I have no direct contact with pupils in these older age groups. KS1 pupils have been included as it is a possibility that such pupils could be transferred to SAGE. These figures have been used for pupils in KS1-3 to investigate patterns of pupil referral and reintegration over time and to search for possible causal relationships impacting upon the reintegration process. The table below shows the number of pupils on roll at the PRU during each academic year of the period studied in the specified age groups.

Table 10: Number of pupils on roll at the Pembrokeshire PRU during the period covered by this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of pupils on roll</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures cover a relatively long period of time (including the academic years 2001-2004 which were prior to my employment by the Behaviour Support Service) and I believed ex post facto research would be an useful method as suggested by Cole, Manion and Morrison (2005) to tease out possible antecedents and events that have happened and thus cannot be further manipulated nor influenced by myself as researcher. As suggested by Kerlinger (1970) it covers variables over which I have no control, I am only able to observe
these figures in retrospect and attempt to use them to find patterns of cause and
effect.

The ‘pupil tracking figures’ for academic years 2001-2008 follow pupils through a
discrete academic year from their initial referral to the PRU through to the end of
the year. The figures studied and analysed are unfortunately based upon
incomplete data records (various pieces of information may be missing for pupils
due to not being imputed in to the PRU data records). I have attempted as far as
possible to produce a pattern of pupil movements into and out of the PRU during
the aforementioned timeframe. Initially, I planned to build up longitudinal patterns
of pupil movements and track pupils through their career at the PRU but this
proved difficult due to missing data. Instead what has been completed are
patterns for pupil movements for separate discrete academic years.

For each discrete academic year within the timeframe a body of quantitative data
has been obtained which includes for each pupil on the PRU register, their:
gender, chronological age upon referral to the PRU (years and months), key
stage within their school career (KS1-3), placement group assigned to within the
PRU, reading delay (in months behind chronological age), spelling delay (in
months behind chronological age), mainstream school attending upon referral to
the PRU, the family of schools to which the referring school belongs, the type of
move made by the pupil (if any) by the end of the academic year and the
destination of the pupil by the end of the academic year.

These were the variables within the data which I focussed upon as having the
potential to affect the success of a pupils’ reintegration and indeed whether
reintegration be attempted for a pupil within the county.

Having removed pupil names to ensure anonymity, each pupil was assigned an
identification number corresponding to their position on the tracking data list per
year i.e. the pupil identified as pupil 1 was the first pupil named on the data sheet.
that year. Then a data set was built for pupils registered at the PRU for each discrete academic year incorporating data recorded at the PRU including (where recorded) gender, age at referral to the PRU, reading and spelling age as assessed upon entry to the PRU, the PRU group to which they had been referred, the name of the referring school, the family to which the referring school belonged, the type of move made by the end of the academic year and their destination school, PRU group or alternative provision. Each of the last four pieces of information were assigned a numeric (name of the referring school, type of move made and their destination) or alphabetical (family to which the referring school belonged) code.

The data set was investigated to search for patterns relating to pupil referrals to the PRU, pupil reintegration to mainstream school and internal movements within the PRU system. In particular patterns of referral and reintegration were investigated in relation to the pupil’s age (and key stage), gender, PRU placement group, extent of reading and spelling delay, family of schools at which they were registered and type of school which they previously attended.

Simple numerical analysis was undertaken for each academic year (mean, median and mode analysis as well as percentages) and made a comparison analysis between academic years, for example did more pupils reintegrate in year 2002-2003 than in year 2005-2006? Relationships between variables that could explain these differences were searched for.

3.7 Questionnaire of educational practitioners

Cohen et al (2005) suggested that postal questionnaires are one of the most effective methods of data collection in educational settings and believed that the response rates are not massively inferior to those achieved by face-to-face interviews. Gorard (2001) noted the self administered questionnaire was the most common form employed in such circumstances and, although contrary to Cohen et al (2005), he felt response rates could be inferior to other methods, he
also suggested that they may lead to more honest answers than some other approaches due to a lack of researcher/interior bias i.e. they are not completed in the presence of a researcher with a vested interest in their responses.

I felt that a postal questionnaire was the right initial instrument of data collection as it would yield both qualitative and quantitative data as well as opening doors to schools to which I had no direct connections and so might afford the opportunity to follow up the questionnaire with face-to-face interviews. The questionnaire would also allow the opportunity to gain the widest coverage from which to gather a broad working sample.

Postal questionnaires do, however, run the danger of poor response rates. Within the literature, there does not appear to be a standard acceptable response rate to a postal questionnaire. Indeed Barclay et al (2002) went as far as to suggest that there is no such thing as an acceptable response rate. There are wide variations as to what is considered an acceptable response rate with authors including Edwards et al (2002) suggesting 60-80% rates to be adequate. Others such as Mangione (1995) and Cohen et al (2005) gave a figure of 50% whilst Kelley et al (2002) found 20% to be a common response rate to postal questionnaires. Earlier, Barryman (1989) highlighted a number of published pieces of research with response rates of 21-25% for postal questionnaires. For this particular piece of research I aimed to achieve a 50% response rate for the postal questionnaires.

To avoid a low response rate, as far as possible, a covering letter was included which assured anonymity and confidentiality for participants and highlighted the importance of their input in helping to inform the research and the possibility of sharing findings with them upon completion. The possibility of a telephone follow up with non respondents was also considered but in the end decided against to allow response to the questionnaire be what it may.
3.7.1 Questionnaire purpose

The questionnaire was designed to gather information from a school practitioner perspective (expert and landscape sample) concerning the reintegration process and, factors that they felt would impact upon the success or otherwise of the transition. In addition I hoped to gain consensus of opinion as to what constituted successful reintegration.

A major difficulty in considering government guidance and the literature is that whilst the term ‘reintegration’ is often employed it is within the context of lacking a clear definition. Should it be defined based upon the length of time that a pupil remains within a mainstream school; for example, does it mean pupils will return to mainstream school and remain there for: a week a month a term a year? Is it based upon their performance in the new setting, for example, will pupils take an active part in all lessons and activities? Or does it just mean being physically on the school campus?

Lown (2007) explored the reality of successful reintegration and believed that it encompassed two factors – a reduction (as appropriate) of the initial intensive support likely to be offered to the pupil and, the pupil remaining at the school for at least three terms i.e. the reintegration is sustained.

I felt that knowing how schools defined this may well shed light on to their approach to reintegration and may explain differences in approaches and success rates between schools. Expert sample questionnaires were mailed in July 2009 to test the questionnaire partly on its fitness for purpose as a data collection instrument and also to inform the makeup of the landscape study questionnaire.
3.7.2 Question types

In general, questionnaires contain two types of question - closed (dichotomous, multiple choice and rating scale) and open.

Oppenheim (1992:115) argued that closed questions are useful in that they generate figures and data which are amenable to statistical analysis and enable comparisons to be made between participants.

Closed questions are those which prescribe the range of replies from which participants can chose. They are quick to complete and straightforward to code (Wilson and Maclean, 1994:21). However they do not allow participants to include additional remarks or explanations and, as a result, the exclusivity of reply categories may increase the chance of bias in the questionnaire (Oppenheim, 1992:113).

Two types of closed questions were included – dichotomous - those requiring a yes/no reply, having the advantage that participants have to make and express a judgement and provide information that is quick to code, and rating scales, which can build up a degree of sensitivity and differentiation of response, whilst generating numbers useful for quantitative analysis. They are widely used in questionnaires as they offer flexible response with the ability to determine figures and correlations and to fuse measurement with opinion, quality and quantity. They, however, suffer from limitations including not being able to check on whether participants are being truthful; and there is no assumption of equal interval between categories. Most people do not wish to give an ‘extreme’ score and will tend to congregate responses in the middle of a scale. For example, on a five point scale, responses tend to fall between two and four.

Open ended questions allow participants freedom to express their views and may provide what Cohen et al (2005) term the ‘gem’ of information that may not have been delivered by closed questions.
Gorard (2001) suggested open ended questions were the easiest to design as they are closer to the natural way we express questions during conversation, yet there are drawbacks including difficulty comparing responses where there may be little if any common ground and in the time taken to code and analyse replies. Gorard felt their biggest drawback came in adding instrument error to questionnaire results.

In particular, it was hoped to gain insight from an educational practitioner perspective on the following areas:

(a) What constitutes successful reintegration?
(b) Awareness of school based factors which may have influenced reintegration,
(c) Awareness of pupil and family factors which may have influenced reintegration,
(d) Awareness of factors related to support (or lack of) from the behaviour support service and the local education authority and
(e) Rating the impact of sixteen factors which may impact upon reintegration such as pupil gender, age and reputation. (In the main study the list had increased to 24 factors).

3.7.3 Processing
Cohen et al (2005) suggested the first task of data processing is to edit questions to identify and eliminate errors made by participants. Mosler and Kallon (1977) previously suggested that question editing had three main purposes: to check that there is an answer to every question (completeness), check all questions are answered correctly (accuracy) and to check participants have interpreted questions accurately (uniformity).
3.7.4 Pilot phase

Cohen *et al* (2005) suggested that a pilot phase can serve to improve the validity and reliability of the questionnaire as a data gathering instrument and can be used to assess the clarity of the questionnaire, the layout and the instructions, eliminate ambiguity and difficulty in wording of items, check time frame for completion, gain feedback on type of questions used, identify relevant questions, identify commonly misinterpreted items or non-completed items and try out coding/classification systems for responses.

Gorard (2001) suggested a pilot study should not be seen as a process of fine tuning the data gathering instrument, rather as a full scale dress rehearsal for the whole research. Thus, he suggested selecting the sample in the same way as one would in the final study and calculating response rates and analysing data in the same way. This was an area in which this research deviated by deciding to increase the size of the sample and breadth of opinion of the topic. I decided to post landscape questionnaires to all schools within the county regardless of their experience of reintegrating pupils. The questionnaire layout was also amended, as was the number of questions and type of questions asked in the landscape sample (See appendix 4 for landscape questionnaire amendments).

The expert sample questionnaire was used not just to test the data gathering instrument itself but to identify key areas to further explore (or eliminate) in the landscape study and follow up during expert sample interviews. Thus, it was used to inform the landscape sample study as well as to trial the fitness of purpose of the questionnaire as a data gathering instrument.

3.7.5 Non response

Cohen *et al* (2005) note that cases can be lost to non response in two ways, either cases will provide no data at all, or part cases which provide incomplete data. Part data responses may result from a lack of instruction, poorly worded
questions, participant incompetence or ignorance of the answer. All participants who replied without completing the questionnaire cited ignorance of or lack of experience in re-integrating pupils in their school as the reason for non completion (i.e. lack of relevant subject knowledge). Non response can be problematic as it leads to a smaller inferior sample from which to analyse data and may introduce volunteer bias.

Cohen et al (2005) suggested non response (and partial response) should be noted by the researcher and the rate at which it occurs. This is something I have tried to incorporate in the analysis of results through looking for factors that may have contributed to non response such as family of schools to which non responding schools may belong and whether non responding schools have had experience of re-integrating pupils.

### 3.8 Expert sample questionnaire

The first phase of questionnaires consisted of a small expert sample study where copies were mailed to fifteen schools within the county in June 2009 (with the aim of maximising response from secondary schools in particular by avoiding the busiest period of external examinations) with participants given a three week time frame to return replies by SAE by the beginning of July. (Please see appendix 3 for a copy of the questionnaire). This questionnaire was treated as a pilot in that following response the data gathering instrument was amended to increase clarity. Some questions were reworked to reduce ambiguity or removed as appropriate whilst responses informed the addition of new variables to the rating scale questions.

The expert sample consisted of seven secondary and eight primary schools. Seven of the eight secondary schools in the county were chosen (each of whom had experience of referring/re-integrating pupils to/from the behaviour support service) and the eighth school was eliminated due to no prior experience in this
area. Thus, schools who had been involved to varying degrees within the area of research were chosen and which may have a vested interest in completing the questionnaire (as results may be disseminated and used to inform their future practice).

Each of the eight secondary schools belongs to a family of schools and is linked to its own feeder primary schools. Each family of schools had two or more primary schools which had referred/reintegrated pupils and again I decided to focus on those schools with prior experience of this area of research. To keep the sample small, one primary school from each family was questioned. A simple random sampling method was used to select participants from this group. A lottery or fish bowl sample was used whereby each of the schools from the relevant population was assigned a number, I placed the numbers into a box and drew them out at random until there was one primary school from each family, thus hoping to ensure a random representation and avoiding picking schools on the basis of size, location or language category, for example.

Questionnaires were mailed to the head teacher of each school but it was made clear that it needn’t be they who should complete them, rather the lead professional involved in the reintegration process. I decided not to include a formal definition of reintegration rather I was interested in how participants themselves defined the topic and their subsequent approach in school.

3.8.1 Response rates
From the expert sample I received three completed responses from seven secondary schools and one non completed response and from primary schools, four completed responses from eight schools. The overall response rate was seven out of fifteen schools and non completion rate was eight out of fifteen schools. Response rates are illustrated in the table below.
Table 11: Response rates of schools to expert questionnaire and size of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Total schools</th>
<th>Number of schools involved in expert study</th>
<th>% of schools involved in expert study</th>
<th>% of schools contacted who completed the expert study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5% (n=7)</td>
<td>42.9% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1% (n=8)</td>
<td>50% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.2 Processing of expert sample study

It became clear after viewing questionnaire returns that there were issues relating to completeness. Of the expert sample questionnaires, three of the seven returns were incomplete in the sense that one question had been left blank. Whether this was due to a lack of knowledge or experience to answer the questions or due to what in hindsight I considered to have been a somewhat confused and cramped expert questionnaire layout was unclear, however, no respondents alluded to problems concerning questionnaire layout in space provided for feedback.

For the expert sample questionnaire (Please see appendix 3), eighteen questions printed over three sides of A4 were included. Of these, eight were open and ten closed dichotomous questions. Of the closed questions, six were used as funnels where a yes response would lead to an open question giving participants opportunity to qualify or explain answers.

3.8.3 Question focus

The expert sample study was designed with two aims in mind – to gather initial data from a selection of schools which could be analysed and to then use the
information collected to inform the landscape stage of the data gathering process.

The questionnaire commenced with two questions concerning whether or not the school had had prior experience of referring/reintegrating pupils to/from the behaviour support service (BSS). The rest of the questions focussed upon participant’s opinion of factors which could influence the reintegration process and the outcome.

Research conducted during the 1980’s-1990’s viewed reintegration as a process done to (passive) pupils rather than viewing pupils as active participants in the process, yet at the same time, any breakdown or failure of the process was largely attributed to the pupil and their actions. I was interested to discover the underlying attitudes of participants towards five main parties in the reintegration process namely the school, the pupil, their family, the Behaviour Support Service (BSS) and the Local Education Authority (LEA).

Question 3 was open ended and offered participants an opportunity to define successful reintegration. Question 4 provided participants 16 potential variables which may impact upon reintegration and participants were asked to provide a yes/no response as to whether they exerted influence upon reintegration and to then choose the 5 variables they believed to exert the most influence and to rate them from 1-5 with 1 being the most influential.

Questions 5-8 focussed upon the school, and factors within the school environment (both positive and negative) which could influence reintegration and, if there were ways in which schools could improve provision to help pupils successfully reintegrate. I believed these questions would provide salient information as to how individual schools viewed their own practice and could explain why reintegration was successful or otherwise in their institution.
Questions 9-12 dealt with perceived influence (positive and negative) that a pupil and their family may exert upon the reintegration process and, from the point of view of educational practitioners, was there anything that they could do to improve the chances of reintegration success?

Questions 13-15 dealt with perceived influence of the BSS, and the degree to which mainstream schools considered they were adequately supported before, during and following the reintegration process.

Questions 16-17 dealt with perceived influence of the LEA and, the degree to which mainstream schools felt adequately supported by the LEA and how support if applicable could be improved in attempting future reintegration.

There were two additional areas which I wished to test, to inform the design of the questionnaire for the landscape study. These were how schools defined successful reintegration as there does not appear to be a standard national definition of this (question 3). Participants were also asked to rate whether certain variables I identified would influence the reintegration process (question 4), and which in their opinion were the most important. These variables were informed through my own professional practice, analysis of pupil tracking data and factors noted within the literature as possibly exerting an influence upon reintegration. Participants were asked to score the influence of the variables between 1 (little influence/importance) and 5 high influence/importance). Preston and Colman (2000) noted rating scale question participants are often reluctant to score at the extremes i.e. in this case a 1 or 5, however, this was not necessarily the case with many respondents awarding a variable a mark at the higher end of the scale (5) although few participants awarded a variable a score of 1, suggesting variables offered were appropriate and participants concurred they exerted influence over the reintegration process.
3.9 Landscape sample questionnaire

I followed the expert sample study by editing the questionnaire (Please see appendix 5 for a copy of the landscape questionnaire) and posted copies to all schools in the county in September 2009, with a four week time frame for completion by October 2010. The landscape sample questionnaire was mailed therefore to four infant schools, sixty one primary schools, and eight secondary schools in the county.

Within this questionnaire an element of decision making was passed onto head teachers to whom questionnaires were addressed as an accompanying letter made it clear that it need not be they who completed the questionnaire rather the person they believed to be the best person to do so in their school. Trust was placed in their decision to select the participant best suited to complete questionnaires.

This was a landscaping exercise to allow for differences in attitudes and opinions between schools and practitioners which may impact upon the reintegration process to be identified. The questionnaire focus was broadened to include colleagues within the BSS, the county special school and three private schools operating within the county widening the knowledge base from which to work.

Although this sample was broadened to include all schools generating expert and non-expert response alike across both school types and participant position the sample still only included the views of one participant per school.

Results, therefore, are based upon opinions and perspectives of a single individual within a school and should not be deemed to be representative of views of a whole school staff. It is impossible within the limits of the results to suggest how indicative of school ethos these opinions are, for example, data suggests differences in views regarding reintegration based upon respondent position. Many participants were positive regarding reintegration yet research by
Ellis, Tod and Graham-Matheson (2008) for example, suggests that within schools there need only be a critical mass (just enough) staff to believe in inclusion (and by inference reintegration) before it be successful. However, the fact that questionnaires were completed by the person best viewed by the head teacher to respond, could be inferred that their opinions shape school ethos as much as their views are shaped by their situation. If these are the views of staff central to driving reintegration within their schools these views may well have been disseminated across staff and be indicative of whole school view.

3.9.1 Landscape sample questionnaire response rates

The completed response rates were one infant school (25% completed response), twenty one primary schools (34.4% completed response) seven secondary schools (87.5% completed response) one special school (100% response) and one private school (33.3% completed response). The overall completed response was thirty one out of seventy seven schools (40.3%) with a further six schools responding but not fully completing the questionnaire (7.8%). The non completion rate was 59.7% and non response rate 51.9%. The graph below evidences response rates to the landscape questionnaire.

![Graph showing response rates](image)

**Figure 4: Percentage response rate to landscape study questionnaire**

I had hoped that within the landscape study, each school with experience of reintegration would respond which would have accounted for 55% of the total
schools questioned. The best case scenario would, therefore, have been forty one responses from seventy four (non private) schools instead thirty responses were received. This questionnaire was also given to six colleagues within the Behaviour Support Service from where the completed response rate was 100%.

3.9.2 Processing of landscape sample questionnaire

It became clear that there were issues related to completeness of response and in some cases accuracy. In the landscape study, question 2 appears to have been misinterpreted by a high proportion of participants (infant and primary responses 52% misinterpreted, secondary responses 50% misinterpreted). What I hoped to achieve with this question was an understanding of how successful reintegration be defined by participants. Instead, those who misinterpreted the question discussed factors which could influence reintegration success. This hinted at ambiguity in phrasing the question, however, this was not apparent during the expert sample nor alluded to in respondent feedback.

The next stage of data processing was coding (Please see appendix 9 for coding frame) i.e. data reduction through applying a code to each answer of a questionnaire item, after total replies to each item were obtained and tabulated. As the majority of questions were open ended, most codes were developed after questionnaires were administered thus data were post coded. A coding frame was then developed. Studies, for example Beaumont (2009), advocate using a random sample of completed questionnaires to build a coding frame, however I had in mind a loose base coding frame built on expected responses to the questionnaire (informed by the literature review and professional experience). A more inclusive coding frame was then devised based upon common response and was adapted and extended as further data processing uncovered additional responses.
3.10 Interviews

The final stage of data gathering was conducted through a series of interviews completed by the end of July 2010. The aim of the interviews was to elaborate, confirm and add additional qualitative data about practitioner perspectives to the qualitative data obtained from the open ended questionnaire items and quantitative data from the closed questionnaire items and, from the analysis of historical pupil tracking data. The interviews presented an opportunity to explore in finer detail responses given to questionnaires and the opportunity to analyse subtler influences of what may have been underlying the reintegration process i.e. the opportunity to explore the ‘whys’ of the situation rather than the ‘whats’ which had already been identified.

Kitwood (1977) contrasted three conceptions of an interview as (1) a potential piece of pure information transfer and collection, (2) a transaction full of bias which needs to be controlled and accounted for and (3) as an encounter approximating everyday life. Kvale (1996:11) regarded an interview as an exchange of views between two or more people on a topic of mutual interest and sees the centrality of human interaction for knowledge production i.e. knowledge is constructed between interview participants to generate data and emphasises the social situatedness of research data. An interview should be seen as a social situation as well as a data gathering instrument where participants will act upon the basis of the constructs they hold about a situation and it is important to not just focus upon the data content from an interview but, mind should be paid to the context in which it was gathered and generated.

These interviews were viewed in a sense as an example of insider interviews in that although I do not work within the institutions in which the interviews took place I am employed as a teacher within the county, so share a common bond of geographical location and career. I felt that this may increase my credentials and legitimacy with interviewees who may not have viewed me as an outsider, and through this common bond may have been more open with their responses and...
also maybe more keen to help a locally based, fellow educational professional conversely however, this situation could have given rise to conflict, have impacted upon interviewees responding with what they believed I might have wished to hear and have had an influenced my conduct as researcher through pre-existing knowledge and ideas I may have held prior to the interviews.

Cohen *et al* (2005) recognised that a research interview may have varied purposes, such as being the principal means for data collection. I felt that my interviews would serve a differing purpose, namely to follow up on results gained from the questionnaires, to validate the data collected as well as a means to delve deeper into apparently successful institutions and gain knowledge of reintegration as experience within real educational settings.

A series of in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted lasting approximately thirty minutes with staff, asking standardised open ended questions at primary schools, secondary schools and the BSS. Five interviews were completed in total (two primary schools, two secondary schools, and one at the PRU).

**3.10.1 Selection of interview participants**

Interview participants were selected following analysis of pupil tracking data and, of questionnaire responses. The first point of selection was how many pupils have been successfully reintegrated by schools (pupil tracking figures). These were analysed over the historical time frame of the data for example to see if there had been (families of) schools who had traditionally exhibited successful reintegration practice? Or, for examples of (families of) schools who have exhibited improved rates of successful reintegration? The second criteria for selection was from the questionnaire responses, for example were there unique responses or attitudes/ideas towards reintegration provided by questionnaire response?
Letters were written to fourteen schools that completed the landscape questionnaire requesting an interview. An interview was requested with each of the seven secondary schools which replied and also seven primary schools. I had hoped to request an interview from a primary school from each family of schools but this was not possible as there were instances of families of schools where no primary school had replied to the main questionnaire. Each school selected (apart from one for reasons explained later) were experts although due to random sampling employed may not have been involved in the initial expert questionnaire sample.

A reply was received from three secondary schools. Two head teachers (both female) agreed to an interview whilst a third was unable to do so as the respondent was absent from school on a period of extended maternity leave.

One secondary school is based in the north of the county serving a bilingual semi rural/rural catchment area, whilst the other was located in the centre of the county serving a largely English medium urban catchment area. Both schools had experience of referring/reintegrating pupils to/from the PRU and both exhibited change in patterns of referring and reintegrating pupils in recent years.

Interviews were requested from seven primary schools that had completed the questionnaire and the aim was to ensure a representative sample by choosing a mixture of relatively urban and more rural schools, English medium, Welsh medium and bilingual schools and examples of large and small schools. To ensure such a representative sample interviews were requested with schools that may not have had direct experience of reintegrating pupils from the PRU as there were instances, in particular of rural and/or Welsh medium schools having never referred or reintegrated a pupil to or from the PRU. Replies were received from four schools and it was possible to interview two primary school head teachers (both male). In the other cases it was unfortunately not possible to conduct an
interview due to the respondent being on sick leave, the school undergoing inspection during the time in which the interviews were to be conducted or through a lack of free time for the head teacher who was heavily involved with evaluating another internal school-based initiative.

One primary school was a large English medium school serving a relatively urban catchment area in the south of the county which had both recent and historical experience of reintegrating a pupil from the PRU, whilst the other was a much smaller bilingual school with a rural catchment area in the north of the county. Although this school had no experience of reintegrating pupils the head teacher had for many years sat on the inclusion panel which decides on which type of move may be most beneficial to pupils into/out of the PRU thus had extensive expert knowledge.

The final interview took place with the Head of the BSS (female) who as part of her remit is in charge of the PRU. I considered it important to conduct an interview with a member of staff from the PRU who may approach the process of reintegration from a different viewpoint to mainstream school practitioners.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face at a time and venue convenient to the interviewee, which in all cases was at their school in the head teacher’s office, and were thus carried out within their place of work where the real life day to day work of attempting to reintegrate pupils would be situated. Two of the interviews took place at the end of the school day, one occurred prior to the start of the school day and two during the first lesson period of the day.

Participants were informed that interviews would be recorded with their consent and transcribed verbatim to which they agreed and interviewees had the opportunity to review their interview upon completion of transcription if they wished.
A standardised approach to interviews was followed where question wording and sequencing were determined in advance, with interviewees asked the same questions in the same order but to allow the interview to flow and follow what the interviewee said (semi structured). An interview frame was constructed based on questionnaire responses with prompts to ensure relevant areas such as school experience of reintegration and factors inherent to the geographical, economic and cultural make up of the education authority were discussed. I believed this to be an efficient approach as it allowed participants to answer the same questions increasing comparability of response as well as reducing interviewer bias and of being more flexible than a rigidly structured interview in allowing interviewees greater freedom in how they chose to respond.

Transcription is a crucial step in the interview process suggested Cohen et al (2005) and also a problematic one, with the transcription process opening up the possibility of massive data loss, distortion and reduction of data complexity.

Transcripts are decontextualised, dislocated from time and space and distant from the situation dynamic. To counter this, Mishler (1991) suggested that in transcription the researcher should aim to record not just what was said, but how it was said, tone of voice, pauses, the mood of the speaker for example, to give a richer detailed transcription. Each interview was transcribed during the evening of the day in which they took place and were thus still fresh in the mind. Each was transcribed verbatim and following the suggestions of Mishler, field notes were added to the transcriptions highlighting such information as mood and tone of the interviewee and my thoughts and reflections of the interview (see appendix 12 for an example of interview transcription).

Following transcription, a coding frame was constructed to analyse responses of participants on both a basic word level where the number of times a key word such as ‘positive’ or ‘attitude’ had been used was counted, and also analysed larger chunks of text such as sentences or longer passages of speech to search
for themes which may have been evident. The coding frame was constructed following completion of interviews and transcription thus, interviews were post rather than pre coded.

3.11 Summary
This chapter has identified the context in which the research took place and outlined the methods chosen for data collection. The proceeding chapters examine data gathered from initial analysis of historical pupil tracking data through both expert and landscape sample postal questionnaires of and subsequent in-depth interview of an expert sample of educational practitioners.
Chapter 4 Results and analysis (1) Ex post facto analysis

4.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a discussion of results obtained through analysis of historical pupil tracking data. This data was collated and held by the main PRU for pupils registered for discrete academic years between 2001 and 2008. This data is gathered centrally and I focused upon patterns of referral to the PRU, subsequent pupil moves within the PRU and reintegration to mainstream school. There were variables within the data set which I believed may have influenced patterns of pupil transfer or reintegration.

4.2 Results: Ex post facto research
Over the timeframe covered by this stage of data gathering a comprehensive (although at times incomplete) data set concerning pupils referred to the PRU was built, their transfers within the PRU and returns to mainstream school. The information was gathered from records known as ‘pupil tracking data’ collated and kept by the PRU over an academic year recording data on pupils referred to the PRU within KS1-3 (Please see appendix 6 for data set example).

For each discrete academic year a picture of each pupil registered at the PRU was constructed which was manipulated and analysed. Information included names of pupils which for ethical reasons of protecting anonymity and privacy were replaced in tables with a number. The numbers themselves hold no significance as pupil number 1 was the first person on the each register so on up to pupil 47 for example.

Having replaced names with numbers, all names were deleted from my records and as such it is possible that pupil 27 for example, in academic year 2001-2 may still be on roll the next academic year but due to the transient shifting nature of the PRU student population, may then be identified as pupil 33. I did not
consider this to be a major issue nor to have any detrimental effect upon patterns identified within the study as reintegration patterns within a school academic year were focused upon rather than longitudinally.

The data set was approached with a relatively open mind regarding potential patterns which may emerge. The information within the data set included pupil gender, the PRU group to which they were referred the family of schools to which they belong and school attended which referred the pupil to the PRU (identified from A to H. The letter I was included as a code for any school from outside the county from where a pupil joined the PRU). The type of move (if any) the pupil made by the end of the academic year identified by numbers 1-8 was also included.

Ethical considerations such as protecting anonymity and non traceability meant schools were not recorded by name but were assigned identification numbers, primary schools assigned numbers between 1 and 33, home tuition and PRU between 35 and 38 and secondary schools between 41 and 51.

**4.3 Pupil referrals to the PRU: an overview**

The number of pupils referred to the PRU varies each year rather, than the PRU accepting a standard number of pupils. There is flexibility in the referral system, depending upon school policy and level of need.

Referrals to the PRU exhibit a strong gender bias in that the majority of pupils are male. The ratio of male to female pupils varies each year and between PRU groups.

Numbers of pupils referred to each PRU teaching group vary each year rather than each group accepting a standard number of pupils.
The age at which pupils are referred to the PRU within each key stage remains relatively consistent.

Upon entry, the PRU tests pupils’ reading and spelling ability with results confirming many pupils arrive with a reading and spelling age lagging significantly behind chronological age. The extent of the delay varies between individuals however, extent of delay becomes increasingly significant as a pupil progresses through the key stages. Furthermore, data suggests delay in spelling age is slightly more pronounced than reading age.

The total number of pupils referred by each of the eight families of schools within the county varies each year depending upon school need. There are noticeable differences in the number of referrals between families of schools. Differences may be explained by school policy and ethos, available resources and facilities, the levels of provision for pupils within the individual families of schools, and the socio-economic profile of the catchment areas they serve, for example.

The number of pupil referrals within families of schools differs according to school type. The majority of families of schools referred a greater proportion of pupils from secondary schools compared to feeder primary schools, but is not universally the case. Whether this was due to differences in ethos, size and nurture between primary and secondary schools was unclear.

The majority of pupils referred from feeder primary schools are from those categorized English medium, being nearly double those referred from Welsh medium and bilingual schools combined.

The majority of the pupils referred from primary schools are from community primary schools compared to faith schools (Church in Wales or Roman Catholic) or voluntary controlled schools. It is possible to suggest that as many VC and faith schools are selective in the sense that parents have to apply to enrol their
children as compared to community primary schools who do not select rather provide for any pupil within the catchment area there is a closer relation between parental and school ethos within the faith schools, therefore, less clash between ethos and culture resulting in less display of challenging behaviour.

4.3.1 Total number of pupils at the PRU 2001-2008
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Figure 5: The number of pupils on roll at the PRU 2001 - 2008

The graph above highlights that between 2001 and 2008, 248 pupils enrolled at the PRU across the KS1 – KS3 age range, varying from a low of 20 pupils during 2004-2005 to a high of 47 pupils during 2006-2007, the PRU catered for an average of 35 pupils within KS1-3 per academic year.

4.3.2 Referring and non-referring schools

The average size of primary schools as of September 2010 was 161 pupils. The average size of referring primary schools was 219 pupils, noticeably larger than the average size of all primary schools suggesting the larger the primary school size, the increased likelihood of pupil PRU referral.

The average size of non referring primary schools (September 2010) was 117 pupils, significantly lower than the average size of all primary schools suggesting
the smaller the primary school size, the decreased likelihood of pupil referral to the PRU.

4.3.3 Referrals by family of schools

Table 12: Primary pupil referrals to the PRU from each family of school (2001-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av prim sch size.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>123.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim sch size range.</td>
<td>27.5 – 224</td>
<td>73.5 – 106.5</td>
<td>130 – 370</td>
<td>96 – 391</td>
<td>61 – 313</td>
<td>35 – 570</td>
<td>68.5 – 310</td>
<td>73 – 216.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av ref prim sch size.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>339.5</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref prim sch size range.</td>
<td>127.5 – 224</td>
<td>101 – 106.5</td>
<td>309 – 370</td>
<td>121 – 391</td>
<td>149 – 313</td>
<td>60.5 – 570</td>
<td>96 – 310</td>
<td>73 – 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av non ref prim sch size.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non ref prim sch size range.</td>
<td>27.5 – 167.5</td>
<td>73.5 – 141</td>
<td>130 – 206.5</td>
<td>96 – 61 – 122</td>
<td>35 – 190</td>
<td>68.5 – 197.5</td>
<td>105 – 216.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of prim sch that have ref.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of pupils ref by these sch.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language cat of ref prim sch.</td>
<td>DS1 TR1</td>
<td>EW 2</td>
<td>EM 2</td>
<td>EM 4</td>
<td>EM 4</td>
<td>DS1 EM 4</td>
<td>DS 2 EM 3</td>
<td>WM 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Secondary pupil referrals to the PRU from each family of school (2001-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec sch size.</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of pupils ref.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of pupils ref by sch fam.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Pupil referrals to the PRU from each family of school (2001-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils ref from prim sch.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils ref from sec sch.</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: The total number of pupils referred to the PRU by family of schools

The above tables and figure highlight in general, the average size of referring primary schools is greater than those who have not. Numbers of pupils on roll at primary schools seems to have had an impact upon referrals to the PRU with
family H being the only exception to this pattern. Across the 7 other families of schools the number of pupils on roll at referring primary schools ranged from between 30 – 214 more than non-referring schools. The number of pupil referrals from primary schools varied from a low of 2 pupils from family H to a high of 23 pupils from both family D and F.

Pupil referrals from secondary schools varied from 0 from family H to 50 pupils from family F. The total number of pupil referrals ranges from 2 pupils from family H to 73 pupils from family F. The majority of families of schools referred more pupils to the PRU from secondary schools, ranging from 54.9% of family D referrals to 83.3% from family A. There were families however, where the converse was evident in that they referred a greater number of pupils from feeder primary schools, ranging from 58.6% of referrals being from primary schools in family G to 100% in family H.

Leonard et al (2001) suggested smaller schools were more conducive to fostering learning communities premised on caring environments and closer personal relationships thus, within smaller schools challenging behaviour may not be evident to the same extent as their larger counterparts. Smaller size may negate against the development of behaviour difficulties. At primary school level, especially in Pembrokeshire larger primary schools referred a markedly greater number of pupils whilst the pattern is largely replicated within the secondary schools.
4.3.4 Referrals to PRU placement group

Table 15: The number of pupils referred to each placement group at the PRU (2001-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key stage 1</td>
<td>Rainbows</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stage 2</td>
<td>Rainbows</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stage 3</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbeams</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See appendix 2 for explanation of PRU groups)

Figure 7: The number of pupils referred to PRU groups 2001-2008

The graph and table above suggest the number of pupils referred to each of the placement groups varies. These pupil groups were defined in the research context section. What emerges is that groups catering for older pupils have seen the greatest historical number of referrals.
In total, just 22 pupils have been referred at KS 1, 65 pupils at KS2 and 161 pupils to KS 3 provision. Of these older pupils, the majority of 111 were referred to the KS3A group, 33 to the Phoenix group and just 17 to the Sunbeams group (created in 2005). The majority of pupil referrals are within the secondary school stage of their school career. One can speculate as to whether this is due to provision primary schools offer pupils to overcome difficulties such as nurture groups, or differing ethos and policy regarding referral to secondary schools, or that difficulties and challenges a pupil may exhibit have become so entrenched by the time they enter KS3 that there is little schools can do to help pupils overcome them.

### 4.3.5 Referrals by gender

An obvious pattern relating to gender is the majority of pupils attending the PRU across placement groups and age range are male, 213 pupils were male (85.9%) and 35 female (14.1%). There has been a male to female pupil ratio of 6:1. This concurs with gender ratios nationally, highlighting greater male referral to PRUs with January 2010 figures (DES, 2010) for England showing 9,220 male pupils on roll at PRUs compared to 3,690 female pupils (a male to female ratio of 2.5:1). However, female PRU referral rates appear lower than those for England nationally although it is impossible to identify from the data the reasons why.

![Figure 8: A comparison of male and female pupils referred to the PRU (2001-2008)](image-url)
The number of female pupils at the PRU ranges from one in 2004-2005 (5% of the pupil population) to eleven in 2001-2002 (23.9% of the pupil population). The number of female pupils at the PRU varies by academic year and between PRU groups. Of the 35 female pupils, 28 were referred whilst in the KS3 age range, with 19 attending the KS3A group and 9 the Phoenix group.

Of the remaining female pupils, 5 were referred to the KS2R group and 1 to the KS1R group. Not only are girls referred to the PRU in significantly lower numbers, but those referred are largely from secondary schools. Whether this is due to female pupils displaying challenging behaviour at a later age than male colleagues or differences in how schools deal with and perceive them is unclear (are disruptive male pupils seen as being more problematic than disruptive female pupils and therefore more likely to be referred to the PRU at a younger age?). Teacher feedback to a study by Cole et al. (1998) suggested boys may be more likely to act out difficulties related to EBD through externalised disruptive behaviour than their female peers thus are viewed as more challenging in the classroom whilst Younger et al. (1999), suggested that although teachers believed they treated girls and boys equally, evidence advises this is unlikely to be the case. Boys who misbehave may be more likely to dominate classroom interactions and as a result may be viewed as more problematic and therefore increase their chance of PRU referral.

4.3.6 Age of pupil at time of PRU referral

A range of themes emerge regarding the age at which pupils are referred to the PRU. The data was incomplete; therefore, any conclusions are drawn from a partial data set. Three main points emerge.

The average age of pupils referred to the KS1R group between 2001 and 2008 was 91 months ranging from an average age of 74 to 105 months. Pupils referred to this group appear older since 2004 suggesting either pupils are
displaying challenging behaviour later, or more likely, schools are referring pupils later after spending time implementing increased ranges of strategies available to them on site such as nurture groups to engage and maintain pupils at the mainstream school.

The average age of pupils referred to the KS2R group was 114 months ranging from an average of 102 to 128 months. Apart from the 2004-2005 academic year where age at referral to this group dropped, age at referral remained consistent. Since 2006 the age upon referral increased suggesting pupils were being referred at a later stage within their school career. There is little evidence within the literature to confirm such a pattern. However, the DES January 2010 Statistical first release highlighted that of pupils registered to a PRU in England, some 40 pupils were aged under 5, 600 pupils were aged 5-10 whilst the vast majority of 12, 260 were aged 11-15 years.

The average age of pupils referred to the KS3 groups was similar indicating referrals within this group occurred in year 8 or 9 rather than the first year in secondary education therefore likely to occur after schools had implemented strategies following initial pupil transition from primary school.

For the KS3A group, average referral age was 161 months ranging from 149 to 162 months. Apart from a drop in age between 2004 and 2006, there was consistency in the age of referral.

For the Sunbeams group average referral age was 160 months ranging from 150 to 160 months.

For the Phoenix group, the average referral age was 161 months ranging from 160 to 162 months. The age at referral remained consistent.
4.3.7 Reading and spelling delay of pupils upon referral to the PRU

The PRU assessed pupil reading and spelling age upon entry. Any delay is measured in months behind chronological pupil age.
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Figure 9: The average reading delay (months) of pupils upon entry to the PRU

The graph highlights average pupil reading delay varied across key stages and PRU group. Data collated was incomplete; therefore, any conclusions are drawn from a partial data set. However, it was possible to discern themes such as the length of the delay increasing as pupils move through the key stages - the lag in reading/spelling ability becomes increasingly pronounced as the pupil gets older.

The average reading delay of pupils referred to the KS1R group was 11 months (ranging between 8 and 13 months). Average reading delay of pupils referred to the KS2R group increased significantly to 28 months (23 to 37 months) and of pupils referred to KS3 groups varied although in each case significantly greater than delays displayed in KS1-2.

Average reading delay of pupils referred to the KS3A group was 37 months (between 15 to 60 months), to the Phoenix group 43 months (27 to 54 months) and pupils in the Sunbeams group displayed the most pronounced delays in reading age with average delay being 58 months (54 to 61 months).
Figure 10: The average spelling delay (months) upon entry to the PRU

The graph above highlights average spelling delay of pupils varies across key stages and PRU group. Again this data set was incomplete. However, it was possible to discern themes such as the length of delay increases as pupils move through the key stages - the lag in spelling ability becomes increasingly significant as the pupil gets older and, for all groups with the exception of pupils in KS2, spelling delay of pupils is more significant than delays in reading ability.

The average spelling delay of pupils referred to the KS1R group was 20 months (ranging between 16 and 24 months), of pupils referred to the KS2R group increased to 27 months (24 to 37 months), average spelling delay of pupils referred to KS3 groups varied although in each case was significantly greater than delays displayed in KS1-2.

Average spelling delay of pupils referred to the KS3A group was 48 months (between 38 and 55 months), to the Phoenix group 45 months (36 to 52 months), whilst pupils referred to the Sunbeams group displayed the most significant delays in reading age with average delay being 72 months (70 to 74 months).
4.4 Internal PRU pupil moves and reintegration: an overview

The number of pupils who reintegrate to mainstream from the PRU varies yearly. There does not appear to be a standard number of pupils attempting reintegration, suggesting the reintegration process is flexible and pupils will only enter into the process if, agreed by all parties they are ready and able to do so and, the move will best serve their needs.

The number of pupils who remain within their PRU group throughout the academic year varies yearly.

The number of pupils who transfer groups within the PRU varies yearly suggesting moves are flexible and based upon pupil and system need.

The type of reintegration move pupils make varies yearly. However, the majority of pupils who do make the transition will make a full time return to the referring mainstream school as opposed to a new school or a part time move.

Proportionately a greater number of female pupils reintegrate, however, a larger total number of male pupils make the return to mainstream.

Summary

The majority of referred pupils were male, from KS3 secondary school year 8 and upon entry to the PRU display significant delays in reading and spelling age compared to chronological age. In recent years referrals have appeared to be undertaken at a later age than previously, suggesting schools are increasingly attempting onsite solutions prior to referring pupils to the PRU.

In general referring schools were larger than non-referring schools, English medium rather than bilingual or Welsh medium. Within the primary sector they were county primary schools rather than voluntary aided or faith schools and located within relatively urban, English medium catchment areas which are characterised by pockets of relative socio-economic poverty.
Patterns of reintegration differ between key stages. For example, there were greater numbers of part time reintegration moves involving KS1 pupils compared to KS3.

There are differences in numbers of pupils who do/do not re integrate between schools within different families some, re integrating a relatively high proportion of pupils in comparison to others. (See appendix 7 and appendix 8 for more detailed information regarding pupil outcomes and reintegration patterns).

4.4.1 Total number of pupils at the PRU re integrating, remaining or transferring PRU groups

Table 16: The number of pupils re integrating, remaining or transferring PRU groups 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reintegrate (M1 – M4)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils re integrating</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain in group (M6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils remaining</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (M 5, 7, 8)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils transferring</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pupils</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11: The number of pupils reintegrating, remaining or transferring between PRU groups (2001-2008)

Figure 12: The percentage of pupils who reintegrate, remain or transfer PRU groups 2001-2008

Figure 13: The percentage of pupils who reintegrate, remain or transfer PRU groups per academic year 2001-2008
The table and graphs above suggest that between 2001 and 2008 a number of patterns of pupils remaining within their PRU group, transferring groups or reintegrating emerged.

The most common pupil outcome was to transfer to another group within the PRU (moves 5, 7 and 8). These moves include moving to/from home tuition and to alternative provision such as early transition to KS4 provision as well, as a move between placement groups and PRU units. 94/248 pupils made such a move. Of those transferring within the PRU, 70 pupils transferred to another PRU class, 14 pupils to alternative provision finally 9 pupils transferred to home tuition.

For many pupils a short term PRU stay followed by reintegration to mainstream school was not the path followed, with many remaining within the PRU from time of referral to the end of KS4 provision and in increasing numbers beyond. This may be for a variety of reasons, for example, a pupil unable to meet targets set by mainstream schools which would lead to schools refusing to consider reintegration as a viable option, a pupil being assessed as not ready to return to mainstream school or, because the pupil was settled and making progress at the PRU and did not wish to be considered for reintegration.

A pupil remaining within the PRU group to which they were initially referred throughout the academic year was the second most common outcome with 87 pupils doing so.

The least common outcome was mainstream school reintegration (moves 1, 2, 3 and 4) with 68 pupils doing so. Most commonly attempted was a full time return to the referring mainstream school with 45 pupils making such a move, 14 pupils attempted reintegration to a new mainstream school, 7 pupils reintegrated part time to the referring mainstream school with 2 pupils reintegrating part time to a new mainstream school.
It emerged that only 27.4% of those pupils referred to the PRU within KS1-3 reintegrated within the academic year, 72.6% of pupils remained within the PRU system. Differences in numbers of reintegration moves became evident based on gender, age and KS, PRU placement group, literacy difficulties and family of schools from which pupils were referred (see appendix 7 for further information regarding pupil outcomes) suggesting these factors may exert influence upon the process and likelihood of success.

4.5 Reintegration - type of move

![Graph showing moves type](image)

**Figure 14: The number of pupils attempting moves from and within the PRU (2001-2008)**

The graph above shows the types of moves made by pupils during the timeframe of the study (please see appendix 6 for definitions). Patterns of reintegration emerge:

*Move 1* – Full time reintegration to referring mainstream school: attempted by 45 pupils (34 males 11 females). 2 pupils were from KS1, 15 from KS2, 13 from KS3A group and 15 from the Phoenix (KS3) group.

No pupils made such a move within family of schools B or H (lowest referring families). Schools within family F accounted for the largest number of this type of
reintegration with 17 pupils, family E 11 pupils, family A 7 pupils, family C 4 pupils and families D and G 3 pupils each.

Move 2 – Part time reintegration to referring mainstream school: attempted by 7 pupils, thus, far less common than full time reintegration. The move was made by 6 males and 1 female. All pupils making this move were from KS1 where pupils may spend half the day at the PRU and the other half at mainstream school. It does not appear to have been attempted with pupils in KS2 or above concuring with research by Atkinson et al (2003) that reintegration is commonly on a full time basis with pupils in KS3.

Such a move occurred within four families of schools - family G with 4 pupils and 1 pupil in each of families D, E and F.

Move 3 – Full time return to new mainstream school: attempted by 14 pupils (12 males 2 females). 1 of the pupils was from KS1, 8 from KS2, 3 from the KS3A group, 1 from the Phoenix (KS3) group and 1 from the Sunbeams (KS3) group.

No pupils made such a move to schools within family A or C, however, 5 pupils did so within family F, 3 pupils within family D, 2 pupils within both families B and E and 1 pupil within families G and H.

Move 4 – Part time return to new mainstream school: the least commonly attempted made by 2 pupils both male and both from KS2.

One of the pupils made such a move to a school within family C and the other within family F (Please see appendix 8 for reintegration patterns).

4.5.1 Reintegration – gender patterns
Of the 68 pupils attempting reintegration, 54 were male and 14 were female; therefore, more male pupils reintegrated compared to females. Male pupils accounted for 79.4% of all pupils who reintegrated compared to 20.6% who were female. However, male pupils vastly outnumbered female pupils referred to the PRU. Of the 248 pupils registered to the PRU, 214 were male and 34 were female.

Although males made up a significantly greater number of pupils who reintegrated, only 25.2% of male pupils \((n=54)\) reintegrated compared to 41.1% of female pupils \((n=14)\). Therefore, a greater proportion of female pupils reintegrated to mainstream school compared to their male peers.

### 4.5.2 Reintegration by PRU placement group

Of the 68 reintegrating pupils, 10 were from KS1, 25 from KS2, 16 from the KS3A group, 16 from the Phoenix group and 1 from the Sunbeams group. Data suggests in total 48.5% of reintegrating pupils were from the KS3 age range. However, the most common single group from which pupils reintegrated was the KS2R group.

### 4.5.3 Reintegration by reading and spelling delay

Of the 68 reintegrating pupils, reading and spelling delays upon entry to the PRU were recorded for 38 and 42 pupils respectively. Based on incomplete data, it was possible to ascertain that these pupils displayed average reading and spelling delays of 34 and 31 months respectively upon arrival at the PRU. There was no record however of any subsequent testing of literacy during their time at the PRU, therefore, it is impossible to infer how literacy difficulties had been reduced during time at the PRU.
Of the 180 non-reintegrating pupils who remained within the PRU, reading and spelling delays upon entry to the PRU were recorded for 117 and 125 pupils respectively. Based on incomplete data it was possible to ascertain those pupils who did not reintegrate displayed average reading and spelling delays of 38 and 48 months respectively upon arrival at the PRU. Again, there was no record of subsequent literacy testing during time at the PRU.

It was evident that reintegrating pupils displayed an average 4 month less delay in reading and 14 month less delay in spelling age than pupils who remained within the PRU. It is possible to suggest that part of the reason that pupils may have reintegrated whilst others did not was that they had greater literacy levels; therefore, were better able to cope with the curriculum in a mainstream environment.

### 4.5.4 Reintegration by school type

Of the 68 reintegrating pupils there was an almost even split between those who reintegrated to primary and secondary school. In total, 35 pupils returned to primary school marginally higher than the 33 pupils returned to secondary schools.

### 4.5.5 Reintegration by family of schools
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**Figure 15: The percentage of pupils reintegrated by families of schools**
Families of schools A, B, C, E, F and H reintegrated a higher proportion of pupils than they referred. The best performing families of schools in terms of total number of pupils reintegrated being family F and E who reintegrated 24 (32.9%) and 14 (29.8%) of their pupils respectively. Families of schools D and G reintegrated a lower proportion of pupils than they referred suggesting that a reintegration to these last two families was less likely. Family F appears to be the family which simultaneously refers the largest proportion of pupils to the PRU and reintegrates the greatest proportion of pupils. The worst performing family would be family D which referred the second largest proportion of pupils to the PRU but only reintegrated the fourth largest proportion back.

Summary

Proportionately greater numbers of girls reintegrated in comparison to boys with the majority of reintegration moves being undertaken at KS2 in year 6 or KS3 in year 9. Reintegrating pupils display slightly lower levels of literacy difficulties as compared to those pupils who remain at the PRU for extended periods of time. The majority of moves were full rather than part time and a return to the referring school rather than a move for a fresh start at a new school.

There were differing rates of reintegration between families of schools however in the majority of cases reintegration rates varied between 29%–38% of pupils within the range of reintegration displayed by research in other areas.
Chapter 5 Results and analysis (2) Educational practitioner questionnaire

5.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a description of results obtained from postal questionnaires sent to education practitioners regarding reintegration split into two stages.

Stage one consisted of a questionnaire sent to an expert sample of schools to elicit views of colleagues in mainstream schools. (Please see appendix 3). These schools had referred/reintegrated a pupil to/from the PRU. This was followed up with a questionnaire sent to all schools regardless of prior experience of referring/reintegrating pupils, as a landscape exercise. (Please see appendix 5).

5.2 Expert sample set
Of eight secondary schools within Pembrokeshire at the time of this research seven had experience of referring/reintegrating pupils to/or from the PRU. A questionnaire was posted to these schools discounting the eighth from the expert sample set due to lack of experience.

Four replies (57.1% of the sample set) were received of which one was unusable. The data under consideration gives views of head teachers from three schools sent questionnaires accounting for 37.5% of all secondary schools in the county.

At the time of the survey, there were sixty five primary schools in the county. A questionnaire was posted to seven schools. Like their secondary counterparts, each was chosen due to prior experience of pupil referral and/or reintegration. One primary school was selected from each family of school where the secondary school had experience of the subject whilst schools from the eighth family were discounted.
Four replies were received (57.1% of the sample set). The data under consideration gives views of a small proportion of head teachers from the overall total of primary schools in the county at 6.2%. Three were completed in full and one partially (see appendix 10 for post-questionnaire-coded replies).

5.3 Expert sample questionnaire results

5.3.1 Reintegration definitions

The sample set had been designed to reflect prior experience of reintegration in the hope that respondents would view the questionnaire as relevant to and concerned with direct experiences in their school and thus increase the likelihood of a completed response.

Expert participants provided twelve statements across eight post-questionnaire-coded categories. There was some consistency of views with the majority referring to reintegration process followed by outcome of reintegration. This second set of statements was of particular concern and a clear separation in focus between primary and secondary school participants emerged.
The diagram above and those which follow display the number of post-questionnaire-coded statements provided to topics discussed on questionnaires. They include the number of statements given to each post-questionnaire-coded response category.

Primary schools provided seven statements, (some respondents provided more than one statement), the majority related to outcome. Successful outcomes related to the pupil displaying acceptable behaviour, for example, willingness to conform to school rules, uniform and behaviour norms, and the pupil displaying a positive attitude. There was also note that the pupil should be socially included within the school and peer friendships should be encouraged, whilst it was felt that a reintegration would be defined as successful if the return of the pupil caused no disruption or negative impact upon other members of the school community. None of the statements related a successful outcome to a specific length of time or timeframe.

Figure 17: Successful reintegration outcomes expert sample
In comparison, secondary school statements related entirely to factors that could increase the likelihood of reintegration success i.e. focused upon process with no outcome statements nor definition as to what successful reintegration may be.

These process factors included a reintegration package which could include, for example, a staged return to mainstream school, maybe to an on-site unit in the first instance to allow pupils an opportunity to catch up with work missed whilst attending alternative provision. Research by Evangelou et al (2008) highlighted the importance of transition days in aiding transition of primary school pupils to secondary school through offering pupils an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the school and associated behaviour norms and to achieve an insight into the academic standards expected of them. It is not I feel too big a leap to suggest that transition days as part of a staged reintegration (especially if the pupil is making a fresh start at a new school) to be beneficial. Allied to this was a revised or alternative timetable or curriculum to be put in place, for example, disapplication from compulsory Welsh lessons to allow pupils opportunities to complete core subjects and the need for careful monitoring and reporting throughout transition.

Summary

Successful reintegration outcome should be defined as the pupil displaying appropriate behaviour, a positive attitude and achievement of social inclusion within the school without their return having a negative impact upon other pupils. Numerous factors were identified as exerting influence upon reintegration success. The most important variables were reasons for initial referral of the pupil to the BSS/PRU coupled with the length of time away from mainstream school. These two factors could impact perceptions of both school staff and the pupil. Finally there needed to be support for staff either from the BSS/PRU or through appropriate training opportunities.
5.3.2 Reintegration barriers and facilitators

Expert participants were offered a list of potential factors that may influence reintegration. These were post analysis assigned to groups of importance based on responses as follows: firstly factors receiving a 100% yes response to having an influence upon reintegration, secondly, factors receiving a greater number of yes responses, thirdly, factors where response was equally split between yes and no and, finally, factors receiving a greater number of no responses.

Table 17: Variables and response rates

| 100% yes response | (1)Reasons for referral to the PRU, (2) Length of time away from mainstream, (3) Staff perception, (4) Pupil perception, (5) BSS support for schools, (6) Staff training. |
| Greater yes response | (1)School ethos, (2)Pupil reputation, (3)LEA support, (4)Pupil SEN. |
| Equal yes and no response | (1)Pupil age, (2) Key stage. |

Of sixteen factors participants were given, six received a 100% yes response suggesting these were viewed by participants as the most important/influential factors affecting reintegration. These were reasons for initial referral of the pupil to the BSS/PRU, linked to this, length of time the pupil had been receiving education away from mainstream school. Paliokosta and Bladford (2010) suggested the longer a pupil be away from mainstream school the harder it becomes to secure successful reintegration and the reason for the referral/exclusion must influence perception of the school receiving the pupil. For example, a pupil referred to the PRU due to episodes of violent behaviour in school is less likely to be welcomed back by some staff than a pupil being reintegrated after time away for medical reasons.
A second pair of factors related to perception both of school staff and the reintegrating pupil. If perceptions are predominantly negative then it would be harder to secure successful reintegration outcomes. Staff would consciously or otherwise convey feelings to pupils who would as a result feel unwanted and act accordingly.

A final pair of factors related to school and wider education system knowledge and expertise in that staff training in mainstream schools was important to allow staff to confidently deal with challenges a reintegrating pupil may present as well as continued support as necessary to schools from the BSS/PRU.

Four factors received a majority yes response indicating they were deemed to have a significant effect upon reintegration. These were school ethos, pupil reputation, (may influence staff perception of the pupil) support from the LEA such as provision of adequate funding to support the move and to a lesser extent pupil SEN.

A third category of factors received equal numbers of yes and no responses. The factors were linked; pupil age and their key stage of education. Studies, for example Tootill (2000) suggest reintegration be more successful if attempted during KS1-2 and less successful as the pupil moves through secondary school. Finally, factors deemed of lesser importance receiving a greater number of no responses. Gender was viewed of little importance as were literacy and numeracy levels of the reintegrating pupil. I expected these factors to have been assigned greater importance in that pupil SEN stemming from literacy and numeracy difficulties may have caused the pupil to display behaviours which led to PRU referral and, if these had not been sufficiently improved then problems may reoccur upon return to mainstream school. Cole et al (2000) noted research in England confirming that at primary school age boys were 10 times as likely as girls to experience exclusion or PRU referral and 4 times as likely at secondary
school. Osler et al. (2000) noted both gender and SEN may have an impact upon likelihood of exclusion. Finally, the size of mainstream school was assigned least importance by respondents, yet analysis of pupil tracking data confirmed it is larger schools which have referred greater numbers of pupils compared to smaller schools. Sparkes (1999) suggested smaller class sizes have a positive impact upon reducing exclusions but it was impossible from the data to determine class sizes within referring schools.

There was an evident difference in perception of the importance/influence of factors between participants from primary and secondary schools. Eleven of the factors were assigned equal importance between participant groups but there were differences within five variables.

Secondary school participants assigned higher levels of importance to pupil age and key stage compared to primary school participants. It became evident in interviews that older pupils in KS4 were unlikely to reintegrate after PRU referral as by then the school would have exhausted strategies available to them and there may well be significant levels of ill feeling between pupil and school making it unlikely the pupil would be welcomed back.

Primary school participants assigned greater importance to pupil SEN, school ethos and LEA support compared to secondary schools participants. Primary schools are smaller communities and have less staff often teaching a variety of subjects to pupils of all ability levels. A pupil displaying SEN may be more challenging in this setting due to the possible lack of an SEN department or sufficiently trained/qualified staff. Also, being a smaller community it is possible that school ethos is more visible in primary schools and easier to instill in members of the community, therefore, a pupil who is not being included may well be more noticeable.
5.3.3 School located reintegration barriers and facilitators

This theme was only considered by expert sample questionnaire participants, I decided to not include questions on this theme within the landscape sample as I was interested in real life experience of reintegration – by definition, experience lacking within the majority of landscape sample participants. Instead, this was followed up within later expert sample interviews.

The majority of participants agreed that factors located within their school have an impact upon reintegration success with a single secondary school suggesting otherwise. This question was deliberately left open ended in that I did not specify whether factors be positive or negative. This was followed up and drilled down into during face-to-face interviews.

Eight statements were provided across eight post-questionnaire-coded categories, a spread of response rather than repetition suggests identified factors were specific to individual school participants rather than generic.
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Figure 18: School based factors impacting upon reintegration
Half related to school staff. There either was or needed to be a key member of staff responsible for reintegration who would act as a link between school, PRU, pupil and family. That there may be staff resistance to the return of certain pupils depended upon previous history at the school and, finally, the ability of staff to cope with the return of challenging pupils. Whether this was ability or lack thereof was not apparent.

Additional factors included the need for careful monitoring of process and pupil progress, adequate funding and resource provision to meet need and, finally, an admission that it can be difficult to include all pupils in some lessons. This may be due to subject matter which pupils consider difficult/boring resulting in negative behaviour to avoid participating, or due to attitudes or teaching styles of staff.

A clear split emerged with equal numbers of participants suggesting ways in which school could improve provision and those suggesting current practice could not be improved.

The solitary category receiving multiple responses was a need to provide pupils with individually tailored programmes of support which could include an amended timetable/curriculum or, having part of their educational needs met in an alternative setting. Both statements were from secondary schools that may forge links with the county further education college for example, or work as part of a consortium to provide aspects of provision.

Further secondary school statements related to a need for resources to be put in place, particularly LSA support to help within the classroom and the need to provide a time out room or quiet area to which the pupil could retreat.

One primary school noted a need for increased staff training specifically dealing with challenging behaviour and classroom management, whilst a final primary
school noted relationships between school and parents had not always been positive, resentment and lack of trust had developed making it difficult to work positively with challenging pupils if parents did not trust or believe in what the school was attempting to achieve.

**Summary**

A majority of participants believed there were specific factors within their school which could impact upon the reintegration process, including staff factors for example, resistance to the pupil making the move and the need for additional resources to support a move. Half of participants identified that their school could improve current provision to improve rates of successful reintegration. Replies were specific to individual schools and included building positive relationships with parents and a need for extra facilities such as a time out room.

**5.3.4 Family located reintegration barriers and facilitators**

All expert sample participants suggested family circumstances were significant in influencing reintegration.
Participants provided nine statements across five post-questionnaire-coded categories. Two categories received multiple statements namely, families needed to support schools in their efforts and they must display a positive attitude to school which would filter down to pupils and influence their perceptions of school. There was a need to support pupils through practical means such as providing correct uniform and appropriate equipment and providing emotional support as and when problems occur. Families need to forge positive relationships with schools and staff to build trust and instill in pupils a sense of aspiration and will to succeed i.e. doing well in school would have a positive outcome on their lives and education was important rather than something to be endured until they were legally old enough to leave.

**Summary**

Participants agreed that family circumstances impacted upon reintegration with parents having a positive attitude and being willing to support efforts of the school being the most significant.
5.3.5 Pupil located reintegration barriers and facilitators

All expert sample participants suggested individual pupils play significant roles in influencing reintegration.
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**Figure 20: Pupil based factors impacting upon reintegration**

Participants provided nine statements across four post-questionnaire-coded categories. The majority of statements related to pupil attitude. A positive attitude was likely to lead to successful outcomes and negative attitude to breakdowns in transition. Further responses related to pupils having to want to return to mainstream school and to them being willing to modify behaviour to fit mainstream expectations and norms and, finally, the pupil must display a level of aspiration and desire to succeed and make progress within mainstream school.

**Summary**

Participants agreed the pupil would have an impact upon the success of their reintegration move through displaying positive attitude, willingness to adapt behaviour to comply with mainstream expectations, wanting to return to mainstream school and aspiring to succeed identified as important.
5.3.6 PRU located reintegration barriers and facilitators

The majority of expert sample participants indicated they received adequate support from the BSS/PRU when reintegrating pupils, with one primary school indicating dissatisfaction.

When need for support was split into different stages of the reintegration process, 66.7% \((n=5)\) of participants suggested support received prior to the pupil starting reintegration and during the process could be improved, rising to 83.3% \((n=6)\) suggesting support received after reintegration be improved.

Secondary participants felt a greater need for improved support than primary schools. A majority of respondents indicated satisfaction with support yet the PRU could make improvements especially after a pupil had embarked upon the transition.
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**Figure 21: What the BSS/PRU needs to improve**

Participants provided six statements across five post-questionnaire-coded categories. The only category to receive multiple statements was a need for the BSS/PRU to engage in joint planning with mainstream schools to ensure an
appropriate curriculum, timetable and pathway forward. Communication with schools and continued monitoring were suggested as was a desire by mainstream schools to receive a record of work completed by pupils during their time away which could be presented upon return to inform schools of progress and topics covered. Finally, there came a request for additional resources. It was not explicit as to what form these should take: for example additional staffing, staff training or appropriate teaching materials.

Summary

The majority of participants indicated they received adequate support from the LEA; however support could be improved in particular through increased funding and provision of additional staffing to support the pupil.

5.3.7 LEA located reintegration barriers and facilitators

Within the expert sample there was an equal split of opinion between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Secondary schools were less satisfied with only one participant suggesting support was adequate compared to three primary school participants.
Participants provided eight statements across four post-questionnaire-coded categories. Themes emerging of greater importance were that the LEA needed to provide sufficient funding to allow for reintegration programmes and to meet individual pupil needs and there was need for additional staffing with LSA support within the classroom to allow pupils to access the curriculum or additional behaviour support teacher input. A further statement relating to staffing was an increased need for the LEA to provide training one participant believed schools to undertake reintegration in isolation and would appreciate a reintegration manual or protocols from the LEA to guide provision.

**Summary**

The majority of participants indicated they received adequate support from the BSS/PRU, but that support could be improved across all stages of the reintegration process, through more thorough communication and relay of information to mainstream schools, provision of resources and joint planning of pupil provision.
5.3.8 Additional comments/ key resources

Expert sample participants provided seven additional statements across seven post-questionnaire-coded categories. Statements appear specific to individual context.

Although each category received a single statement, themes emerged. The first concerned the possibility that reintegration need not be attempted for all pupils nor be seen as failure if it did not occur, in that mainstream school was not necessarily the most appropriate provision for all. A mainstream school environment may lead to or exacerbate challenging behaviour and alternative settings may remove difficulties and provide an environment in which pupils make progress and thrive. A pupil unable to make progress or cope with mainstream school expectations but thriving in an alternative setting should be viewed as a success if that provision is catering for their specific needs.

A second theme, noted by secondary participants, was the rigidity and inflexibility of mainstream schools due to size and curriculum restraints in comparison to a PRU. This rigidity may exacerbate difficulties. One participant believed rigidity related to sanctions in mainstream schools with teachers with larger groups of pupils having little leeway in how they react to pupil challenge for example, whilst in a PRU with smaller groups there may be a wider range of sanctions, rewards or strategies that a teacher may implement which are effective.

An additional statement from secondary participants was that mainstream education staff may be less tolerant of pupils and challenging behaviour than PRU staff who display greater resilience and view challenging behaviour as a pupil strategy in reacting to a situation rather than a direct attack on authority. This could lead to differences in ways teachers deal with situations and possibly look to avoid confrontation rather than reacting to behaviour ‘head on’ inflaming situations. This notion of staff resilience, or lack thereof, was identified by the Head of the BSS during a follow up interview.
5.4 Landscape sample questionnaire

A second questionnaire was sent to all mainstream schools within the county, three private schools, the county special school and BSS colleagues. This questionnaire incorporated all schools regardless of prior reintegration experience and was thus a landscape rather than an expert sample. The aim of broadening the sample set was to improve data collection threefold through increasing the number and range of schools which could respond, to increase the range of opinions and perspectives and gather a wider representative view from education practitioners. In addition, this questionnaire was used to check the validity of expert sample responses (Please see appendix 9 for landscape questionnaire coding frame and appendix 10 for post-questionnaire-coded results).

5.4.1 Landscape Sample set

From sixty nine mainstream schools twenty nine replies were received, twenty two from infant/primary schools and seven from secondary schools.

Summary

Participants suggested that in particular reintegration to mainstream secondary schools can be difficult due to rigidity and inflexibility of school structures and, for some pupils mainstream school provision is inappropriate and that a pupil making progress in an alternative setting needed to be viewed as a success rather than failure – the debate concerning inclusion needed to be extended to incorporate alternative provision as a form of inclusion as pupils were being catered for within the wider education system.
In total 33.9% of infant/primary schools returned usable questionnaires as did 87.5% of secondary schools. In addition a reply was received from the county special school, from one private school and from six BSS colleagues.

**Table 18: The number of questionnaire responses received by family of schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf/Primary schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the eight families of schools, each secondary school provided a response, except family D (the school had completed an expert sample stage questionnaire).

Of IPS, only those from Family A failed to respond with at least two usable replies received from each of the other families. It is difficult to suggest why some schools responded and others did not. I had expected that schools that had experience of referral/reintegration would have been more likely to respond than those that did not, yet there were instances of schools with prior experience who did not respond and conversely schools with no experience who did.

I had expected that there would be a positive correlation between questionnaire response and the relative number of referrals of pupils to the PRU from families of schools. However, four families of schools provided a greater proportion of questionnaire responses than expected based upon the proportion of pupils they referred to the PRU, for example family H, whilst for the remaining four families of schools the opposite was evident.


5.4.2 Position of respondent

Unlike the expert sample questionnaire participants were invited to indicate their job title/role within the school. This was not intended as a mechanism to identify participants (participants were ensured anonymity and did not give their name). However, I considered the role the participant carried out within the school may impact upon perceptions of reintegration and pupils undertaking the transitions.

Initially I considered classroom teachers or LSA (learning support assistant) tasked with meeting the reintegrating pupil’s individual needs on a daily basis had more direct knowledge and experience of working with pupils than the SENCO or head teacher.

I expected teachers and LSAs would be more concerned with reintegration outcome whilst SENCOs and head teachers who may have more input in the planning and delivery of transitions but less in classroom delivery to display a more process orientated view.

Table 19: Comparison of number of participants by job title and education sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Infant/Primary Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Secondary Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Non-mainstream Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>Head teacher 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head/SENCO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>Asst Head/SENCO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>Head of unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>SENCO 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>LSA 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of respondents were a member of their school’s senior management team (SMT 31 out of 37 respondents) and I would infer be, the person tasked with planning/implementing reintegration.

After providing their job title, participants completed eight questions including open ended questions allowing free response and closed rating scale questions which asked participants to score the extent to which variables can effect reintegration. Answers were on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 not very important/small influence to 5 being very important/large influence).

5.4.3 Landscape sample questionnaire analysis

I opted to undertake two analyses of data to interpret patterns of response. The first was completed through grouping participant’s answers in three categories based upon type of school in which they worked. The categories were Infant/Primary schools (IPS), Secondary schools (SS) and Non-Mainstream schools (NMS) (respondents from BSS, special school and private school).

I considered this to be a valuable way to categorise participants to analyse and compare response as I expected colleagues working within different education sectors to display differing opinions and perspectives to pupil referral/reintegration. This was borne out by data received from the expert sample questionnaire. In particular, I expected IPS participants, where reintegration appears to be more successful, would display a more positive outlook than SS colleagues where reintegration is generally less successful and where many pupils referred to the PRU do not attempt reintegration. I also expected NMS colleagues would display differing opinions to mainstream colleagues as they work with the same pupils albeit in an alternate environment. Staff attitude towards reintegration (and the pupil) I felt helped explain patterns of successful reintegration within the county. In schools with previous positive reintegration experience staff I felt likely to display more positive attitudes.
towards future transitions helping foster future success through establishing positive cycles of success.

Following the school type analysis replies were re-categorised based upon job title and role. Again, three categories were used - head teacher (including head of unit), SENCO (including those fulfilling the role in addition to other roles) and classroom practitioner (teacher and LSA). I considered this a valuable additional way to categorise participants to analyse and compare replies as I felt that participants’ duties and role within the school may influence perspectives and opinions towards reintegration. I felt head teachers and SENCOs may be more concerned with reintegration process whilst classroom practitioners may display a greater focus upon outcomes of reintegration.

5.4.4 Definitions of reintegration and successful reintegration
Landscape sample participants were asked to identify how reintegration could be defined. I considered that how participant’s defined reintegration impacted upon their approach to the process and ultimately the success of any transition.

Figure 23: Factors relating to definitions of reintegration landscape sample
Using a coding frame formulated after replies were received, sixty nine statements were placed into five categories. There was some consistency in views on this issue with the majority related to notions of reintegration occurring within mainstream school with a pupil making either a return or move to mainstream school from other provision. Additional statements related to notions of inclusion were, the pupil attending a ‘normal’ class and that the pupil would in effect be starting again within mainstream provision.

**Summary**

Replies highlighted a commonality of opinion as to what they considered reintegration to be i.e. a pupil making a return or move to a mainstream school or classroom from alternative provision such as returning from a PRU to a mainstream school or from a specialist class/unit within a mainstream school to a mainstream class, for example;

- Pupils being weaned off PRU placement back into mainstream school
- Primary head teacher 5.
- Successful return to mainstream class or indeed to school if the pupil has been in education elsewhere Secondary head teacher 3.

Replies indicated a notion of reintegrating pupils being included within a mainstream setting and also to a lesser extent of having the opportunity to make a fresh start or, start again their mainstream school career after a period of time away in an alternative setting for example

I also wished participants to define how the return or move to mainstream school noted as defining reintegration by the majority would be viewed as successful.

Although no comments alluded to difficulties within questionnaire feedback, there may have been ambiguity within the wording of this question with responses falling into two categories. Some participants answered by identifying what needed to be put in place for reintegration to be successful i.e. concentrated on process whilst others focussed upon what they believed constituted successful
outcomes. This was similar to replies encountered in the expert sample questionnaire. It was this second category of replies with which I was concerned as I again wished participants to provide information concerning how they would define a successful reintegration and identify parameters used to inform their definitions.

Figure 24: What is successful reintegration?

Following formulation of a post-questionnaire-coding frame, sixty seven statements were placed into thirteen categories - six categories were process orientated and seven related to outcomes.

The majority of successful outcome statements related to the pupil conforming to rules and expectations of a mainstream school setting. Again there followed a range of interlinked responses relating to individual pupils. Participants suggested successful outcomes related to the pupil feeling part of the school community and being willing to invest time and energy and participate with what the school was able to offer. If this condition was met then it increased chances of the pupil conforming to rules and behaviour norms expected of all pupils in mainstream education. They should display positive attitude to the process,
mainstream school staff and peers, and as a result be able to function within a mainstream environment. Additional success indicators included making progress academically and socially, including themselves in extracurricular activities and if and when appropriate the pupil be weaned off additional support initially provided until sufficiently confident and competent to work without support.

When setting this question it was expected that replies would be received relating success linked to a timeframe. Definitions of successful reintegration within the literature are relatively scarce and those which mention a timeframe are unable to agree upon length of time the reintegration process needs to proceed before it is defined as successful. The fact that no participant alluded to timeframes suggests successful reintegration should neither be judged nor defined over a particular length of time. A reintegration, for example, may break down in response to an incident after a week, a month or term but in each case may have been considered a success beforehand.

When analysed by school type, it became clear that successful reintegration was defined differently in differing settings. SS participants were far more concerned with the reintegration process as compared to outcome, the polar opposite of views expressed by NMS participants whilst IPS participants placed an equal emphasis upon process and outcome.

When analysed by participant position, both head teachers and classroom practitioners placed greater emphasis upon outcome rather than process. I had expected that classroom practitioners would express such views but the focus of head teachers was a surprise as I expected they would be more concerned with process due to their role in policy implementation and indeed in many secondary schools head teachers in particular, do not carry teaching commitments and, therefore, do not necessarily experience reintegration outcomes firsthand within
the classroom. SENCOs displayed a greater concern towards process rather than outcome matching expectations held for this group.

**Summary**

The three most important indicators of successful reintegration outcome identified were that the pupil was able and willing to conform to mainstream school expectations, for example;

- The pupil is able to maintain attendance and cooperate in class
  Non-Mainstream head teacher 1

- A pupil is using the strategies learned to function in a normal class
  Non-Mainstream teacher 2.

That the pupil was able to make progress without having a negative effect upon other members of the school community

- The pupil is accessing the curriculum, learning and not affecting the education of others
  Secondary head teacher 1

- The pupil is back in the classroom without adverse effect on other pupils or staff
  Primary head teacher 13

Finally that the pupil felt themselves to be a part of the school community, for example;

- The pupil is a valued member of the school. They feel secure and wanted
  Primary head teacher 8

- The pupil is able to feel part of a class or group once more
  Primary head teacher 1.
### 5.4.5 Potential reintegration barriers and facilitators

#### Table 20: The average ratings given to variables influencing reintegration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Infant/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Overall average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil age</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stage</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exc reason</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil SEN</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil literacy</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil num.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil percept</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff percept</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil reput</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av resources</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par support</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out support</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA support</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 8 variables: 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th
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Table 20 indicates the average rating scores calculated for each participant group to the variables offered on the questionnaire as potentially influencing successful reintegration. Participants were asked to rate the relative importance of each variable on a scale of 1 (not important/influential) to 5 (important/influential). It is important to note that the number of participants within each group was not equal which may therefore impact upon the comparativeness of results. Each respondent rated the variables on a 1-5 scale. During analysis, participant rating scores were grouped, for example by job title. Average scores were calculated for each participant group and are displayed above.

Within the landscape sample, the average IPS score across variables was 3.80, for SS participants 3.93 and NMS participants 3.88. Scores were similar; however SS provided highest average scores with IPS the lowest. In each case, average scores were located in the 3.00 – 3.99 score bracket.

The average head teacher score across all variables was 3.82, for SENCOs 3.89 and classroom practitioners 3.80. Scores were similar and did not differ substantially; however SENCOs provided the highest average score, and classroom practitioners the lowest. In each case the score was located in the 3.00 – 3.99 score bracket.

Of 23 variables participants considered, 12 received average scores between 4.00 and 5.00, a further 9, scores between 3.00 and 3.99 and finally 2 scores between 2.00 and 2.99. No variable received an average score of 1.99 or less.
Table 21: The number of variables gaining average ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00–4.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: The number of variables gaining average ratings (grouped by job title and education sector)

Variables were assigned post analysis to four categories of importance – those viewed important/having an influence by all participant school categories, those considered important by two categories, those viewed important by one participant category and finally, those receiving below average scores across all participant categories. (Please see table 23 and figure 26).

Variables participants rated as most important/influential were largely located within the sphere of control and influence of the education system suggesting schools hold a potentially large amount of influence over success of reintegration. However, it is important to consider that the reintegration process of each individual pupil and school is unique and it is difficult to suggest whether or not there is sufficient flexibility within the school or education system to
individually tailor the reintegration package to each pupil. It is also important to consider the relative influence of variables within the process as even though school based influences appear large, do these influences carry equal or greater significance than the lesser amount of pupil or home environment located factors i.e. if a pupil is determined not to make a move to a particular school and there is no parental support for the move even with all the variables apparently under school control can they be offset or overcome?
Table 22: Top 8 Variables influencing reintegration (grouped by job title and education sector)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pupil perception</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>Pupil perception</td>
<td>School ethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>Outside support</td>
<td>Time out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>Pupil perception</td>
<td>Exclusion reason</td>
<td>Staff perception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>Outside support</td>
<td>Staff perception</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>Pupil perception</td>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exclusion reason</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>Exclusion reason</td>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>LEA support</td>
<td>Class size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some agreement existed across participant groups as to which variables exert the greatest influence upon reintegration. Grouping categories of participants, average scores evidence that parental support is deemed of greatest importance (average score 4.87, range 4.60 – 5.00). Both classroom practitioners and NMS participants assigned this variable an average score of 5.00.
School ethos ranked second (average score 4.61, range 4.33 – 5.00) although not across all participants. The rankings have been manipulated here as school ethos ranked higher across a range of participants in comparison to the other variables highlighted in table 28. A school with an inclusive ethos I believe is more likely to achieve successful reintegration in that a pupil feeling they were valued wanted members of the school community would have a more positive perception of the school. This was of greatest importance to classroom practitioners.

Thirdly, length of time the pupil had been away from mainstream school prior to attempting reintegration received an average score of 4.58 (range 4.29 – 5.00). The longer a pupil had been away from mainstream, the harder it becomes to reintegrate successfully. A PRU is a very different environment especially to a mainstream secondary school and the longer a pupil spends in a PRU environment the more difficult it would be to cope with a return to mainstream school. This was of greatest importance to classroom practitioners.

Staff training rated fourth (average score 4.44, range 4.14 – 4.70). Staff who are appropriately trained to deal with the challenges a reintegrating pupil may bring are likely to feel confident in dealing with, and less threatened by, the pupils’ arrival and, therefore, have a more positive perception than an untrained member of staff who may appear reluctant to work with the pupil and consciously or otherwise make the pupil feel less welcome. This was of greatest importance to SENCOs.

Support from the BSS/PRU rated fifth (average score 4.42, range 4.17 – 4.57). This could be support for the pupil, parents and mainstream school and was important before transition commenced and during the process and continued support should be available as appropriate after the pupil had returned to mainstream school. This was of greatest importance to Secondary schools.
Pupil perception ranked sixth (average score 4.41, range 4.13 – 4.71). I believed this may have rated of greater importance by respondents in that the pupil must want to return to mainstream school and be positive towards the transition, school and staff before there is any possibility of success, the pupil must want to be at the school before being willing to abide by school rules and guidelines. This was of greatest importance to Secondary schools.

LSA support ranked seventh (average score 4.35, range 4.13 – 4.70). This was of equal greatest importance to SENCOS and classroom practitioners.

Availability of resources to support the reintegration process ranked eighth (average score 4.25, range 3.67 – 4.70). This was of greatest importance to SENCOS.

There was also agreement as to which variables exerted the least amount of influence upon reintegration. Grouping the six categories of participants, average scores evidence that pupil literacy was deemed of least importance (average score 2.77, range 2.17 – 3.14). Classroom practitioners deemed this least important. Research by Fletcher-Campbell and Wilkin (2003) identified delays in pupil literacy levels as having a detrimental impact upon reintegration through making it increasingly difficult for the pupil to cope with work within the mainstream school environment.

Pupil numeracy ranked of second least importance (average score 2.79, range 2.17 – 3.05). This was deemed of least importance to classroom practitioners. It was expected that this variable would have rated of greater importance particularly to this group, as it would be classroom practitioners who would be working to combat these difficulties on a daily basis.
Deemed of third least importance was school size (average score of 3.04, range 2.59 – 3.50). This was deemed of least importance to secondary schools. I had expected that this variable would have rated of greater importance as within the literature for example Rothika (2010), school size is deemed to influence sustained reintegration success rates, with smaller schools offering a more personal environment to pupils and being able to tailor disciplinary approaches to meet individual need.

A review of literature had been unsuccessful in locating data relating pupil exclusion and reintegration to school size. Research for the Local Government Association suggested the optimum size for a secondary school to be 900 pupils and a primary school 300 pupils.

Measured in this context, six of the eight secondary schools within the county would have pupil rolls above optimum size whilst fifty four of the sixty one primary schools would be below the optimum limit. Research by Craig (2001) suggests optimum school size not be measured upon pupil number, rather related to school leadership, ethos and quality of teaching and learning and will be dependent upon the relative poverty or affluence of the pupil cohort and school catchment area.

Research undertaken in South Carolina by Stevenson (2006) suggested that although optimum school size is as yet undetermined there is evidence that pupils from poorer socio-economic backgrounds achieve greater progress in smaller schools. This is in accordance with earlier research in the USA published in the 1999 Research Roundup of the National Association of Elementary School Principles which suggested that smaller schools offered advantages to pupils related to a caring ethos and sense of nurture.

In 2010 research in England for the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (who advocate a ‘schools within schools’ approach to large secondary schools)
concluded that smaller schools led to decreased exclusion due to more positive pupil-staff relationships. Ofsted (2010) did not agree fully citing that larger schools provide better quality teaching, leadership and management and a wider range of diverse learning and curriculum opportunities which can mitigate against challenging behaviour and exclusion.

Pupil key stage was rated as fourth least importance (average score 3.08, range 2.77 – 3.43). This was of least importance to IPS participants and closely related to pupil age which rated of fifth least importance (average score 3.20, range 2.68 – 3.67). This was of least importance to IPS participants.

Pupil SEN ranked sixth least important (average score 3.28, range 2.71 – 3.50). This was of least importance to Secondary schools. Research by Eastman (2011) suggested that pupil SEN may in some cases increase the risk of pupil exclusion and decrease the likelihood of successful reintegration or inclusion.

Class size ranked of seventh least importance (average score 3.37, range 2.90 – 4.13). This was of least importance to SENCOS.

Pupil reputation ranked eighth least important (average score 3.49, range 3.00 – 3.67). This was of least importance to SENCOS. Research by Wilkin et al (2005) suggested that informal pupil reputation may impact upon reintegration either positively or negatively depending upon the reputation.

Having first provided participants with a prescribed list of variables I considered to impact upon reintegration success within question 3 on the questionnaire, variables were grouped into four categories and participants were asked to rate and compare their relative influence within question 4.

The categories were ‘within pupil’ variables i.e. whose sphere of influence were located within the reintegrating pupil, for example attitude; secondly, ‘at home’
variables (sphere of influence radiated from pupil’s home/family, for example parental attitude); thirdly, ‘environmental’ variables (located within the wider environment the pupil lived in, for example peer attitudes and aspiration). The fourth category consisted of ‘within school’ variables (sphere of influence located within mainstream school, PRU or alternative provision and wider education system, for example, staff training or government policy).

Participants rated the influence/importance of these variables on the same 1 – 5 rating scale as the individual variables.

**Table 23: The average rating given to groups of factors influencing reintegration (grouped by job title and education sector)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Head SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Infant/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Overall average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 26: The average rating given to groups of factors influencing reintegration**
The overall average score across all participants to all categories was 4.26 which would suggest participants rating variables on a 1 – 5 scale agreed that they exerted significant levels of influence. There were however, 3 categories namely pupil, home and school based factors identified as more influential recording an above average score and a further category of wider environment factors receiving below average scores, therefore of lesser importance.

Scores were remarkably similar (range of 0.22 between first and third most important variable). Within pupil factors were ascribed most importance (4.52 average score), followed by ‘at home’ factors (4.47) with school based factors ranking third (4.30). Participants deemed the largest influences upon reintegration to be located within the pupil and home environment i.e. factors outside the control or sphere of influence of the school and therefore, the key to reintegration success lay outside their control. Finally, ‘environmental’ factors were viewed of lesser importance although an average score of 3.74 suggests factors were still of significance.

Average scores displayed a variation of only 0.04 (range 4.21 – 4.25) between participant groups.

IPS participants assigned the second overall lowest average score of 4.17 to the four categories with ‘within pupil’ factors receiving the highest average score of 4.59 and, environmental factors received their lowest average score of 4.23, assigning the lowest average score to environmental factors of any participant group.

SS participants assigned the highest overall average score of 4.54 to the four categories with ‘within pupil’ factors receiving the highest average score of 4.86. These participants assigned the highest average score across the four categories.
NMS participants assigned the lowest average score of 4.14 to the four categories. Unlike mainstream colleagues they displayed differing perceptions as to relative influence of factors, assigning the greatest level of influence to ‘at home’ factors with a score of 4.43 and again, environmental factors last. These participants assigned the lowest average score to both within pupil and school based factors of the three participants. It is possible to suggest that colleagues who work within NMS work not just with pupils who are disaffected and disenfranchised by experiences within mainstream education, but also with equally disaffected parents, often negative about and confrontational towards mainstream schools attempting to reintegrate their children following previous breakdowns in provision. Parental negativity filters down to pupils and influences perceptions they form of schools, negative parental attitude is likely to foster negative pupil attitude and increase the chance of negative outcomes. Within the literature Rieser (2010), PRU staff noted negative parental attitudes and the relative importance of forging positive links with parents before any change in pupil attitude towards mainstream school could be shaped.

Head teachers gave the second highest overall average score of 4.24 to the four categories with both ‘within pupil’ and ‘at home’ variables jointly receiving the highest score of 4.55, with environmental factors lagging some way behind with 3.55. Head teachers assigned the highest average score to ‘home’ factors and lowest to ‘environmental’ factors.

SENCOs gave the highest overall average score of 4.25 to the four categories with ‘within pupil’ factors receiving the highest average score of 4.80, with environmental factors again ranked fourth. SENCOs assigned the highest average score to ‘within pupil’ factors and the lowest to ‘school’ based factors.

Classroom practitioners gave the lowest overall average score of 4.21 to the four categories. They held a differing perception of the influence of variables to SMT colleagues in that school and home based factors were of equal greatest
influence (average score 4.33) and again environmental factors fourth. Classroom practitioners assigned the highest average score to school and environmental based factors of the three groups and, the lowest average score to within pupil factors. I felt classroom practitioners would have greater experience of working with pupils on a daily basis than SMT and therefore, able to view the impact of school based variables such as the success of strategies employed. Mather and Goldstein (2001) suggested that as classroom practitioners see positive results from strategies they implement they become increasingly confident and positive about working with ‘difficult’ pupils and of the amount of influence they can exert within their classroom.

Summary

Participants displayed commonalities and differences of opinion and, of perception of the relative importance of each category of variable.

Of the 4 variables each of the 6 participant categories assigned the lowest level of influence to factors within the wider environment suggesting variables that influence the success of a reintegration are located in greater quantity within the pupil, their home and family and within the school where the reintegration will take place.

Participants classed as members of school SMT differed in opinion to classroom practitioners assigning greatest levels of influence to pupil and home rather than school and home as did classroom practitioners.

Participants classed as from mainstream schools differed in opinions to participants from non-mainstream schools in that they too saw the greatest influences as being located within the pupil or their home compared to within the school and the home.

Mainstream schools and SMT participants appeared to believe they were doing all in their power to achieve successful reintegration yet were relatively powerless to influence outcomes in comparison to pupil and their home influence. Classroom practitioners and non-mainstream participants believed that schools could do more or do exert a greater level of influence upon the outcome of a reintegration but, that home influences and relationships with parents need to be forged before reintegration can be successful.
5.4.6 Pupil located reintegration barriers and facilitators

Within the landscape sample, head teachers, SENCOs and mainstream schools suggested pupils exerted the greatest level of influence as to whether a reintegration move would be a success.

Perception of what participants expected of individual pupils may influence ways schools approach reintegration and have an impact upon success as reintegrating pupils undertake the transition within unique settings with their own set of procedures, expectations and perceptions.

![Figure 27: Pupil based factors influencing a successful reintegration](image)

Participants provided sixty two statements across nine post-questionnaire-coded categories. The majority were in agreement that the pupil undertaking the reintegration process needed to display a positive attitude to the process, mainstream school and staff, for example;

Be positive about reintegrating.  
Primary school head teacher/SENCO 1
Allied to this was a recognition that pupils would be willing to cooperate with school and staff and to implement strategies taught during time in alternative provision. This could avoid escalation of incidents through actively seeking a period of ‘time out’ from the classroom, for example;

Accept that rules apply to all.  
Secondary head teacher 1 or

Agree that guidelines and rules are important.  
Secondary head teacher 3.

Other statements included the need for pupils to join in with what the school had on offer, be willing to accept responsibility for their actions when negative situations arose, to accept support put in place, for example, in class LSA support (which can be seen as a cause of stigma or embarrassment), to communicate with staff any issues which may arise, to actively work towards meeting targets set at the start of reintegration and to attend on a regular basis.

**Summary**

Replies identified attitude of the reintegrating pupil as being seen as influential upon outcome, in that positive attitude was linked to successful outcome and, negative attitude to a failure of reintegration, for example;

Be positive about school and education and, to make a positive effort with staff and fellow pupils  
Non-Mainstream LSA 1

Allied to the need to display a positive attitude, responses suggested the need for the pupil to cooperate and be willing to meet expected norms of behaviour, for example;

To realise that they can’t do what they want in school and, that there are common rules for everyone  
Secondary SENCO 1
5.4.7 PRU located reintegration barriers and facilitators

Landscape sample participants provided fifty five statements across six post-questionnaire-coded categories.

The greatest number of statements with twenty was related to the need for PRUs to retain links with mainstream schools and continue to offer support before, during and after the reintegration process, for example;

Link with school staff about what work was carried out at the PRU and outline clear timescales and expectations for/from all parties.

Primary SENCO 1

They said PRUs should continue to communicate with mainstream schools and inform them of issues regarding pupil success and failures, work carried out during time spent at alternative provision and sharing of strategies and ways of working with the pupil that had proved successful, for example;

A curriculum that is appropriate to the individual student and what is essential, is dialogue and flexibility within groupings.

Secondary head teacher 3
The PRU should help design, offer and implement a package of reintegration to pupils and schools tailored specifically to meet individual need (both pupil and school) rather than expecting all pupils and schools to follow a generic pattern of provision, for example:

- Give frequent opportunities for children to be a part of their normal year group.
  Primary head teacher 1

- Make the change slowly and support the child and the school in the process.
  Primary head teacher 9

Three further categories received a lesser rate of reply: the possibility of the PRU allowing an LSA who has worked with the pupil and built up a relationship to accompany pupils to mainstream school at least for an initial period until the pupil is deemed sufficiently settled for support to be withdrawn, the need for the PRU to maintain a link with parents and encourage them to support the pupil and transition to mainstream school and for the PRU to instil in pupils the importance of adhering to school rules and behaviour expectations. As one of the Primary head teachers said there was a need to:

- Support mainstream school staff and portray mainstream school in a good light and as the preferred option for the pupil.
  Primary head teacher 12

They should continue to communicate with mainstream schools. Schools needed to be informed of issues regarding pupil success and failures, work carried out during time spent at alternative provision. A sharing of strategies and ways of working with the pupil that had proved successful would also be appreciated.

- A curriculum that is appropriate to the individual student and what is essential, is dialogue and flexibility within groupings.
  Secondary head teacher 3

The PRU should help design, offer and implement a package of reintegration to pupils and schools tailored specifically to meet individual need (both pupil and
school) rather than expecting all pupils and schools to follow a generic pattern of provision, for example;

Give frequent opportunities for children to be a part of their normal year group.
Primary head teacher 1

Make the change slowly and support the child and the school in the process.
Primary head teacher 9

Three further reply categories received a lesser response - the possibility of the PRU allowing an LSA who has worked with the pupil and built up a relationship to accompany pupils to mainstream school, at least for an initial period until the pupil is deemed sufficiently settled for support to be withdrawn, the need for the PRU to maintain a link with parents and encourage them to support the pupil and transition to mainstream school and for the PRU to instil in pupils the importance of adhering to school rules and behaviour expectations, for example;

Support mainstream school staff and portray mainstream school in a good light and as the preferred option for the pupil.
Primary head teacher 12

Participants were in agreement as to factors of greatest importance. It was deemed crucial that the PRU provide support to mainstream schools and maintained links with them whilst the pupil attended the PRU, during the transition process and for an appropriate period of time after the transition had occurred. The PRU also played a key role in helping to design, offer and implement a package of reintegration options and support allowing the process to be tailored to individual needs.

There were some differences in participant opinion, for example, the possibility of the PRU providing LSA support was only noted by head teachers, the need for the PRU to forge and maintain links with parents received no response from SENCOs and a desire for the PRU to work with the pupil to reinforce acceptance of mainstream school rules was noted by head teachers only.
A commonality of opinion was displayed by these groups with PRU maintaining links and support, communicating and providing reintegration packages being of greatest importance. There were differences in opinion with IPS participants suggesting LSA support and maintaining parental links were important, whilst the Secondary schools were the only participants to note the need to reinforce mainstream school rules.

5.4.8 LEA located reintegration barriers and facilitators
Landscape sample participants provided fifty six statements across six post-questionnaire-coded categories.
The largest number related to the need for the LEA to provide adequate funding to mainstream schools to allow them to properly accommodate the pupil and fulfil their needs and requirements, noted by all respondents, for example:

To ensure appropriate funding for support services and for complementary curriculum initiatives.

Secondary head teacher 2

This was followed by a wide ranging category of providing schools with support. Two categories related to staffing issues accounting for a quarter of responses; provision of extra staff input such as an LSA, support worker or Educational Psychologist or to provide schools with staff training to meet specific pupil need, for example, strategies to work with pupils exhibiting SEBD or ADHD.

To provide further training for example provides training so that a member of staff from the school spends time with the pupil at the PRU and throughout the transition back to school.

Primary head teacher 2 and Support the school financially and/or give training in counselling children in school as many behaviours may be linked to mental health issues.

Primary head teacher 11
This was especially important to both head teachers and classroom practitioners. Some participants noted there would be an expectation for the LEA to provide additional resources which may be physical including additional school space, and that the LEA should carry out a liaison role and coordinate communication and links with all agencies involved in meeting the needs of the reintegrating pupil including mental health teams (CAMHS), Youth Service and additional agencies as necessary.

Summary
Two themes became evident from replies, namely schools believed LEA support was crucial in terms of provision of appropriate funding levels to provide appropriate curriculum opportunities

Support i.e. funding for additional programmes if necessary.
Secondary assistant head/SENCO 1

More funding needed to be released to support pupils for example Nurture groups.
Non-Mainstream teacher 2

and in terms of staffing through either the provision of additional staff to support the reintegration process or through training opportunities to improve skill sets of existing staff.

5.4.9 Additional comments/ key resources
Landscape sample participants provided seventy nine statements across nine categories of response.
This theme received the greatest reply from any of the open ended questions. The most common reply highlighted that skilled staff were the key to promoting successful reintegration, for example:

- A caring staff skilled in the way that children feel.
  Primary head teacher 1

- Properly trained staff who are willing to make the effort.
  Primary SENCO 3

These skilled staff could be located either side of the transition namely mainstream school or alternative provision or within the LEA. They were vital to the process for their specialist knowledge, positive attitude or empathy towards pupils, relationships maintained with pupil and families and did not necessarily need to be located within the SMT of a school but simply, were a caring adult that the pupil felt able to approach for advice, was trusted and made them feel valued.

- Staff willing to advocate for a child with a bad reputation and provide the encouragement and support to sort out confrontations.
  Primary head teacher 11
Linked to this key staff member, careful planning of the reintegration process was the second most common response followed by parents and guardians of the reintegrating pupil, with positive parental input of greatest importance to classroom practitioners.

A link member of staff who can assess the readiness of the pupil to manage in a mainstream setting and support the pupil through a gradual transition.

Non-Mainstream teacher 1

Additional statement categories included having a positive inclusive school ethos, (of greatest concern to IPS respondents), training for staff, additional staffing, and appropriate levels of funding and positive relationships.

Summary

Three themes emerged from replies to this question. By far the most important was the need for skilled staff to be available to work with the pupils within both the mainstream schools and alternative provision settings

Key staff with the skills to be able to support the pupil at the same time as encouraging independence.

Primary SENCO 4

The need for positive relationships to be forged with parents and careful planning of the reintegration process were also identified as important

Fitting the right people with the right attitude with the right child.

Primary head teacher 7
Chapter 6 Results and analysis (3) Expert interviews

6.1 Introduction
This chapter examines the information provided by interviewees concerning experiences they encountered when reintegrating pupils from the PRU within their schools. Interviews were conducted with an expert sample of participants with the intention of drilling down into questionnaire data to see how the reintegration process was experienced within a range of real life educational settings.

To build data from an expert sample participants were interviewed who indicated that their school had previous experience of reintegration. I was interested in gathering their views of reintegration and of how these views may have impacted upon the success of reintegration attempted at their school, and of how that experience subsequently shaped their views of reintegration. Participants from primary and secondary schools and the BSS were interviewed to gather information from both mainstream schools and alternative provision (Please see appendix 11 for interview schedule).

6.1.1 Sample set
Schools within the county serve a wide variety of catchment areas including urban, small town and rural catchments, those which are relatively economically disadvantaged or economically well off, English medium to bilingual and Welsh medium areas. A data set which would be as representative as possible of the range of catchment areas was built. There were also a range of participants in terms of positions held within their schools such as head teacher or SENCO and the aim was to include a variety of participant positions within the sample.

Fourteen questionnaire participants were contacted to request carrying out a semi-structured face-to-face interview. It may have been possible to have
increased the participation rate if telephone interviews had been offered. However, I was not keen to do so as I believed that carrying out the interviews face-to-face would allow the advantage of social cues such as voice and intonation, which can be an additional source of information alongside verbal responses.

A reply was received from three secondary schools (one secondary school was discounted as they did not respond to the postal questionnaire), a response rate of 42.9%. Interviews were arranged with two respondents, 28.6% of the hoped for secondary school expert sample set. The third potential participant was unavailable after recently starting an extended period of maternity leave.

A greater reply (71.4%) was received from primary schools (five schools). For a variety of reasons including school inspection and participant commencing maternity leave, two interviews were conducted with primary school participants again 28.6% of the hoped for expert sample set.

To gather views of participants within the alternative provision setting, a colleague from the BSS was interviewed. All interviews were conducted during the summer term of 2010 (Please see appendix 12 for post-interview-coded data and appendix 13 for example of interview transcription).
6.1.2 Profile of interview participants

Table 24: Profile of interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of school and length of time in position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary head teacher 1 (PHT1)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary school, 15 years in current post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary head teacher 2 (PHT2)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Primary school, 13 years in current post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary head teacher 1 (SHT1)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary school, 15 years in current post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary head teacher 2 (SHT2)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary school, 3 years in current post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of BSS (HT5)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Behaviour Support Service, 15 years in post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.3 Primary school sample

The first primary school was an English medium school with 252 pupils on roll serving an economically disadvantaged urban catchment area in the south of the county. The interview was conducted with primary head teacher 1 (PHT 1). Both school and head teacher had historical experience of reintegration and at the time of the interview a recently started reintegration was ongoing.

The second primary school was a Welsh medium school with 117 pupils on roll serving a mixed economic rural catchment in the north of the county. The interview was with primary head teacher 2 (PHT 2). Like the majority of Welsh medium/bilingual schools in the county, neither school nor head teacher had direct experience of reintegration. However the school was included within the sample due to the nature of the catchment area served and because the head
teacher had for a number of years sat as a member of the county inclusion panel. The inclusion panel meet at set intervals to discuss potential moves including reintegration of pupils from the PRU. Although the head teacher had no direct experience of reintegration he had a wealth of experience in assisting with ratifying pupil moves.

6.1.4 Secondary school sample
The first secondary school was an English medium 11-18 school with 656 pupils on roll. The school serves a mixed semi urban and rural catchment area in a relatively economically disadvantaged area in the north of the county. The interview was with secondary head teacher 1 (SHT 1). The school had historic experience of reintegration but none within two academic years prior to the interview due to changes in school policy and strategies employed with pupils displaying challenging behaviour.

The second secondary school was an English medium 11-18 school with 1167 pupils on roll. The school serves a relatively economically disadvantaged predominantly urban catchment within the centre of the county. The interview was with secondary head teacher 2 (SHT 2). The school had historic experience of pupil reintegration but none in the three academic years prior to the interview due to strategies implemented with pupils displaying challenging behaviour by the school coinciding with the appointment of the current head teacher.

6.1.5 BSS/PRU sample
The BSS/PRU covers the whole county accepting pupils from anywhere within the county boundaries (and occasionally beyond) covering all potential school catchment areas. At the time of the interview the PRU and satellite units it oversees had a combined 40 pupils on roll within the KS 1 - KS 3 age range. The interview was with head teacher 5. As Head of Service, she was in charge of the
PRU, satellite behaviour support units and behaviour support teachers located within families of schools.

6.1.6 Interview focus
Interviews were semi-structured and expected to last approximately thirty minutes. Each interview was conducted as a matter of courtesy and convenience in the participant’s office at a time and date of their choosing. After an explanation of ethical considerations binding the study and a request to audio record the interview with a digital voice recorder for ease of transcription a semi structured interview schedule was followed to guide the discussion. As well as being audio recorded brief handwritten notes of salient points which I wished participants to expand upon were taken.

The question route followed was designed to gather responses on four main themes, namely:

(A) Participant and their school’s experience of reintegration.
(B) Participant and their school’s views on and definitions of successful reintegration.
(C) Participant’s views on any school based barriers to reintegration or success factors which they felt were evident within their school and,
(D) Participant’s views on barriers to reintroduction and success factors which may be evident within and specific to the county.

6.2 Participant and school’s experience of reintegration
Participants provided seventeen statements which were organised into four post-interview-coded categories emerging from the data. Categories were determined following transcription and analysis of transcripts for emergent themes. Fourteen statements were positive.
The majority of positive statements referred to schools, followed by aspects of the reintegration process and, finally, to both pupil and parents. Of negative statements, the majority related to school and the pupil. No negative statements related to the reintegration process or parents.

Of the nine statements related to school, seven were positive suggesting respondents had a positive perception towards what schools had been able to provide or do for pupils during reintegration moves they had experienced.

In total, only two statements related to pupils with an equal positive and negative split.

6.2.1 Primary school participant and school’s experience of reintegration

Primary school one was the only mainstream school to have a recent, ongoing successful reintegration and as a result PHT1 was able to talk in greater depth than other interviewees. His statements account for 82% of replies discussed. This may be seen as posing difficulties relating to the representativeness of the data to be presented; however the head teacher believed his views would be
comparable to those of the wider community of primary schools within the county which he suggested was evident from regular meetings he attended with senior management teams from other schools within his family. However the following results may be skewed as a consequence.

Reintegration thus far had been successful due to a combination of factors relating to how the school and PRU had worked collaboratively to put in place a package which suited the pupil. The attitude of the pupil and his family had been instrumental in ensuring a successful outcome.

A key factor of the collaborative approach between school and PRU was preparation which took place prior to commencement of reintegration. This included meeting the pupil at the PRU unit, seen as invaluable in that it allowed mainstream school staff to get to know the pupil and view how he operated within a classroom environment as well as allowing staff to gather advice from PRU staff working with him, for example;

> We spoke to staff at the unit and we were given a lot of advice as well as having a half day visit to the unit to see him in action.
> Primary head teacher 1

The head teacher visited the pupil and parents at their home, in both instances accompanied by the class teacher who would be reintegrating the pupil to her class and both were able to allay concerns they initially felt after seeing the pupil in a positive light in the two separate settings. They provided positive feedback to colleagues concerning the pupil with the whole staff adopting a positive attitude making him feel welcome upon arrival at school.

> There was a positive attitude about accepting him not just from one class teacher but from the whole school.
> Primary head teacher 1

The head teacher attributed much credit for success of the reintegration to staff at the school and, in particular, praised their attitude towards the pupil and his difficulties.
The staff are up for the challenge and accept that EBD problems are very much as big a problem as maths.

Primary head teacher 1

He stressed there had been a shift in staff attitude towards pupils from the PRU over the previous decade, citing the example of a less successful reintegration of a pupil ten years previously. At that time, a majority of staff were reluctant to accommodate the pupil. They displayed negative entrenched perceptions as to how he would behave upon his return from the PRU. In essence, the pupil had been stigmatised and demonised prior to return which resulted in him being met with an atmosphere of negativity which would have had a significant impact upon his self esteem leaving him feeling unwanted. He, therefore, behaved in a manner staff expected him to and his time at the school was neither a positive experience for the pupil or staff tasked to work with him.

However it was the same staff who now held more positive perceptions and attitudes towards the recently arrived pupil making him feel welcome and wanted and as a result his behaviour had been generally positive.

It was not clear from the interview as to how much this positive staff perception came from feedback from initial visits to see the pupil or, whether it related, for example, to increased staff training and awareness of challenging behaviours such as EBD which staff had undertaken in recent years. Research in 2007 by the Royal College of Psychiatrists deemed staff training to have a positive impact upon teachers, resulting in greater confidence and sense of empowerment when dealing with a greater range of behaviours within their classroom. It is suggested that a further success feature was that the pupil had not been at the school prior to his stay at the PRU; he was making a fresh start in a new school after his family moved into the catchment area. Staff had no negative history or memories of dealing with this pupil which they would have had in the previous instance of reintegration and it may, therefore, have been easier to view him in a positive way.
Tootill and Spalding (2000) suggested that reintegration may be more successful if pupils reintegrate to a different school from the one in which they initially experienced difficulties as it offered the pupil the chance to make a fresh start and broke the cycle of negative experience. It is ironic that this may have been part of the reason for the success of the move when the head teacher suggested he would not in any instance consider accommodating a pupil transferring to his school (due to challenging behaviours displayed in their old school) unless they lived within the school catchment area. Neither does this appear to be a common outcome in the county as evidenced by pupil tracking data showing the majority of reintegration moves between 2000 and 2008 were a return to the referring school.

The pupil was given great credit for the success of the reintegration. It was a key factor, I feel, that the pupil wished to attend the school after being assessed by the PRU as ready and able to do so. Visser (2000) suggested reintegration could only be successful if the pupil wanted to make the transition.

He was eager to come here as there were many things we could offer him…like a football team…which as a mainstream school we could offer but the unit not.

Primary head teacher 1

The PRU unit the pupil attended was small with a small transient pupil population. There are limits as to facilities and opportunities pupils can access there in relation to what may be available at mainstream school. The pupil was a keen and talented footballer and the fact that the mainstream school ran a football team undoubtedly had an influence on his desire to make the move. Being able to play for the football team was not just a matter of possessing talent but linked to positive behaviour in the classroom which acted as an appropriate reward for the pupil meeting targets the school felt acceptable for him. Taking part in wider school activities had the positive effect of allowing for socialisation with peers and led to the pupil forming positive friendships through taking part in
sport. There had been concerns from other pupils about the pupil attending school but these had largely been allayed through viewing him positively within football training sessions, allowing friendship bonds to form which were replicated within the classroom environment.

Finally, the head teacher praised the parents for their impact on the process.

Another positive aspect was the attitude of his parents. I found them to be excellent. I got on very well with them and they were genuinely pleased about him making the move.

Primary head teacher 1

Not only did the parents view the school and the move positively, there was an effort by the parents to support the school and forge positive relationships with staff, an issue which the Head of the BSS found to be unfortunately uncommon when dealing with many parents of pupils who were about to enter into a reintegration move.

The second primary school had no experience of reintegration and subsequently provided zero statements to this area of questioning.

6.2.2 Secondary school participant and school’s experience of reintegration

SHT 1 held negative views of reintegration largely related to events three years prior to the interview. Since 2008 the school referred pupils to the PRU at a later stage of their school career on what the head teacher termed a ‘one way ticket’. The school would neither expect nor welcome a return, in that throughout their time in KS3, pupils had exhausted all strategies and provision the school could put in place. SHT 1 cited difficulties relating to the school, the reintegrating pupil and work of the PRU.
Tootill and Spalding (2000) demonstrated evidence that reintegration tended to be more successful with primary age in comparison to secondary age pupils, so this negative view was not unexpected. Their study had shown most reintegration to be attempted when the pupil was aged 11-13 (KS3) yet the majority would break down and end in failure. In Pembrokeshire, reintegration appeared to be attempted in year six at the end of KS2 provision prior to pupils making the transition to secondary education or in year nine at the end of KS3 provision prior to commencing GCSE studies in KS4.

SHT1 acknowledged some pupils found difficulty conforming to behaviour norms and ethos of mainstream school and this was especially difficult for pupils returning after a period of time spent within the more relaxed PRU environment.

When they did return to school our mainstream expectations of these pupils quickly resulted in crisis...which was what we saw the initial behaviour as.

Secondary head teacher 1

SHT 1 admitted that school attempts to impose authority, discipline and conformity on these students were often met with an equally robust refusal by the pupil to 'buy in to' what the school was attempting to achieve. This led to an impasse with a clash between school and pupil ethos. Due to the nature of the PRU and the pupil clientele it caters for, there is by necessity a more flexible, less rigid environment than can be provided by mainstream schools to which pupils may be able to adhere. However, upon return to mainstream school they often display the same challenging behaviours and clashes with authority that led to their initial PRU referral.

Farrell and Tsakalidou (1999) identified clashes between school and pupil ethos as a potential reintegration barrier suggesting some pupils may prefer the environment and experience of the PRU and, therefore, may not wish to return to mainstream school. SHT 2 held this perception of the PRU in that;
I feel that the PRU lends itself well...the more relaxed atmosphere and work patterns are more suited to deal with the often chaotic home life of these pupils and there is often less academic pressure.

Secondary head teacher 2

The PRU may offer the pupil an environment and curriculum which they are willing to adhere to but one which would be difficult to replicate within a mainstream school.

Unlike PHT 1, SHT 1 had little praise for work carried out by the PRU.

The underlying issues that were causing the pupil problems were so severe that they were still affecting the child even after a period of time away and I don’t think that the PRU was able to significantly reduce these underlying issues.

Secondary head teacher 1

In her experience, pupils returned to mainstream school experiencing the same difficulties for the same underlying reasons as they had previously. She did provide some explanation for this in that;

The children we send to the PRU lack the coping strategies to deal with what is going on in their lives in and outside of school.

Secondary head teacher 2

The Head of the BSS refuted this as the PRU places emphasis upon providing pupils with coping strategies to employ in the school environment and instils in reintegrating pupils the notion that mainstream school is the most appropriate environment for them to make progress. The pupil then aspires to return to mainstream school and returns armed with strategies to allow them to cope with the demands that will be made upon them there.

There is a limit as to what either the PRU or mainstream school can do to help pupils overcome difficulties outside of school which may be within the realm of social services for example, but pupils will only return to mainstream school once they consistently meet targets that mainstream schools set and they are
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assessed as ready and able to reintegrate successfully by the PRU with any move ratified by the independent inclusion panel.

Any move must be agreed by all parties involved. It is maybe the more rigid inflexible structure of the mainstream school that the pupil cannot or will not work with which ultimately leads to failure, rather than a lack of coping strategies imparted by the PRU. Such strategies must have been working within the PRU environment before pupils would be deemed suitable candidates for reintegration.

SHT 2 was positive about the PRU, believing the PRU to offer a far lower pupil: teacher ratio than mainstream school and more intensive support and attention for the pupil both within the classroom and social times. The pupil may flourish in such an environment but upon return this could not be replicated due to sheer numbers of pupils vying for teacher attention meaning the pupil finds it difficult once more to cope and a return to acting out challenging behaviours ensues.

As a second strand to this theme of previous reintegration experience, I wished to gather information concerning the support schools received from the PRU and wider BSS and what, if any, additional support they would have appreciated.

PHT 1 was not satisfied with the input received from the behaviour support teacher (BST) attached to their family of school;

We should have had input from our behaviour support teacher but it did not materialise as they were tied up with another pupil with greater issues in a different school. I was a little disappointed…and as such we had to put our own strategies in place.

Primary head teacher 1

The BST should have been available to help guide reintegration on site yet due to increased concerns for a pupil in a different school they were unable to provide input in this instance. This could have had a critical negative influence upon the process and it would appear there was disappointment on behalf of the school.
although a realisation that support was needed for another pupil who was experiencing far greater difficulties, making them an urgent priority. The school had been forced to cope without this additional layer of support and put in place their own strategies which had proved successful. The school was proud of the outcome facilitated by these strategies, and the fact that the success had been achieved through their own efforts may have increased confidence in dealing not just with this pupil but in attempting future reintegration. Miller (1996) suggested that staff dealing with pupils with challenging behaviour feel a sense of empowerment when a strategy they implement proves successful and this has a positive impact upon staff morale.

Mainstream schools, it would appear, need guidance and advice on how to manage pupil reintegration with a key member of staff to drive the process and be available to offer support as necessary.

PHT 1 was complimentary about the continued communication between the PRU and the school.

The PRU did keep in contact to find out how he was settling in and I would contact them to say of any particular successes we had had...He was aware that I was phoning the PRU not just to tell them when he was good...a case of celebration all round, but also on occasion when things went pear shaped.

Primary head teacher 1

Due to lack of direct reintegration experience, PHT 2 discussed support he would expect to receive during reintegration. Farrell and Tsakalidou (1999) highlighted that a lack of appropriate staff to work with a reintegrating pupil could act as a major barrier to success. This was a situation the head teacher foresaw within his school as he would expect additional staff to be in place.

Perhaps an LSA carer to be put in place to look after the pupil as often educational needs will go hand in hand with behaviour problems.

Primary head teacher 2
He would also expect a level of continued communication and support from the PRU to monitor the pupil progress.

It would be nice to see staff from the PRU coming to the school to see for themselves how the reintegration was taking place...maybe they would learn something if they had to do this as a matter of course.

Primary head teacher 2

PHT 1 spoke of the benefit gained from seeing the pupil within a classroom environment at the PRU prior to reintegration. PHT 2 suggested a corresponding visit by PRU staff to mainstream school would have an equally advantageous impact upon their own practice.

SHT 1 was concerned with the pupil being able to keep up to date with work during time at the PRU and that they should not have fallen behind peers in following the curriculum upon return.

Their progress especially in the core subjects has to be maintained, if they have chunks of work missing then they are obviously playing catch up straight away.

Secondary head teacher 1

It is suggested that it would be difficult for even the most able pupil to start a new school and reintegrate successfully let alone without the added challenge of being unfamiliar with what peers were studying within the classroom.

This was noted by SHT 2 who was concerned with pupil academic progress and keen that the PRU share information regarding work pupils had been doing so that the school could put implement an appropriate curriculum.

We would want to know from the PRU what the pupil had been doing so that the work we pitch to them is appropriate...challenging but not too challenging so that they are unable to engage in the classroom.

Secondary head teacher 2

There was a feeling this detailed information had not always been available in the past and that as a result the school were giving inappropriate work to pupils leading to resurfacing of challenging behaviour.
The Head of the BSS gave an account of support offered to schools during the reintegration process and explained support was planned in conjunction with mainstream schools prior to the start of reintegration. Therefore schools had an input in suggesting support they hoped to receive from the PRU and agreed in advance to what would be delivered.

A lot of the support that is offered to schools is arranged at the review meetings…the behaviour support teacher attends the meetings and will help support the child and the school when they move.

Head of BSS

The onus for providing support falls upon the BST attached to families of schools once the move has been implemented but, as suggested by PHT 1, this support in practice is not necessarily provided as the reintegrating pupil and school is one of many the BST will work with.

Support offered is based upon what both the school and the pupil may require and linked to targets the schools set the pupils upon referral to the PRU and targets set prior to the onset of reintegration.

If the child has met the targets and we feel that the child is ready to return then the work of the review meeting is to negotiate what the plan is to be for when that child goes back. The child will transfer back after negotiations have taken place. There will be a concrete plan of action but it will be decided upon and implemented before the child makes the move.

Head of BSS

There is frustration on both sides of the process with mainstream schools suggesting the PRU could do more to help support the transition, whilst the PRU noted what had been put in place was planned with and agreed upon by the mainstream school prior to the pupil making the move. It may be that schools have underestimated the support they require and are subsequently frustrated with that which is implemented.
Finally, primary and secondary interviewees noted the importance of communication as highlighted by the Head of the BSS who suggested they continued informal contact with the mainstream schools to discuss progress on a regular basis and held regular scheduled meetings.

We would continue to hold meetings about the child with the school usually on a monthly basis where both sides would report back on how the transition was progressing.

Head of BSS

**Summary**

Statements relating to positive reintegration experience outweigh those of negative experience by a ratio of 4:1.

The majority of success factors were related to the school and the staff, for example, positive attitude and to the reintegration process, for example, having the opportunity to observe the pupil in a positive setting prior to commencing at the school fostered a positive welcoming outlook within staff.

The majority of barriers were also related within schools, for example, negative staff attitude or lack of training as well as within the reintegrating pupil.

6.3 Participant and school’s definitions of successful reintegration

Participants provided twenty statements across four post-interview-coded categories.

![Bar chart showing participant responses for successful reintegration](Figure 32: Participant responses – successful reintegration)
Seven statements related to the reintegrating pupil, eight to school and staff, three to other pupils within the school and two to aspects of the reintegration process.

Reintegrating pupil statements related to the pupil displaying a positive attitude maybe facilitating a shift in their perception of the school and them being happy within the mainstream school environment. This happiness would be achieved through the pupil feeling settled, wanted and belonging within the school and of being absorbed back into the environment and coping with mainstream education.

School and staff statements related to staff displaying a positive attitude towards the reintegrating pupil without the pupil being demonised, rather, being made to feel welcome. The school could ensure a successful reintegration by allowing the pupil to access an appropriate curriculum (alternative curriculum if necessary), engaging the pupil for the full length of the timetable and providing additional support as necessary.

Other pupil statements related to the reintegrating pupil having no negative impact upon peers with pupils feeling safe and happy with this pupil at their school.

Process statements suggested that successful reintegration should not be viewed as time or location specific; for example, a pupil may only reintegrate partly to mainstream school but still access an element of alternative provision. The location of success should not be seen as being at a particular physical site rather success should be located within the mindset of the reintegrating pupil.
6.3.1 Primary school interviewee definitions of successful reintegration

PHT 1 believed the ongoing reintegration at his school could be defined as successful in that the arrival of the pupil had not impacted on the everyday running of the school.

My children’s safety is paramount to me and they feel safe with this lad in school and I am able to run the school successfully with him in it.

Primary head teacher 1

The education of other pupils was unaffected by his arrival and was also appropriate for the reintegrating pupil.

The quality of education for the boy and the quality of education for others in the class must not be allowed to suffer.

Primary head teacher 1

In his opinion, the most important indicator of the move being a success was that:

The boy is happy here and that is the most positive thing

Primary head teacher 1

PHT 2 largely located the success of reintegration within the individual pupil concerned and felt reintegration would be a success if the pupil was:

able to cope with a mainstream education.

Primary head teacher 2

Part of this coping would necessitate displaying appropriate behaviour and academic process, and like his primary colleague, PHT2 suggested this would have to be achieved without having a negative impact upon other pupils at the school.

I would expect that the child would be self disciplined within the classroom and be able to carry on with his education without affecting the other children.

Primary head teacher 2
6.3.2 Secondary school interviewee definitions of successful reintegration

SHT 1 also believed reintegration could be defined as a success through lack of negative impact upon other pupils in the school in that the pupil:

Can go back to class with their peers, learn and just be absorbed.
Secondary head teacher 1

However, it would not necessarily be expected that the pupil follow the same curriculum as peers and there was scope for flexibility in that the pupil:

Follow a shortened version of the curriculum or other accredited courses
Secondary head teacher 1

SHT 2 viewed successful reintegration as the pupil following an appropriate learning pathway without a negative impact upon peers. She believed the pupil needed to be engaged for the full curriculum timetable but there was a degree of flexibility in how that time would be spent and the curriculum the pupil could follow.

The pupil must follow an appropriate curriculum and if they are doing that and the pupil is effectively engaged for five hours a day five days a week then they would be successfully reintegrated.
Secondary head teacher 2

Farrell and Tsakalidou (1999) viewed a key barrier to successful reintegration as stemming from reluctance of mainstream schools to accept pupils from a PRU. Visser (2000) documented schools displaying a caring ethos towards pupils, who were willing to welcome them into their community subsequently, increased significantly the likelihood of a successful outcome. SHT 1 related to this view in that:

A feeling of belonging is what matters to these children.
Secondary head teacher 1

A school making pupils feel welcome and wanted should be viewed as a success or at least a prerequisite for success.
6.3.3 BSS interviewee definitions of successful reintegration

For the Head of the BSS, much of the success was located within the individual pupil, focussing upon pupil’s mental and psychological state and perceptions rather than physical location of a school site. The real success of reintegration took place within the psychological realm of the pupil, parents and mainstream school staff through reducing negative perceptions replacing them with positive perceptions so all parties could forge effective working partnerships.

It is about what goes on inside the pupil’s head, if they feel part of the school then it doesn’t matter if they are in a school based unit for some of the time or following a significantly different curriculum programme to the rest of the pupils, they are still part of the school community.

Head of BSS

Success should be measured in terms of a pupil feeling wanted and welcomed as a respected part of the school community and being treated in a manner commensurate with their peers.

If you feel that you are not being welcomed back and don’t feel welcome or involved then I don’t think that is successful reintegration.

Head of BSS

The Head of the BSS believed it was not enough for the pupil to physically be on the mainstream school site for a reintegration to be classed as a success, rather there needed to be a psychological shift from both parties so that school made the pupil feel welcome and the pupil responded by conforming within the mainstream environment.

Interestingly, she was of the opinion that as well as not being physical location specific, reintegration success should not be viewed against a specific timeframe. In many cases where a reintegration had broken down there was a perception that the move ultimately had proved to be unsuccessful. She felt that should not be the case rather the breakdown should be viewed as a reaction to some change in life circumstances of the pupil and, therefore, not a failure as, until the change in circumstances the move may have been progressing well.
I am not sure that it is time related because you can reintegrate successfully for one or two terms and then something happens…something changes which causes the pupil to lose the plot.

Head of BSS

Summary
The greatest number of comments related to how the school and staff could foster successful reintegration through positive attitude and perception of the pupil, the provision of an appropriate curriculum and learning pathway offering an opportunity for success and full engagement of the pupil.

For reintegration to be deemed successful, the pupil must want to remain at the school, feel happy and make progress.

No other member of the school community should in any way be disadvantaged by the introduction of the reintegrating pupil.

Successful reintegration should not be assessed against a timeframe.

6.4 School barriers and reintegration facilitators interviewees identified as evident within their schools
Respondents from primary and secondary schools and the BSS provided sixty-two statements across five post-interview-coded categories which were analysed for school based reintegration barriers and success factors.

Figure 33: School factors influencing reintegration
In total, thirty statements related to potential barriers and thirty two to potential success factors. Participants identified a greater number of potential success factors within their schools than barriers.

The greatest number of statements \((n=37)\) related to schools and staff. The majority were potential success factors. Schools and staff were viewed more positively in that they did more to help achieve rather than hinder successful outcomes.

Rigidity of mainstream school structure was recognised as a barrier, for example strict codes of conduct and uniform which pupils may find difficulty adhering to causing conflict. Schools face financial constraints leading to insufficient (specialist) staff to support pupils with challenging behaviour or to provide alternative provision within the school. There were issues relating to the setting and structure of teaching groups; an admission that lesson planning and classroom delivery may not be suitable to meet the needs of all pupils. Finally, pupils with challenging behaviour may have to deal with perhaps fifteen teachers on a weekly basis at a secondary school within which there are inconsistencies in approach, tolerances and resilience displayed within the classroom.

Attitudes and aspects of provision were viewed as success factors which may prevail in schools where reintegration has proved successful. Availability of nurture group provision or strong SEN department and SENCO may mean pupils are more likely to have academic and social needs met, decreasing the likelihood of escalation of difficulties resulting in challenging behaviour. There was a notion of consistency of staff approach, and there should be a key member of staff within the school who would advocate for the reintegrating pupil, a person that the pupil could trust, who was ‘on their side’.
Eleven statements related to the reintegrating pupil, the majority related to potential success factors. The pupil was viewed more positively doing more to help achieve rather than hinder successful outcomes.

Barriers were partly located within pupils including negative perceptions of school, lack of resilience in the face of difficulties resulting in the display of classic ‘fight or flight response’ and lack of strategies to cope with mainstream school environments. Other factors were that these pupils may often be stigmatised by staff and peers, and that when problems did occur, there was a commonly held view that it was always the pupil seen to be wrong and punished.

The majority of success factors related to pupil’s psychological mind frame in that they should display positive attitudes have a positive perception of the school as the appropriate environment to fulfil their education and a willingness to abide by rules and uniform expectations as well as displaying resilience in the face of adversity.

Seven comments related to parents of the reintegrating pupil, the majority were potential barriers. Parents were often viewed negatively with a perception they placed obstacles in the path of reintegration success.

Some parental barriers were displays of negative attitudes towards school (possibly based upon their own negative education experiences education). Many difficulties the pupils displayed or faced stemmed from insufficient care and nurture at home and lack of appropriate home boundaries. Pupils, therefore, were coming into a school environment ill-equipped to cope with what was expected of them.

In terms of success factors, the opposite was true in that parents could help the school and their child through displaying a positive attitude and support and sufficient care and nurture of the child at home.
Five statements related to wider environmental factors such as peer culture, home environment and influence of the media, the majority of these related to potential barriers. Environmental factors were viewed negatively with a perception that they placed obstacles in the path of successful reintegration.

Initial teacher training acted as a barrier in that it did not equip new teachers with sufficient knowledge and skills to cope with demands placed upon them by challenging behaviour. This could lead to confrontation within the classroom necessitating the removal of the pupil from the school. Closer to home, there was a perception of the reinforcement of negative attitudes and behaviours through peer culture and also within the family of the pupil and, these negative influences acted to negate the work done by the school.

In some catchment areas success factors were linked to close knit communities with support available for members who found themselves in challenging circumstances and there was a ‘joined-up approach’ between schools to work together to meet pupil need.

Finally, statements related to the PRU, with an equal split between barriers and success factors.

In terms of barriers, the PRU could be seen as a victim of its own success in working with pupils. Pupils would only embark upon a reintegration following a lengthy period of success and progress within the PRU where they were in an environment which may have been appropriate to their needs. This environment could not be replicated within mainstream school leading to difficulties and tensions.

The fact that the PRU undertook analysis of pupil progress, attitude and ability such as completion of Boxall and reintegration profiles (The Boxall Profile is a
resource used to develop a precise and accurate understanding of children’s emotional and behavioural difficulties, and for planning effective interventions and support activities. The reintegration profile is a tool which can assess the readiness of a pupil to reintegrate to mainstream school) to inform reintegration planning and the suitability, or otherwise, of the pupil to undertake such a move was viewed as a potential success factor. These profiles are completed by staff that work with the pupil in class and are used to help inform and plan intervention.

6.4.1 Primary school interviewee perspectives toward school based reintegration barriers and facilitators

PHT 1 suggested staff at his school were an important source of success especially their attitude towards the recently reintegrated pupil specifically but also to all pupils in general.

  I can’t think of one occasion where I have heard a member of staff speak negatively about this child…I think if you were asking me these questions some years ago that my response may not have been so positive.
  Primary head teacher 1

He emphasised how staff treated not only this individual but all pupils with flexibility and consistency, as well as treating pupils as individuals in a way appropriate to their needs.

  We do have ground rules, we don’t treat all pupils the same but we are consistent… illnesses don’t necessarily share the same medicine as they say and this equally applies to our children.
  Primary head teacher 1

He continued that pupils:

  Are treated appropriately but we do make allowances; we don’t expect this little lad to be an angel.
  Primary head teacher 1
PHT 1 expressed two possible barriers to success located within the wider school environment - within parents and the pupils (including the boy being reintegrated).

Firstly, this barrier was not caused by parents of the reintegrating pupil, (of whom he spoke with high regard), rather parents of other pupils at the school. Although the school was confident they would accommodate the boy with little if any effect on the other children, some parents were concerned about his arrival and fearful for how their children could be affected. This may have been understandable considering the previous reputation he had built for himself, however, this stigmatisation and demonising of the pupil could have made the reintegration impossible, as the concerns of parents could have filtered down to their children and to the pupil himself, seriously jeopardising his return.

There have been some incidents of some very misinformed parents being very forthright with their concerns.

Primary head teacher 1

The head teacher made his thoughts on the matter clear to parents who approached him regarding their concerns and due to the lack of difficulties as the process progressed, their attitude changed. In general the pupils viewed him as just another pupil, allowing him to become socially integrated into life at his new school.

A final problem arose as the head teacher suggested not all pupils perceive situations in the same way and their views can be at odds with that of the school leading to conflict.

Some of the children here including this lad have a very strong sense of what is right and wrong and his perception can at times of what is right and fair can be way off the mark.

Primary head teacher 1

The head teacher admitted there had been ‘a couple of minor incidents’ sparked by differing opinions of right and wrong which although not serious enough to call
the reintegration into danger did send warnings as to what could happen if incidents escalated. However, the flexibility of staff members had eased such potential tensions as:

We do find that we have to explain things more to this lad and other pupils but we do generally find that he is willing and able to take these things on board.

Primary head teacher 1

PHT 2 suggested reintegration barriers could exist within the school in particular, relating to attitude and preconceptions of staff (and other pupils) towards a reintegrating pupil.

Once a child has been taken from a school there will be a stigma attached. It can be very difficult for some staff to accept a child coming back without some worry in the back of their mind.

Primary head teacher 2

If a child is reintegrating to the school in which they previously encountered difficulties, there is a need to break the cycle of negative experience and forge ahead with a fresh start. This is not always easy and doubts or lack of confidence a teacher may have in dealing with the pupil will surely become evident and impact upon relationships they have with each other.

However, PHT2 viewed the SENCO and school SEN department as potential success factors, suggesting the school operated an approach of ‘prevention rather than cure’.

We have a very good SENCO and special needs department...Perhaps because of this the school is able to fully offer help to children who need it very early on in their school career and that tends we see to alleviate the problems of discipline.

Primary head teacher 2

He located a further success factor within the local community the school served. The school catered to pupils from a small stable rural community, where many of the parents of pupils at the school had been friends since their own childhoods spent at the school and as a result there was a perceived attitude of help and
support amongst community members towards each other and positive attitudes towards the school.

There is a close relationship between the children here due to the fact that they all live locally… I would say this is a close knit community.

Primary head teacher 2

6.4.2 Secondary school interviewee perspectives toward school based reintegration barriers and facilitators

SHT 1 suggested barriers to reintegration related to the school and processes and to parental and home factors.

Although there was flexibility in terms of the curriculum options pupils were encouraged to explore, there was one area on which she was unwilling to compromise which led to conflict with some potentially disengaged pupils, namely uniform. Rules were strict and exceptions not tolerated, both pupils and parents were fully aware of dress codes and personal presentation expected. Pupils knew how they should present themselves and that any deviation would be challenged. She lay some of the blame for conflict with parents, for example, by providing pupils with clothing or footwear which they knew the school would find unacceptable.

I have a very strict uniform policy on which I am not prepared to compromise. I think, no I know that when children conform to uniform it helps them conform to school rules and they are more or less saying that they buy into what the school is trying to achieve.

Secondary head teacher 1

The next barrier related to the attitude of some staff in that there had been instances of staff being unable or unwilling to forget past incidents and accept reintegrating pupils back. There was an element of a minority of staff bearing grudges and, as a result, making the pupil feel unwelcome.

There is a prejudice in teachers’ minds about these pupils and we work really hard to overcome that.

Secondary head teacher 1
However, knowing the problem had existed, the school had made great strides in attempting to alleviate these difficulties.

We have a policy of no revenge, no raking over the past...We make a great effort if they do come back to welcome them.

Secondary head teacher 1

There had also been a concerted effort to promote staff consistency and fairness when dealing with pupils. It is difficult for some pupils to know how to deal with some staff members if there are inconsistencies, as what may be acceptable to one teacher may not be to another.

If a situation does arise the first thing I ask is not what the child did but ‘what did the teacher do?’ Have they followed procedure? At least most of the time children know we are consistent.

Secondary head teacher 1

Not only does this reinforce consistency, it relays to the pupil that a behaviour matter or discipline issue is not being considered from the viewpoint of the pupil at fault, rather as occurring as a result of a shared interaction which should reinforce to the pupil that the school is not just ‘out to get them’, but views incidents from differing perspectives and accepts that actions of some members of staff may contribute to incidents.

Finally, within the school any disaffected pupil is made aware that they do have a route out from situations and somewhere to go if they feel that, for example were they to stay within a classroom for example that behaviour would escalate.

We do have a time out card and they are encouraged to use it if they feel like blowing and my door is always open to them.

Secondary head teacher 1

A major barrier was located within the home and social environment outside of school. She viewed negative behaviour as a learned behaviour and one, reinforced by peers rather than alleviated by the pupil spending time with a responsible adult influence. These negative behaviours were subsequently
brought into the school environment where they were unacceptable and led to clashes between school values and those of some peer groups of pupils.

They never seem to be at home they are in a large crowd and are copying and reinforcing their behaviour habits rather than being under the moderating influence of a responsible adult at home.

Secondary head teacher 1

SHT 2 suggested potential barriers within her school relating to ethos and staff attitude. The first related to the rigidity of school structure and environment in that all pupils are expected to conform to certain norms. In the majority of cases this happens, but for some disaffected pupils school norms may not match their own.

We are asked not to treat these pupils differently so you expect the children to respect the guidelines and that can be a barrier.

Secondary head teacher 2

An important potential barrier concerned an area in which the school had invested heavily in recent years, namely classroom lesson delivery. The school had invested in technology and teachers received training in providing activities for pupils with differing learning styles with the expectation of engaging a greater number of pupils, thus reducing the occurrence of challenging negative behaviours.

Other barriers include what goes on in the classroom in terms of delivery and planning, the way you structure your groups, your sets, and the content of the lessons.

Secondary head teacher 2

This appears to echo The Elton report ‘Discipline in schools’ (1989) which suggested that 80% of disruption in schools was directly attributable to poor classroom organisation, planning and teaching. Crowley (1993) suggested teacher flexibility, provision of engaging lessons and help with catch up with work can have a positive influence upon the EBD pupil who will react accordingly.

Finally, mainstream expectations of pupils and what they can cope with could lead to some pupils becoming disaffected and reaching crisis point in their school career. This was especially salient with pupils in KS4 burdened with the
pressures of GCSE study, as well as physical and emotional difficulties associated with puberty and the teenage years.

At KS4 do we expect too much from the pupil?

Secondary head teacher 2

Some pupils were expected to cope with far more academically than they were capable of, as this was what was expected nationally of pupils in this age group. To alleviate pressure on some pupils, the school had recently implemented a scheme where the SENCO could recommend a pupil be allowed to drop a subject from their timetable and the lesson time freed up would be used to focus on completing work in remaining subjects. Pupils had more time to devote to a lesser number of subjects and subsequently were under less pressure. It acted as a ‘safety valve’ to prevent pressures arising to crisis levels.

We have a drop line...where they can drop an option so they go to the nurture class to ‘over learn’ in their other subjects...they don’t seem so overburdened...this helps to avoid potential problems before they crop up.

Secondary head teacher 2

Finally, referring to the school motto placed across all entrances to the school and on the badge of the uniform, SHT2 said:

We live by the maxim include, inspire, improve.

Secondary head teacher 2

By doing so the school had accommodated pupils who may in the past have been referred to the PRU. This had been successful to the extent that no referrals had been made for three academic years although, she believed there were pupils within the school who were potential candidates for PRU referral and who would in reality ‘be better off there’.
6.4.3 BSS interviewee perspectives toward school based reintegration barriers and facilitators

The Head of the BSS identified more potential barriers than success factors. Half the barriers related to the attitude and perception of vital participants in the reintegration process - the pupil, parents and mainstream school staff.

Many pupils referred to the PRU arrive with poor perceptions and opinions of mainstream school, as their time there was characterised by poor relationships with staff and peers and ended with rejection. As a result many pupils may wish to reintegrate, but are not necessarily happy to do so to their original school, due to previous negative experiences.

The pupil’s point of view is that they are being sent back to a situation where they have previously failed and we have got to change their mindset on that.

Head of BSS

Their parents may also have a negative perception of school and staff which may filter down to pupils.

Parents have their part to play, we often hear things like ‘Why is my son going back to that bloody school?’ and this negative attitude filters down to the pupil.

Head of BSS

Finally, there was, at least in some secondary schools always likely to be a small yet vocal minority of teachers opposed to the pupil and their return. This negativity could filter to other staff and pupils and jeopardise a successful reintegration.

Staff perception is vital. Staff perception of a so-called naughty kid will mean that that kid however they behave has that hanging over them.

Head of BSS

In some cases, as had been suggested by mainstream school colleagues there may be a minority of teachers who do not make the pupil feel welcome as they
may hold a grudge based upon shared negative experiences in the past. This could lead to:

The child in the eyes of some being demonised or made to feel unwanted.

Head of BSS

However, many pupils at the PRU are able to forge relationships with teaching staff in that environment. Is there a difference therefore between how mainstream and alternative provision teachers view and work with these pupils?

To overcome negative perceptions, the PRU has in recent years provided pupils with positive solution and resilience training known as MTQ48. This training aims to build pupil resilience in the face of difficulties they may encounter within mainstream schools by providing a range of proven success strategies. Pupils are taught they have the power to alter the outcome of situations and it is hoped that this empowers pupils to take control of their actions and avoid reverting to displays of challenging behaviour, for example;

We say if you’re of going into a class with a teacher you know you don’t get on with give them a smile instead of a frown on your way in…it may work wonders.

Head of BSS

Resilience was not just an issue limited to the pupil but, in some cases, staff. A barrier in mainstream schools less evident in the PRU was the way in which staff reacted to challenging behaviour.

We don’t I think view behaviour in quite the same way at the PRU but see it as more of a reaction to a situation rather than a direct threat to a teacher’s authority.

Head of BSS

As a result problems could be prevented from escalating.

Mental toughness (resilience) can be defined as an individual’s ability to deal with stress, pressure and challenge, irrespective of the circumstances in which they find themselves. Lewis (1999) believed many teachers of pupils with EBD were
aware that pupils brought to school with them the effects of adverse experiences of turbulence and lack of nurture from their backgrounds which have a negative impact upon resilience in the way in which a pupil may react in a situation within the school which they find stressful or challenging.

Although it should not be suggested that schools alone can provide all necessary resilience promoting factors, it has been claimed that the organisation, ethos and pedagogy of the school can be powerful contributors to building resilience. Some of these factors include school satisfaction, self-efficacy, provision of a safe and secure environment, inclusive classrooms and positive relationships.

Through schools promoting resilience by enabling students to believe success is possible, it is hoped that pupil efforts be directed towards more positive endeavours and away from those which are less desirable. Research by Cefai (2004) suggested factors such as positive relationships and a caring environment have a positive influence upon pupil self esteem and, as a result, resilience.

Another mainstream school barrier especially evident within secondary schools was size and organisational structure. The PRU structure is similar to primary school in that pupils will spend most, if not all, of their time in a single classroom with the same member of staff, rather than visiting different classrooms and different teachers with differing norms of acceptable behaviour on a weekly basis.

School structure and lack of flexibility in the way that classes are sorted… I think that’s why we don’t see as many problems here and that’s why it seems easier to reintegrate pupils back to primary schools.

Head of BSS

Pupils cope better with the informal but still structured PRU environment and maybe find it easier to forge positive relationships with staff in that they spend more time working with them in smaller groups and became attuned to what is acceptable behaviour.
A final barrier lay in the way in which ITT was conducted in that today the Head of the BSS believed many teachers were experts in their particular subject field receiving extensive training in this area but at the expense of being trained to deal with children in the classroom. A lack of training in dealing with challenging behaviour could lead to a situation escalating out of control with negative consequences for the pupil.

I tend to find teachers that may be experts in their subjects but not necessarily experts or well trained in child development, they haven't been taught about how children will deal with situations in the classroom.

Head of BSS

Increased ITT and CPD related to dealing with challenging behaviour may be needed which could increase staff resilience and allow staff to deal with difficulties in a manner that alleviates the situation rather than escalating towards the removal of the pupil from the school and subsequent ill-feeling and resentment.

The National Behaviour and Attendance Review (NBAR) by Reid (2008) noted a series of major reports in the UK relating to issues of teacher training linked to pupil behaviour, for example, The Elton Report on discipline in schools (DES, 1989), Better Behaviour-Better Learning (SEED, 2001) and School Matters (DES, Ireland 2005).

The NBAR by Reid (2008) reported that although a clear structured framework for both qualification route and professional development of teachers existed, respondents related concerns regarding training in dealing with behavioural matters. Training alone cannot act as a panacea to solve all situations and resolve all problems experienced by pupils, parents and teachers, but there was a sense that more could be done to improve insight, understanding and skills of teachers at all levels when dealing with pupils with challenging behaviour.
Despite EBD pupils being deemed the hardest and most challenging to teach, and the pupils which schools are most reluctant to accept (Farrell and Polat, 2003), although there is compulsory content relating to general behaviour management within ITT courses it is likely to be insufficient to fulfil requirements to identify and effectively cater for all students with challenging behaviour, there is no compulsory content for specialist training to deal with EBD or mandatory specialist CPD for teachers already working with this pupil group.

There were success factors located within the PRU in that before a pupil would be reintegrated there had been a long thought out process and evidence would have been gathered and analysed to determine whether or not a pupil should be reintegrated. A reintegration would only be attempted if all sources of evidence suggested the pupil would be able to cope. No pupil would attempt a reintegration if it was obvious they were not ready and no pupil was ever put in a position that set them up to fail.

We do think long and hard about whether pupils should be reintegrated in the first place...We look at the reintegration profile scores and we see that if they are low then they aren’t going to be able to cope with the move because they don’t possess the social skills necessary to be able to cope in mainstream school.

Head of BSS

Summary

There were an almost equal number of statements relating to school based barriers and success factors with a greater number of success factors identified.

School barriers related to rigidity of mainstream schools as compared to the more informal environment of the PRU, a lack of specialist staff or training to deal with challenging behaviour, a lack of resources to meet pupil need, issues relating to the curriculum, lesson content, planning and delivery and inconsistent staff approach, tolerance and resilience.

School success factors related to positive staff attitude, the availability of a key member of staff trusted by the pupil, a strong SEN department or SENCO, availability of resources to meet pupil need and consistency of staff approach, tolerance and resilience.
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6.5 County specific reintegration barriers and success facilitators

The primary and secondary head teachers and Head of the BSS provided twenty statements. These were organised into eight post-interview-coded categories.

![Graph showing number of responses for reintegration barriers and facilitators]

**Figure 34: County specific barriers and success facilitators**

Interviewees harboured a pessimistic perception of the county in that the majority, fifteen of the twenty responses, related to potential reintegration barriers; this is in stark contrast to the 2011 study by Grandison where participants identified more reintegration facilitators rather than barriers in their more urban English context.

Seven statements related to schools, with four statements relating to potential success factors. Schools were viewed positively in that they helped achieve successful outcomes.

OFSTED (2008) suggested schools had a key role to play in reengaging disaffected pupils. Factors included the need for a commitment from all staff to meet pupil needs, effective monitoring systems, consultation between schools and other agencies, curriculum modification and communication with parents. Despite interviewees identifying county schools displaying these positive features OFSTED warn that reintegration is still likely to be problematic and often unsuccessful.
Potential school based barriers within the county related to the notion that some schools may seek to have a pupil who they have referred to the PRU reintegrate elsewhere. This was noted by PHT 2 who saw this approach often from secondary schools during his role serving on the county inclusion panel, yet both primary head teachers refused to entertain the notion of accepting a reintegrating pupil from outside their natural school catchment area. OFSTED (2008) drew attention to a reluctance to accept the return of a pupil and the difference between the rules, regulations and the learning environment between the PRU and mainstream schools being key barriers as well as a lack of contact with the PRU during the period of pupil placement.

In terms of potential school based success factors, schools displayed a great sense of ownership of and responsibility to pupils within their care and schools would provide all that they could to ensure that a pupil displaying difficult behaviour remained at the school partly through viewing a referral to the PRU as a sense of failure i.e. they had not done enough to engage the pupil and partly, through trying to provide the pupil with some stability (possibly the only area of stability in their life) to avoid a sense of rejection that referral would bring. School ethos can be viewed as the unwritten rules, norms and expectations of the institution (Paliokosta and Bladford, 2010) with school policy and teacher attitudes based upon historically honed reasoning and reflective of ethos.

The second greatest number of statements with six related to family issues, a majority of five related to potential barriers, with a negative perception of families within the county in that they hindered successful outcomes.

Potential family based barriers included a sense that pupil difficulties were in part caused or exacerbated by a lack of various features within the home and wider family. Some interviewees highlighted what they saw as a lack of parental input within the county and a sense that schools were providing the child with what the
family was unable or unprepared to do. Within the literature issues relating to pupil disadvantage, especially in rural areas related to lack of parental input and perceived lack of parental and community aspirations which are transmitted between generations have been recorded affirming beliefs held by interviewees.

Brann-Barrett (2011) suggested schools expect children to have acquired (often from the family) skills and attitudes to enable them to succeed with their education. Parental involvement with children from an early age has been found to equate with better outcomes yet there is little universal agreement as to what parental involvement is as it can take many forms including, involvement in the life of the school and support of the child at home. Gutman and Akerman (2010) found that parents have high aspirations for young children. However, these are subject to change as children get older due to economic constraints, abilities and availability of opportunities.

Harris and Goodall (2007) suggested many barriers to parental involvement in education with parents from poorer or lower socioeconomic status backgrounds being less likely to get involved with education, especially at secondary level. Nechyba et al (1999) considered there to be three possible mechanisms through which socio-economic status may operate as a barrier to parental involvement. There was a potential culture amongst some groups of not attaching value to education, poorer families may have less social capital and some families may face certain institutional barriers from schools which exhibit a different set of values to those of the home.

Concerns about a lack of parental involvement or positive role model outside school meant some pupils were gaining much of their cultural perspectives from peers. This meant negative attitude towards school and education in general were being reinforced in the absence of positive guidance elsewhere. Sutton et al (2004) showed that as children grow up, whilst the influence of parents and families remains important (if it is there to begin with), the influence of friends and
the wider community becomes increasingly important. Earlier authors such as Reid and Patterson (1989) and Buchman and Dalton (2002) previously suggested peer influence upon academic achievement and aspirations increases as a pupil passes through school and become increasingly important where family bonds are weak.

There was a sense of many families being rooted in a very small geographical area for generations and that, through a lack of skills or ambition and aspiration, they had not prospered or fulfilled their potential. This had led to collective low self esteem and lack of resilience becoming the norm within the family and negative feelings and patterns of behaviour were reinforced across generations with families trapped in a negative spiral which was increasingly difficult for the schools to try and break down.

St. Clair and Benjamin (2011) believed low aspirations should not be viewed as an indicator of personal shortcomings; rather it is necessary to appreciate the social constructedness of aspiration in that pupil aspiration reflects the expectations, experiences and constraints evident within their setting rather than a free choice or a desired outcome. The appropriateness or otherwise of the aspiration arises from the direct context and reflect the social context within which they live and operate.

Auerbach (2007) previously suggested that a lack of educational aspiration was an informed response to historical and cultural context in which social factors create recursive loops affecting aspiration. An individual cannot simply decide to alter their aspirations; rather the decision will be taken to fit the aspirations displayed within a limited area of context based on the neighbourhood or community in which they operate. This suggests community norms impact upon an individual’s aspirations.
Kintrea (2009) highlighted that within communities there were a variety of institutions within which socialisation took place, beliefs and attitudes crystallise and are reinforced. Research, for example, Higgins et al (2005) suggests where school systems are tied to a place through catchment area then strong associations between the social characteristics of the community and of children in the school form. The school provides an arena for social networking which may or may not be positive, as, for example the catchment area of PHT 2.

Bajema et al (2002) felt research in the USA indicated an aspiration level gap between rural compared to (sub) urban youth. Breen and Quaglia (1991) felt rural youth held lower educational and later life aspirations compared to urban counterparts. Haller and Virkler (1993) suggested this gap arose through socio-economic determinants, believing children can only aspire to what they know or imagine and lack of career diversity and role models within their communities can limit their choices. Quaglia and Cobb (1996) expanded upon this to suggest that the aspirations of rural youth are in a sense limited by the geographical and cultural context within which they reside. This was certainly felt by interviewees, for example, SHT1 suggested:

parents haven’t handed down coping strategies or installed resilience within their children (long pause) what I’m saying I suppose is that these children have a very narrow small slice of life without realising that there is anything else out there or other ways of being.

Secondary head Teacher 1

Interviewees highlighted perceptions of positive parental input and support in their children's lives especially within rural areas where ‘traditional Welsh family values’ lead to a close knit family with children cared for and nurtured, having their emotional, as well as physical needs met. However, there was a sense of erosion due to increased levels of in-migration to the county in recent decades of families from towns and cities outside of the region, many of whom it was felt displayed the potential barriers discussed earlier.
Barlow and Brown (2008) produced a study using Bourdieu’s concept of ‘Habitus’ which can be described as a template of practices and attitudes reflected within an individual’s behaviours and intentions. Habitus encompasses the shared history of a community as over generations social arrangements and customs that individuals perceive as being the way things are simultaneously influence and are influenced by the habitus.

Their study focussed upon individuals who grew up in disadvantage in rural Wales and demonstrated how their sense of culture, history and national identity were intertwined with later academic achievements. There was a sense within their communities that education was valued (often within people who had no formal education of their own). Participants believed this helped drive them on to university. In all cases, the first person from their rural welsh community to do so was viewed as a communal success. These individuals attended university as a torchbearer or proxy to others. Morgan (1986) wrote that the pervasive image of Wales was as a nation that valued education. Is this still the case of communities within the area included in this study, especially within the families and wider communities of those pupils who have been referred to the PRU?

The third greatest number of statements related to both cultural issues and outside agencies. All cultural issue statements related to potential barriers suggesting the culture characterising the county did more to hinder rather than help achieve successful outcomes. There was an equal split between barriers and success factors relating to outside agencies.

In terms of potential cultural barriers, some interviewees felt many people in the area held a narrow world view and perception reinforced through the generations which had over time almost become a monoculture affecting many residents of the county.
It was noticeable that there were no potential cultural success factors highlighted as evident within the county.

In terms of potential outside agency barriers, there was a strong belief that children were disadvantaged and failed by health services in the county in particular, services provided by CAMHS i.e. children and adolescent mental health services. Waiting times for initial assessment by some health services relating to issues such as Autism or mental health professionals can take as much as five years from initial referral, time in which difficulties may escalate within the mainstream education sector leading to pupil placement at the PRU. Paliokosta and Bladford (2010) view length of time away from mainstream education as a major reintegration barrier and lengthy waiting times for clinical consultations may increase time pupils are outside a mainstream setting.

There were no potential outside agency success factors highlighted as evident within the county.

A final set of four post-interview-coded statement categories each received a single statement relating to potential barriers. These were differences between urban and rural communities, issues relating to the Welsh language, transport issues and economic issues. Each was viewed as hindering a successful outcome.

There was some feeling of an increasing encroachment of negative urban influences and ethos upon traditional rural areas leading to a negative effect upon pupils in these areas, linked to that was a historic pattern of Welsh speaking within the county represented by the location of bilingual and Welsh medium schools which could mitigate against a transfer of a pupil, for example, from one part of the county to another, with traditional Welsh speaking heartlands tending to be located in the more rural or small town communities of the north of
the county as opposed to the more urban English speaking communities to the south.

Communities within the county are spread out and direct transport links between areas are in some cases very poor, especially public transport. Lack of public transport services largely due to sparse usage and lack of profitability for private firms means, for example, a pupil would find a transfer to secondary school in a different catchment area difficult due to the move relying on ability of parents to transport the pupil and the subsequent impact upon home life, or the responsibility would rest with the LEA who would have to provide expensive provision to transport pupils between schools. A 2008 survey of members of the ATL union working in rural schools established transport issues as one of the major obstacles to providing a broad range of educational opportunities for pupils within a rural setting. The lack of well resourced, regular extensive provision of public transport prevents many pupils, especially from disadvantaged backgrounds, accessing after school or extracurricular activities which have been shown to provide opportunities to build self esteem and help pupils to (re)integrate within a school.

Finally, linked to barriers of lack of family ambition and aspiration noted earlier is the problem of few job opportunities. The ATL (2008) report found one in five households in rural areas of the UK lived below the official poverty line, yet within at least 50% of these households at least one member was in employment. The problem is that many of the jobs available are low skilled and/or low paid, which is a particular difficulty in rural areas. Many jobs which do become available are seasonal and do not offer career progression opportunities, tending to mitigate against pupil ambition to achieve in school as there is very little to work towards in their economic future within the area.

Urban poverty is relatively highly visible and well documented. By contrast, rural poverty appears to be less so due to dispersal of poorer rural households, often
close proximity to areas of relative affluence and a lack of official statistical documentation. Within Wales, the proportion of households in receipt of working families tax credit is higher in rural areas and a distinct geography emerges as to low income based rural benefit receipt in the country with the highest proportion of households being located in the West, including Pembrokeshire.

Across rural Wales in 2001, Pembrokeshire recorded greater levels of poverty than that of rural Wales combined, with rural Wales recording greater poverty levels than Wales as a whole.

Table 25: Indicators of Income and deprivation (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% households receiving:</th>
<th>Job seekers allowance</th>
<th>Income support</th>
<th>Council tax benefit</th>
<th>Working families tax credit</th>
<th>Average household income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Wales</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>£24065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>£22894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only does rural Wales support lower household incomes than Wales as a whole but those in Pembrokeshire are lower than other rural areas. Again in 2003, 20.5% of the population of Pembrokeshire received a yearly income of less than £10000 compared to 19.8% of all rural areas of Wales.

Research by Hirsch (2007) suggested strong links between poverty and SEN. Low income in particular, was a strong indicator of low educational performance, with pupils from the most impoverished backgrounds being anxious and lacking confidence concerning education.

The 2009 report ‘Child poverty and social exclusion in rural Wales’ by the End Child Poverty Network Cymru suggested there were 192,000 children living in households with less than 60% of the UK median income in Wales (Households Below Average Income, HBAI 2009) equating to 32% of children in Wales and that poverty levels were higher in many rural areas.
Developed countries define child poverty not as absolute poverty but with a social and relative perspective. Poverty is not just about income but also about the social exclusion of people from the daily life and activities of the communities in which they live. It is about not having access to what others in your society take for granted (Sharman, 2005).

According to OECD (2001), the UK has one of the steepest socio-economic gradients in education amongst similar countries with children from disadvantaged backgrounds doing worse than those from advantaged backgrounds by a greater amount than elsewhere. Figures suggest Pembrokeshire includes areas of relative economic disadvantage with PRU referrals largely coming from schools serving poorer economic catchment areas where the majority of referred pupils are entitled to receive free school meals. This suggests, in some instances home or community socio-economic factors impact upon in school behaviour in a negative way and in part drive PRU referrals.

Socio-economic circumstances in childhood resulting in low educational attainment in adulthood may precipitate the transmission of poverty across generations with the relationship between poverty and attainment being part of a wider cycle in which family disadvantage is passed from one generation to the next. Hirsh (2010) suggested pupils from different backgrounds experience different relationships with teachers. Consequently it may be possible to argue that pupils from poorer socio-economic backgrounds forge less positive relationships within schools, which may as a result impact upon their behaviour and their ultimate referral to the PRU. Shubin (2010) suggested poverty has a cultural aspect, which is less well documented and does not figure in official poverty definitions. Yosso (2005) suggested this cultural dimension related to a lack of specific forms of knowledge, skills, abilities and contacts which can be used by communities to improve their well being. Beloin and Peterson (2000)
believed one of the biggest problems facing rural communities was a frequent loss of a positive vision for the future. In such situations teachers, pupils and parents may develop negative self-fulfilling images of their communities and future lives which become reinforced over time.

There may be differences displayed between communities based upon the Welsh language and traditional Welsh culture in that across the county Welsh medium schools have traditionally referred lower numbers of pupils to the PRU. Whether this is due to a different ethos of schools, parents and pupils in Welsh speaking communities or that in many cases parents will have actively chosen a Welsh medium or bilingual school and are, therefore, more supportive of them is open to conjecture. At secondary school level for example, the designated Welsh medium school has never to date referred a pupil to the PRU despite taking pupils not just from within its own natural catchment area but electively pupils can be enrolled from anywhere within the county including from catchment areas which traditionally have referred high levels of pupils.

6.5.1 Primary school interviewee perspectives toward county specific reintegration barriers and success facilitators

PH1 focused upon what was evident in his school, believing it to be representative of ‘many’ other schools in the county. He noted three school-based success factors in the county.

His school, as did others, felt a strong sense of ownership of and responsibility for any pupil who lived within the catchment area and they would do their utmost to ensure the pupil could be accommodated without the need to refer to the PRU.

If I lost a child to the PRU I would view that as a failure as would my staff.

Primary head teacher 1

This statement included not just himself but the school staff en mass, a powerful indicator to a caring ethos embedded within the culture of the school which, as
Visser (2000) noted, was a significant factor in ensuring a successful reintegration.

This sense of ownership of the pupil is felt to be significant in that schools were prepared to be flexible to accommodate different pupils rather than feel the need to transfer them on. As he says:

No matter how unsettled a pupil may be at their school they will feel more settled being there.

Primary head teacher 1

Pupils, even though they may experience difficulties, felt a sense of belonging to the school which would be more beneficial psychologically than a sense of rejection from a school referring them away to the PRU.

PHT 2 suggested two reintegration barriers within the county and one success factor. A key success factor came from the rural nature of much of the county which was very evident within his school's catchment area. He spoke at length about traditional parenting roles and family values that he felt were evident.

In a rural area like this I think parents in general have more time for their children.

Primary head teacher 2

As a result he believed some pupils in rural areas had more significant positive nurturing experiences than urban counterparts and formed more positive attachments to adults had higher self esteem and were less likely to exhibit challenging behaviour in school. The fact that traditionally rural schools have referred far fewer pupils to the PRU than those in urban areas may indicate he had a salient point of view.

He believed there were interlinked reintegration barriers. Firstly, from his experience of sitting on the inclusion panel, there was reluctance from some schools in the county, especially secondary schools, to accept pupils back once
referred to the PRU and would rather they were reintegrated elsewhere, which could compound difficulties for pupils through a sense of further rejection.

In some schools there is a view that pupils should maybe not go back to the school.

Primary head teacher 2

Secondly, the traditional language differences between the Welsh speaking/bilingual north and the English speaking south could mitigate against pupils reintegrating to schools in different areas as the language of instruction in some schools could render such a move impossible.

I think it is hard to reintegrate pupils from the south of the county because of the Welsh language. We here at this school are expected to achieve full bilingualism which would without question make it more difficult.

Primary head teacher 2

Thirdly, the difference between urban and rural areas in terms of attitudes and behaviour norms were considerable and any attempt to reintegrate urban pupils to rural schools would have a marked detrimental impact. It would be a move that he would not consider in his own school.

We have here in the county a tremendous difference between the rural and urban….if a troublesome child was sent to one of the rural schools then that child would change the makeup of that school tremendously.

Primary head teacher 2

6.5.2 Secondary school interviewee perspectives toward county specific reintegration barriers and success facilitators

SHT 1 suggested four county barriers to reintegation and one success factor. Barriers were interlinked relating to the economic situation in the county and prevailing family attitude to work.

A key problem was the lack of employment opportunities within the school catchment and surrounding area and that many of the jobs available were poorly paid, often seasonal and not demanding.
There are so few job opportunities and there isn’t the multiplicity of roles for children to see in their home lives or town or local areas …it’s not a monoculture as such but almost in terms of employment opportunities for boys…traditionally low paid and not particularly demanding.

Secondary head teacher 1

Children did not see people in their local area undertaking a variety of jobs especially skilled jobs as a result she felt that:

This mitigates against aspirations…it’s very hard to pin aspirations to them of striving to achieve something in the future as they don’t see it around them.

Secondary head teacher 1

Children did not see achievement or career progression and advancement in their local areas and had no hopes or aspirations of fulfilling professional roles in the future. There was, in the case of disengaged pupils, a sense of futility in working hard and participating in school, as after all what was there for them at the end? Traditional employment opportunities for less skilled employees had massively declined in the previous two decades in her school catchment area with the shutting of three traditional main employers and the loss of thousands of jobs, which had never been replaced. As a result the importance attributed to education had been eroded within some families.

This view may be reflected by figures contained within the 2008 Pembrokeshire Profile (Pembrokeshire County Council/ Statistical Unit, WAG, 2008) which suggests that across England and Wales in total 29.1% of inhabitants aged 16-74 held no formal qualifications. This compares to 33% of the equivalent population of Wales and 31.1% of the population of Pembrokeshire. Within the main catchment area served by SHT 1’s school this ranged from 28.7% to 35.6% of the population holding no formal qualification, therefore, at a higher level to much of Pembrokeshire and Wales as a whole. Similar patterns are to be found in other areas of the county, for example where traditionally rates of PRU referral have been high including rates of 41.1% and 43.1% of the adult population holding no formal qualifications in urban areas to the south of the county.
SHT 1 was complimentary about the role the education sector played within the county.

If it wasn’t for the education sector in Pembrokeshire I don’t know where some of these kids would be as I have never met a more concerted effort to try and sort these problems but it all seems to come from education, we need more.

Secondary head teacher 1

At the same time there was a sense that education had been left to its own devices to cure all society’s ills and additional help and support needed for these pupils was lacking. Those in education were doing their best and were doing well but more needed to be done elsewhere and at the moment that was lacking. As a result problems were left unaddressed, were becoming exacerbated and schools ultimately were left picking up the pieces at a time when budget and staffing levels were being reduced.

This appears to echo The 2006 ESTYN report ‘Behaviour in Wales ‘Good practice in managing behaviour’ which suggested that, in general, agencies are not collaborating well enough to ensure that pupils are being supported effectively and to address circumstances that give rise to challenging behaviours.

ESTYN noted barriers to multi-agency partnerships which must be addressed before partnership working can become effective including issues relating to lack of communication and information sharing, underdeveloped planning and evaluation, inadequate funding and a lack of trust between agencies.

SHT 2 cited three barriers within the county and like her secondary head teacher colleague they were barriers facing all pupils, rather than just those being reintegrated.

The effects of the rather depressed economy of the area were noted.
It is not easy to identify additional appropriate opportunities or employment opportunities for young people...there is no inward investment here.

Secondary head teacher 2

This lack of potential employment was particularly damaging to disengaged pupils, as there was no chance of giving pupils something to aim and work for in their future after school as if they stayed in the area, realistically what job opportunities would there be for them?

For the youngster who is potentially disengaged it is difficult to find as a school something to give them that appetite for life.

Secondary head teacher 2

Like PHT 1 and SHT 1 who felt reintegration to a new school could be problematic, she believed this to be the case, largely due to the geography of the area. For example a pupil wishing to reintegrate from a secondary school in the north of the county to another would face a return journey of at least thirty miles a day, probably involving public transport as the authority would not necessarily provide transport and many of the pupils come from families who do not own transport. The length and cost of travelling would act as a barrier to some pupils as well as the potentially damaging effects of having to reintegrate into a new school at some distance to their family and social support networks. However, it can be noted to their credit and an indicator of satisfaction that many pupils who thrive at the PRU face similar lengthy journeys to attend provision.

The issue of rurality doesn’t help and neither does the transport as it leaves some pupils with a distance to travel to school which can itself disengage some pupils.

Secondary head teacher 2

In some authorities outside the study area managed moves have been used as a means to reduce exclusion and to provide a pupil with a fresh start in a new school setting.

Burton (2007) discussed the example of managed moves implemented by a small rural English authority with managed moves being overseen by educational
welfare officers having a positive impact upon pupils displaying challenging
behaviour in schools.

Pupils were offered managed moves to a new school for an initial 6 month
probationary period and moves were promoted as ‘viable’ and ‘standing a good
chance of success’ to the schools involved. Consequently, schools had built a
positive perception of such moves rather than viewing the situation as being
forced to take a ‘difficult pupil’ from another school that had ‘failed them’.
Whether such a system could be introduced within the study area is open to
debate due to difficulties relating to geography and culture. The 2006 ESTYN
report ‘Behaviour in Wales: Good practice in managing behaviour’ suggested
providing equitable bilingual opportunities across an authority in particular is not
always possible and arrangements need to be flexible to tackle the challenge of
managing transfers within rural areas where the distance between schools would
make transfers more difficult. Interviewees also alluded to a seeming reluctance
to take pupils from outside a school’s natural catchment especially if they were
‘difficult’.

For such a system to work moves should be managed through the pupil inclusion
panel and pupils and schools be supplied with adequate support. It is possible
that such moves could be managed successfully within primary schools within a
family cluster especially if schools took a collective responsibility for such pupils
rather than allowing a particular school to become overburdened.

6.5.3 BSS interviewee perspectives toward county specific
reintegration barriers and success facilitators
The Head of the BSS noted problems relating to geography and associated
transport difficulties. The PRU itself suffers greatly from this in that the pupils
may be referred to them from anywhere in the county and as a result some pupils
faced a daily three hour round trip. For these pupils, who are often tired and
irritable due to a lack of sleep possibly caused by a lack of parental care or lack of home boundaries, an early morning start followed by a ninety minute commute does not equal a happy mood nor desire to attend education and as such can have a negative impact upon pupil performance throughout the entire school day.

The rurality and transport issues are obviously big problems.

Head of BSS

This issue was highlighted within the Cole et al study (2003) with some LEAs in England unconvinced of the worth of PRUs citing problems relating to rurality (sparse population dispersed across a rural area) as a potential difficulty threatening the viability of a PRU due to the time pupils spent travelling to and from the PRU and the transport costs incurred. She located further potential factors within mainstream schools in the county in that schools can put up immediate barriers through expecting pupils they have referred to the PRU to be reintegrated elsewhere.

Although it may be possible for a child to get a fresh start at a different school I don’t think that is feasible in most cases due to the distance between schools.

Head of BSS

The fact that the school is not prepared to accept the pupil’s return suggests an ethos in which all blame for incidents leading to the referral are placed upon the pupil rather than the school being willing to accept they need to display more flexibility and be willing to make changes to provision either to allow a reintegration to take place or to prevent situations escalating to referral. This is a very salient point in how to best at least lay the foundations for a successful reintegration reiterated by the Head of the BSS in that:

I think the best way is if schools do it properly and welcome the pupil back and show that they are valued and respected. That pupil is going to have a significant psychological shift.

Head of BSS
Summary

Statements relating to county specific barriers outweighed those of county success factors by a ratio of 3:1.

80% of barriers were located outside the locus of control of schools and the education system. The majority of barriers were located with families and wider communities the schools served relating to lack of aspiration, narrow world view and negative outlook reinforced within small communities and passed between generations.

Other barriers related to the physical and cultural geography of the county leading to transport issues, community ethos at odds with that promoted by the school and language differences. There were issues relating to poverty either pockets of socio-economic deprivation, lack of demanding well paid employment opportunities or more commonly service poverty, for example, adolescent mental health provision or broadband coverage reinforcing a narrow world view.

80% of success factors were located as being within schools and education services who were serving interests and needs of pupils with little input from outside agencies.
Chapter 7 Conclusions

7.1 Review of research themes
The aim of the study was to investigate both patterns and influences on referral and reintegration between PRU and mainstream schools in the largely rural county of Pembrokeshire in south west Wales. The study consisted of two stages of enquiry. The first had specific objectives to undertake an historical audit of patterns of pupil referral and reintegration between mainstream schools and PRU and to scrutinise these data for factors which may explain the patterns uncovered.

The second part of the study gathered data from educational practitioners using a postal questionnaire and subsequent interview. This stage of enquiry investigated the reintegration process and factors perceived as exerting an influence (both positive and negative upon it). Two sample sets were employed an expert sample consisting of three secondary and four primary school head teachers and a broader landscape sample drawn from both mainstream and alternative provision settings and included a range of job titles from classroom assistants to head teachers. Replies from these two groups were in many ways complimentary, as will be discussed below.

Unlike the majority of previously published research focussing upon reintegration and PRUs in urban settings in England, this study focussed upon reintegration within a largely rural authority in Wales. For the purpose of this study reintegration refers to efforts made to return pupils referred to the PRU back to mainstream school based education provision which in a minority of cases, for a variety of reasons may not be to the original referring school.

However, for some pupils a reintegration to mainstream school is a neither desirable nor feasible outcome as their needs may be better met within an alternative setting. Although the remit of a PRU does not necessarily suggest it
should cater for long term provision of pupils it is felt that it should not be viewed as failure if pupils do not make a reintegration transition in cases where the PRU is the best place for pupil needs to be met.

7.2 Theme one: historical patterns of pupil referral and reintegration to and from the Pembrokeshire PRU and mainstream schools

The historical data focussed upon pupils referred to and on the roll of the PRU between 2001 and 2008. Patterns emerged suggesting factors which may have influenced pupil moves. However, these factors were attached little significance by questionnaire respondents, yet it would appear from historical data that they may have contributed to referral and subsequent reintegration patterns.

7.2.1 Potential variables influencing pupil referral and reintegration

A review of the historical tracking data suggested the following variables may exert some level of influence upon the likelihood of a pupil being referred to the PRU and their subsequent likelihood of a mainstream school reintegration:

Pupil gender (more boys were referred than girls however, proportionately, more girls reintegrated than boys).

Pupil age (the likelihood of referral increased with age with the majority of referrals taking place at KS3).

Pupil SEN such as literacy difficulties, the majority of pupils referred to the PRU displayed reading and spelling delays increasingly pronounced with age suggesting underlying literacy difficulties within the classroom may have impacted upon pupil behaviour driving referrals.
Those pupils who reintegrated displayed on average a lower reading and spelling delay than those who did not. An ability to cope with demands of school work within a mainstream classroom may have been considered when judging the suitability of a pupil for reintegration.

School type. Community primary schools referred a greater number of pupils to the PRU than did faith schools or voluntary controlled schools who may have some degree of control or selection of pupils on their roll and, therefore, pupils and parents may have a greater degree of support for the school and its ethos than in areas in which pupils were enrolled at their nearest county primary school.

School language category. English medium schools referred a far greater number of pupils than Dual Stream, bilingual and Welsh medium schools combined.

School size. In general, the larger the school the greater the likelihood of a referral to the PRU, especially within KS1-2, suggests that smaller schools may foster a greater sense of community and pupil contentment than is possible in larger institutions, therefore, pupils are less likely to display behaviour leading to a referral and, in general, this pattern is displayed at secondary school level whereby the largest schools referred the greatest proportion of pupils.

Family of schools. In general, those suffering greatest levels of poverty and economic disadvantage have referred and subsequently reintegrated the greatest number of pupils.
7.2.2 Patterns of pupil referral to the PRU

Gender

The majority of referrals were of male pupils (213 compared to 35 female) a ratio of six to one concurring with research by Sparkes (1999) which highlighted at primary level, male referrals outnumber females ten to one and at secondary level four to one.

Key stage

The majority of pupil referrals are within the KS3 age range (school years 7-9) and the likelihood of referral increases with pupil age.

Age

The average age at which pupils are referred to the PRU within the key stages remains remarkably consistent being 7 years 7 months at KS1 (school year 3), 9 years 6 months at KS2 (school year 5) and 13 years 5 months across the KS3 groups (school year 8-9). These results at the PRU in Pembrokeshire mirror research by Stevens et al (2005) which suggested the majority of pupils at PRUs nationally are within KS3 or above.

Literacy difficulties

The majority of pupils referred across all key stages display literacy difficulties identified and recorded upon referral as a lag between chronological age and reading and spelling age. Average literacy delays become increasingly pronounced as a pupil moves through the key stages concurring with research by Claridge (2010). This may be due to several factors including disruption to the pupil’s education, developmental delays and learning difficulties, disaffection with school or involvement with an alternative curriculum which may be focussed
upon maintaining the pupil in school rather than upon developing literacy skills. These literacy delays are not unexpected by PRUs, however, it can be a challenge to improve literacy levels sufficiently for the pupil to access a mainstream curriculum.

**Referring schools**
Patterns emerged relating to school size, language category and type. At primary school level referrals were predominantly from larger schools. Referring schools were predominantly English-medium accounting for 65.38% (n=17) of referrals and were county primary schools rather than voluntary controlled or aided schools.

At secondary school level all but one school had referred a pupil across the timeframe studied, the non-referring school being the designated Welsh medium school serving the entire county, taking pupils from all catchment areas. It was not clear from replies as to why this was the case. I suggest it would be at least partially linked to school ethos and parental support for the school in that many families have elected for their children to attend there rather than their local secondary school. Therefore, there was a greater correlation between school and family expectations and attitudes and more likely to be positive parental views of education at home.

**School family and catchment area**
The school families serve mixed catchment areas in terms of socio-economic status, language and rural or urban nature. Lupton (2010) recognised that schools are influenced by the socio-economic composition and cultural profile of their catchment area and wider community and the largest number of referrals were linked to schools that served larger urban, predominantly English speaking
and lower socio-economic status catchment areas (or at least pockets of relative deprivation).

Within the highest referring families of schools there are issues within catchment areas linked to poverty, low qualification of adult residents, unemployment, social housing, lack of opportunity and services, which may impact upon family life. Some families may be characterised by tension and difficult relationships due to pressures of external issues, which in turn lead to difficulties in pupils forming nurturing attachments and gaining social norms prior to starting school. Thus, they attend school at a disadvantage which can lead to challenging behaviours acted out in the classroom.

7.2.3 Pupil transitions (PRU internal moves)

The remit of a PRU is to enable pupils to return to mainstream provision once it is deemed appropriate for the pupil to do so. Of the 248 pupils studied, 87 remained within the PRU group to which they were referred at least throughout the academic year of their arrival. 93 pupils transferred to an alternative group within the PRU including a move to a satellite unit, to a KS3 class at the end of KS2 provision, to alternative provision or home tuition. Mainstream education is not considered achievable or appropriate for all pupils; it is therefore, not unexpected that some pupils will remain within the PRU. Groups within the PRU may display a differing ethos and offer differing levels of support. Pupils transferring between groups suggest the PRU monitors pupil performance and seeks to match provision to support required by individual pupils.

7.2.4 Patterns of pupil reintegration from the PRU

The least common pupil outcome once attending the PRU was a reintegration to mainstream provision. The most commonly attempted reintegration was a full-time return to the referring mainstream school followed by a full-time return to a
new school. A full-time reintegration was the most commonly attempted pathway. Patterns of reintegrating pupils emerged in relation to gender, key stage, age, literacy delays and schools and catchment areas.

**Gender**
During the time frame covered by the tracking data (2001-2008) greater numbers of male rather than female pupils reintegrated. However, proportionately only 25% of male pupils (n=54) reintegrated compared to 41% of female pupils (n=14), meaning although fewer in number, female pupils were more likely to be deemed suitable to reintegrate.

**Key stage**
As a proportion, KS2 pupils have the greatest attempted reintegration rates. It is interesting to note that both Phoenix and KS3A groups had identical reintegration rates of 24% in that it was expected that a greater proportion of Phoenix group pupils would re integrate in that their placement at the PRU initially at least was for a short term fixed timescale of 6 weeks compared to those in the KS3A group referred for extended periods. Yet it would appear that, for Phoenix group (see appendix 2) pupils also, a return to mainstream school is far from likely as either their needs are being met at the PRU and do not wish to reintegrate or that they do not meet the targets set by their mainstream schools who as a result do not wish them to return.

**Age**
The majority of reintegration moves occurred when the pupil was within the last school year of their National Curriculum key stage. At KS1 the greatest number of pupils to reintegrate did so within school year 2, at KS2 within school year 6
and at KS3 within school year 9 possibly to allow the pupil a fresh start for the next key stage of their school career.

**Literacy difficulties**

Pupils who reintegrated had an average of four month lesser reading age delay and fourteen month lesser spelling age delay than pupils who remained within the PRU system. It is possible to suggest that part of the reason that some pupils reintegrated was due to a greater level of literacy and, therefore, greater ability to cope with the curriculum in a mainstream school environment.

**Reintegrating schools**

The reintegration rate remained relatively consistent being between 29.2% and 38.4%. It is impossible from the figures to explain reasons for differences in reintegration rates; however I would suggest that historically schools within some families appear less reluctant than others to reintegrate a pupil therefore impacting upon the number of pupils making such a move.

**School family and catchment area**

Within catchment areas reintegration rates are relatively consistent; therefore, it is suggested that socio-economic differences, language patterns and nature of geography which may have some level of impact upon referrals do not necessarily have the same level of impact upon subsequent reintegration. What does drive reintegration I suggest is willingness on behalf of individual schools to accept the return of a pupil, the degree to which the pupil wishes to complete the move, and as a result, conform to school behaviour norms alongside, support available to both school and pupil from parents.
7.3 Theme two: Definitions of ‘reintegration’ and ‘successful reintegration’ from educational practitioners

Within the literature, reintegration is defined for example as ‘restoring an individual to a study program after a fairly long absence’ (Committee of Mauriciens for Persistence in Education, Training and Enrolment of Students, 2001).

Participant’s similarly largely defined reintegration as a pupil making a return/move to a (new) school following a period of time spent at alternative education such as a PRU.

All statements related the concept to a return to mainstream education from alternative provision even though it may involve a pupil moving being alternative provision settings. A proportion of statements (14%) related reintegration to the ideology of inclusion in that pupils experiencing SEN were receiving education within the mainstream sector with some also expressing a notion of a pupil making a ‘fresh start’ at mainstream school following a period of turbulence necessitating their referral (exclusion) to alternative provision.

Within the expert sample questionnaire, participants linked successful reintegration outcome to four areas, namely, the pupil displaying acceptable behaviour and positive attitude to school, staff and the process, that their arrival at the school should have no negative discernible effect upon other members of the school community and that pupils should achieve social inclusion such as formation of positive peer associations alongside making academic progress.

Replies from landscape questionnaires given to a broader constituency of practitioners including mainstream schools, private schools and the PRU expanded upon these successful outcomes to include the pupil feeling a sense of belonging and attachment to the school through which they displayed a positive attitude and conform. As reintegration progresses support may be reduced if
appropriate with pupil continuing to make progress and function within the mainstream environment.

7.4 Theme three: Factors educational practitioners identified as influencing reintegration success
A general consensus emerged from questionnaires with participants exhibiting a remarkable consistency concerning factors they believed to exert an influence upon success of reintegration and upon factors exerting a lesser influence. The relative importance of other variables varied according to the position and school type of the participant.

Across both questionnaire stages participants indicated that pupil age (and subsequent key stage), gender, SEN, literacy and numeracy ability were of little importance to reintegration, neither was the size of the class or school to which the reintegration would occur. Pupil reputation was viewed as important by expert respondents but deemed of lesser importance in the broader landscape sample, which may be related to lack of direct experience within the landscape sample set.

Prior to commencing the study I believed that each of these variables may have been important, a view confirmed by analysis of historical data in that the above mentioned variables appeared at least to be potential driving forces governing referral to the PRU and accounted for variations in reintegration patterns to mainstream school. For example girls are referred in far lower numbers to the PRU but are reintegrated in proportionately greater numbers to mainstream settings. The majority of referred pupils displayed literacy difficulties through reading and spelling delays with, in general, reintegrating pupils displaying lesser difficulties and the majority of referrals were from larger schools which in the majority of cases would be the same schools to which pupils would return.
These variables may not be the main driving forces of referral and reintegration which I believe to be unique to each individual pupil and school rather than generic, but at the very least are contributory factors and may be determinants as to where future intervention may be focussed such as targeting resources to families of schools or upon meeting the needs of boys in particular in mainstream schools.

Landscape questionnaire statements highlighted eight key factors deemed most influential upon reintegration of which the most important – parental attitude was home/family based, with pupil perception based within pupils. The remaining factors were inherent within reintegrating schools or the wider education system, including ethos, staff training, LSA support, BSS/PRU support, availability of resources and length of time the pupil is away from mainstream school.

Once variables were grouped into four broad categories, namely pupil located factors, home located factors, school located factors and factors located within the wider environment an additional pattern emerged in that school based factors were deemed the third most influential category. Only environmental factors were placed lower. Now participants agreed the greatest influences upon reintegration success were located within either the individual reintegrating pupil or their home/family background. Participants suggested a willingness to support school, the pupil and reintegration process as most important variables with the pupil displaying positive attitude and willingness to cooperate with the school. Although the relative influence of each variable is specific to each individual case rather than generic, responses concur with results of research, for example, GHK Consulting (2004) suggesting there are ways in which each of the categories of variables could improve practice to increase the likelihood of success.
7.4.1 School factors
Participants considered ethos to be the most important school based reintegation factor. Reintegration appears to be successful within schools which demonstrate a nurturing whole school ethos within which a critical mass of staff are committed to an inclusive ideology, are appropriately trained and in which provision is offered which matches the needs of the reintegrating pupil. Schools should seek to reduce barriers to the participation of reintegrating pupils through ensuring that the philosophy of inclusion is embedded within school practice and accepted by students, parents, staff, governors and the local community.

Many pupils at the PRU in Pembrokeshire (except those reintegrating from the short term Phoenix placement) attempt to do so after an extended period of time away from mainstream education. This may act as a barrier to reintegration. Research by Grandison (2011) concurs with this view as does the study carried out in 2000 by Tootill and Spalding which suggested that reintegration is increasingly successful if all parties expect the reintegration to occur as soon as possible, strong links are forged with the PRU or alternative provision setting, flexible patterns of attendance are possible and curriculum offered is flexible to match pupil need. The length of time in which the pupil has been away from the mainstream education setting may have an impact upon the success of reintegration with a shorter time period of attendance at a PRU likely to foster success provided the pupil is deemed to be ready and able to make a return.

One authority in North Wales concerned that too many pupils were spending long periods at the PRU redeveloped provision to focus upon offering short-term, flexible placements to pupils at risk of exclusion. This may be a way forward in Pembrokeshire which is a similarly rural location although Phoenix provision at KS3 is already set up with this aim in mind, however, such provision could be extended into KS1 and KS2 with the aim of shortening the process as appropriate for pupils in the primary education sector.
In consultation with schools, the authority offered six weeks’ intensive support at the PRU followed by supported reintegration at the end of that period. The programme enabled the PRU to offer short-term support and flexible placements more readily, with a much higher number of pupils returning to their local schools.

Schools reintegrate pupils with help from supported reintegration packages, which use behaviour support assistants monitored by specialist teachers. This has allowed schools to develop skills and confidence to cope more effectively with managing challenging behaviour. Reintegration was established as a goal at the start of the provision within a specified timeframe as it is in Pembrokeshire within the current Phoenix group provision (although it is more fluid and less defined within the other groups).

Not all pupils will reintegrate nor is a mainstream education placement the most appropriate provision for all pupils as noted by the Welsh Assembly Government ‘mainstream education is not always right for every child’ (WAG, 2006). However, it may be a possibility that the Pembrokeshire PRU speed up reintegration arrangements for those pupils for whom it has been deemed to be an appropriate transition.

It may be appropriate for the PRU follow the example of the North Wales authority and place a greater emphasis upon short term flexible provision to supplement the provision already in place such as, for example, introducing a ‘school returners group’ targeted at pupils who have been identified as reintegration candidates and which would focus upon improving skills such as communication, target setting, empathy and resilience which may increase the likelihood of the reintegration being successful. Key staff from mainstream schools identified to support these pupils upon return could be involved with this provision which could include targeted transition activities within the mainstream schools.
Interview participants suggested a general lack of support for managed moves within Pembrokeshire, at least within the primary education sector. For potential students a fresh start in a new environment without baggage of negative memories of previous experience can be a powerful determinant of success as it could indeed be for a pupil reintegrating from the PRU. Pupils largely were reintegrating to the school in which there were previous negative experiences and attitudes and these attitudes may resurface as barriers to reintegration upon the pupil's return (Tootill and Spalding, 2001).

Participants suggested resistance from many schools to entertain managed moves citing geographical distance between schools and language issues as additional barriers. Although transport is an area of concern, it is possible that language differences need not be so to the extent of totally excluding a pupil from such a move as there are, for example, increasing numbers of pupils attending the county Welsh medium secondary school who arrive with minimal if any prior knowledge of the language.

Reintegrating a pupil to a new school, despite instilling a sense of greater exclusion in some pupils, has for others according to Parsons et al (2001) been an important variable leading to success. The Welsh Assembly Government (2011) issued guidance on effective managed moves for pupils suggesting that providing both schools, parents and pupils agreed with such a move then it may be of benefit for pupils deemed at risk of permanent exclusion and for pupils with EBD for whom school intervention strategies had so far proved unsuccessful.

7.4.2 Teacher factors
Having caring skilled members of staff in place was viewed as a key component to ensuring successful reintegration with a member of staff willing to advocate on behalf of the pupil and be someone whom the pupil trusts to listen to their side viewed as crucial.
Many participants noted the importance of training being made available to staff prior to commencement of reintegration in that training in and awareness of issues may help encourage greater acceptance of the pupil by at least a critical mass of staff. The competency which teachers feel in dealing with pupils with challenging behaviour and EBD may be related to the success or otherwise of reintegration with mainstream teachers receiving little training in dealing with such pupils (indeed as a teacher within the PRU training in this area is also scarce).

School staff can create barriers to reintegration. Schools as appropriate need to take into account the circumstances behind challenging behaviour such as learning difficulties; continue improvements to the quality of teaching and ensure that all staff be given behaviour-management training and ongoing support.

The notion of further staff training was highlighted by thirteen questionnaire participants and it is felt that a way forward would be to offer joint training opportunities in conjunction with PRU staff, for example, focussing upon good practice relating to behaviour management. Staff from the PRU have recently completed ‘Team Teach’ training and are delivering ‘Team Teach’ techniques to mainstream school colleagues. This focuses upon positive handling and behavior de-escalation techniques which can be safely used with challenging pupils.

Such a delivery approach could be extended through schools suggesting training from which they could benefit regarding successful approaches employed with specific reintegrating pupils for example, or generic behaviour issues.

Many participants noted the importance of staff building relationships, in particular with the pupil. The teacher needs to be willing to connect with the pupil on a personal level and build relationships, with pupils needing to feel the teacher is genuinely interested in them and concerned with their progress and success.
(Barr, Parrett and Crowley, 1993). This implies teachers require continued support regarding challenging behaviour within a collaborative school environment and that resilience training currently offered to pupils at the PRU could be usefully extended to both pupils and staff at mainstream school.

### 7.4.3 Parental/home factors

Teacher relationship with families was identified as important but an area in which some schools needed to make improvements. Participants suggested that parents need to demonstrate positive attitudes towards the reintegration process, the pupil and the school and identified parental support as the most vital factor underpinning success.

Research by Leyser and Kirk (2003) suggests that although many parents believe in the goal of including pupils within mainstream schools, there is reluctance on the part of many parents towards the reintegration of their own children with only 14-36% of parents favouring such a move. Having not sought views of parents within this study this would be impossible to corroborate, however, the Head of the BSS did highlight reluctance on behalf of parents to allow their child to return to a particular school as being common and undermining the success of a reintegration.

### 7.4.4 Pupil factors

Participants believed that the reintegrating pupil was largely responsible for a successful outcome and in particular needed to display a desire to reintegrate as well as positive attitude, an acceptance of school rules, a willingness to take advantage of opportunities offered by the school and the acceptance of support offered and use of strategies given to them prior to their return. The increasing value attached to resilience training offered to pupils at the PRU may have a positive impact upon future reintegration success rates as pupils enter into a
reintegration armed with a greater range of proven success strategies at their disposal to overcome difficulties they may face upon re-entering the mainstream school environment.

7.4.5 Environmental factors
In general, questionnaire replies gave least credence to environmental impacts upon reintegration, however, the wider education system, outside agency support and community norms and culture within the county were viewed as of great importance to interviewees especially the inter-generational transfer of negative attitude, lack of aspiration and value placed upon education and geographical inertia of families signifying there may be issues located in the wider environment which are specific to schools and catchment areas within Pembrokeshire.

It is difficult to state whether it is within the capability of education services to address and counteract these longstanding often deeply ingrained issues as these issues may be seen as a fact of life within this particular geographical area or to particular families with schools therefore able to do no more than recognise and work with constraints of the catchment areas and communities they serve. These factors are discussed in greater detail in the next section.

7.5 Theme four: Factors specific to a rural county such as Pembrokeshire which educational practitioners identified as influencing the success of reintegration
A number of factors were identified by interviewees pertaining to the specific issues of attempting reintegration of pupils within Pembrokeshire. What emerged was a view that factors inherent to the county relating to geography, language and culture, socio-economic issues and poverty and deprivation impacted not only upon pupils at the PRU attempting a reintegration but upon all pupils. Interviewees believed many pupils within Pembrokeshire were at a disadvantage
due to the area in which they resided and it could be argued that potentially those pupils referred/reintegrated were impacted upon more than the general school population.

Historically many pupils who have attended the PRU have been from families from poorer socio-economic backgrounds and broken homes for example, and are suffering increased levels of disadvantage within an already disadvantaged area. Negative factors relating to the county were largely based within the realms of geography – rurality, culture, family issues, socio-economic issues and outside agencies whilst there were issues relating to differences in Welsh language speaking and transport difficulties which could make the reintegration process more difficult.

Any success factors based within the county were largely, according to participants, located within schools themselves and to a lesser extent within the families of pupils who have historically reintegrated successfully.

This research unearths similarities in issues and educational practitioner perspectives concerning reintegrating pupils from a PRU to mainstream school within a largely rural education authority in Wales, to findings by Lawrence (2011) researching reintegration within a large urban English context.

This would indicate that reintegration is difficult to successfully promote regardless of the setting in which it is attempted and despite the reintegration experience being unique to individual pupils and schools entering into the process there appear to be common generic barriers and facilitators located within national guidance and legislation, schools and staff, PRUs, local education authorities, local communities, reintegrating pupils and their families.

However, this research suggests that these issues are compounded and exacerbated by factors within the county and these factors relate in the main to
geography (rural nature, lack of transport etc) culture (Welsh language prevalent in some areas, narrow world view, lack of family aspiration) and an apparent lack of willingness by schools to entertain transfers of pupils to allow reintegration to take place within a new setting offering the pupil a fresh start.

7.6 Limitations of study
As the study progressed, a number of limitations inherent within the study located within the data collection and analysis stage of the research became apparent. The initial analysis of tracking data was confined to a cut off point of the 2008 academic year due to technical issues with the ICT systems at the PRU which meant that the data that year was irretrievably lost. Therefore, the historical data therefore ceased at the time at which I started to gather my own live data through the expert and landscape questionnaires. As a result, it was not possible to obtain a concurrent tracking data set alongside the live data as originally planned, however, the unforeseen cut off of the historical data provided a platform from which to launch the live data gathering which examined variables identified.

A second issue regarding the tracking data was that in some areas the data set was incomplete in that only partial recording of pupil information had been stored by the PRU with items such as reading and spelling age and pupil age upon referral in some instances missing. This may have impacted upon validity of patterns inferred from the data set in that they were based on incomplete data. However I am confident that inferences drawn from the data set were appropriate and correct due to confirmation from questionnaire and interview respondents.

There were limitations linked to selected data gathering methods through both postal questionnaire and interview stages of the research. I opted to undertake data gathering through a postal questionnaire method and a copy was sent to a sample of schools within both the primary and secondary sector within the county.
who had previous experience of referring a pupil to and reintegrating a pupil from the PRU as it was hoped, that this may have a positive effect upon the response rate which can be notoriously low in a postal sample. In practice this did not materialise and the final response rate after follow up was 46.7% which is still greater than that achieved by many postal questionnaires including those in previously published research studies.

I decided against phoning schools who had not replied within the timeframe as although the letter was addressed to the head teacher, it had been made clear that it should be answered by the person seen as being the most appropriate by the school and was not necessarily, therefore, the person to whom the envelope had been addressed and there was an uncertainty as to whom (if anyone) the questionnaire had been passed onto. As a result the questionnaire data underpinning the study accounted for the opinions of only 40.3% of schools which may have led to an element of bias within the study in that participants were those who wished to express a particular point of view and may, therefore, not have been wholly representative of all schools in the county however I believe the views represented are fit for purpose within the context of this study as many of the views expressed mirrored the real life experience of reintegration as referred to by the expert interviewee sample and I believe that a range of views from a sample set inclusive of school size, language category, school sector and catchment area for example, were captured.

As noted previously, questionnaires were only completed by one participant within each school and it is, therefore, impossible to conclude that the views they expressed are indicative or representative of staff at the school as a whole or if they are a matter of distinctive personal opinion. However, if questionnaires were completed by the lead professional within the school concerned with reintegration or inclusion, it is feasible that within their role they would practice leadership concerning reintegration practice, offer guidance and support to pupils and colleagues, disseminate knowledge and promote staff values therefore, their
views may be indicative of wider staff values, however, it is impossible to infer this conclusively within the study.

Each of the interview schools represented different features concerning size, language of instruction and socio-economic and geographical nature of their catchment areas that I hoped to achieve but again the interview results are based on a very small proportion of the total number of schools and may not necessarily be wholly representative of views of all schools within Pembrokeshire. Despite there being generic variables which may affect reintegration it is believed that reintegration should be viewed as a process specific to the individual pupil and school attempting the transition, however, interviewees remarked upon variables and issues previously suggested by questionnaire respondents as evident within their experience of reintegration.

A further limitation related to data gathering is that all questionnaire and interview data was derived from colleagues within the education sector. There are many additional outside agencies which play a role in influencing reintegration such as child psychology and mental health services and perhaps more crucially the pupil and their parents who are attempting the transition.

Therefore, results are based upon only one viewpoint i.e. that of education professionals. MacLeod (2010) noted that although there are a wide range of professional and disciplinary groups with a vested interest in EBD pupil research, professionals who undertake research focus upon their own professional community of practice rather than incorporating other professionals and disseminating results to a wider audience.

It had originally been planned to undertake a pupil and parent questionnaire and interviews to canvas a more balanced representation of views. However, due to a lack of direct access to reintegrating pupils allied with ethical considerations regarding age and diagnosis of special educational needs this was not
completed. There were also concerns relating to access to parents who, within the PRU system are notoriously difficult to contact and often are distrustful of professionals and their intentions, and do not wish any further intervention in their lives or those of their children.

7.7 Recommendations for future practice
What emerged from participants in both mainstream and alternative provision settings was a need for greater communication between staff in both settings including sharing of data, information and strategies which have proved successful with the pupil and, an agreed set of targets for the pupil to achieve. Taylor (2012) recommended schools share any relevant information and agree the nature of intervention for pupils whilst setting targets for their future life prospects.

This appears to be especially important prior to commencement of transition but also during the move and needs to be monitored and followed up as appropriate. Alongside the need to plan and work collaboratively in sharing data, of greater potential importance and impact would be a greater sharing of staff and expertise between PRU and mainstream schools. This could include visits by PRU staff to mainstream school to observe the pupil in that environment and offer advice as appropriate and also, for mainstream staff to observe the pupil in the PRU environment prior to making the reintegration to see the pupil being positive which could then be fed back to mainstream school colleagues which may have a positive impact upon the perception staff hold of the pupil and, therefore, increase the likelihood of the transition being successful.

Such a pattern of shared observation could lend itself to preparation of an individually tailored support package for the pupil and school. It could be used to inform the decision, for example, as to whether reintegration would be full or part time, be immediate or staged, and similar to the year 6 transition days that the
secondary schools put in place to help reduce difficulties encountered by many pupils embarking upon their secondary school career in year 7, it may be possible to put similar provision in place to allow the pupil to spend increasing periods of time back in mainstream school within a variety of settings to re-familiarise themselves with a mainstream school environment and its associated expectations prior to embarking upon the move.

Many participants alluded to a need for greater staff training linked to dealing with challenging behaviour and also specifically for pupils who may disrupt the good order of the classroom such as those labelled as having EBD or ADHD. This could be provided by the local education authority or through greater links with the PRU where staff could share expertise and advice with mainstream school colleagues and could include resilience training not just for staff but for pupils who may be at risk or vulnerable to allow an increase in behaviours that are likely to lead to a lowering of clash points in the classroom that can lead to exclusion. Within the south Wales area currently, an informal PRU network is being established to encourage collaborative working practices, training and good practice between PRU staff which could be expanded to work with schools that are experiencing difficulties with pupils relating to challenging behaviours.

Other participants noted a sense of isolation or coping with a reintegration alone especially those colleagues for whom a reintegration had been their first experience. It was felt that although there was continuous support from the PRU what would have been appreciated and made a difference would have been a guidance pack or set of protocols collated by the LEA which could have included disseminating information regarding good practice which had already occurred in the area from which schools could draw upon and use to influence their own processes. Another theme much in evidence was a sense that each pupil needed an individually planned and tailored reintegration package rather than schools offering a generic provision which may negate the possibility of providing a set of
reintegration protocols, yet some even informal guidance from the LEA would be appreciated by many mainstream schools.

Finally, was a sense at least from the Behaviour Support Service that it would be beneficial if the LEA were able to appoint a reintegration/inclusion officer for the county to fulfil the role of coordinating all reintegration moves and to act as a central reference point to take the lead on all matters. This echoes the recommendations of the NBAR (Reid, 2011b, 2011c) findings in Wales which as well as suggesting that all local education authorities should appoint a behaviour support team, or at least work in collaboration with neighbouring authorities where such a team already exists, suggested that local education authorities should have a designated inclusion officer who would be the key point of contact for taking all exclusion and reintegration queries and offering advice.

In April 2012, a dedicated inclusion manager was appointed by the authority whose remit could include the monitoring and evaluation of how the local education authority, schools and agencies share information about children and issue guidance on joint-planning arrangements and the commissioning, delivery and evaluation of services to vulnerable children.

There may also exist opportunities within families of schools themselves for collaborative working to take place to each appoint a central person to fulfil such a role as and when it would be required.

Taylor (2012) recommended schools rather than Local Authorities should hold responsibility for commissioning alternative provision and PRU services and that head teachers or members of SMT from schools should join the management committee of the local PRU which further fosters links between PRU and mainstream schools who can shape the services and provision their pupils require and maybe more efficiently tailor delivery.
7.8 Recommendations for future research

The initial thrust of the research rested upon the fundamental importance and influence of perspectives of individual stakeholders to the success or failure of any reintegration move.

This research focussed upon views of a single set of stakeholders namely educational professionals. Any future study wishing to take matters further could usefully expand its sample to include other relevant professionals and agencies to extend the range of stakeholder views considered as reintegration is influenced not just by school staff. Educational psychologists, mental health professionals and social services for example, have links with re integrating pupils and it would be extremely enlightening to incorporate the views of both pupils attempting a reintegration and their families to inform future practice.

I would have liked to extend the range of the research to include a longitudinal study of reintegrating pupils following a pupil on their return journey to mainstream education from the point at which reintegration is agreed, through the preparation stage of the process prior to the transition, and to follow up at intervals after their return to mainstream education. This I feel would be an invaluable follow up piece of research incorporating as suggested previously a wider range of stakeholder views than those delineated within this study.

The desire was to focus upon the effect of labelling of the pupil as much research had already suggested that those pupils labelled as EBD were amongst the most difficult to reintegrate due to negative connotations attached to the label, and that within Pembrokeshire the fact that the majority of reintegration took place within the school which had previously referred the pupil to the PRU that there may be an element of long established negativity of the pupil towards the school and staff and in turn of staff towards the pupil.
What I had not considered when commencing this research but which became increasingly evident as the research progressed was that within the county there were various geographical and cultural contexts within which people worked and lived which may also impact upon the process and indeed have a significant impact upon the educational outcomes not just of pupils incorporated within the study but of all pupils in the county. In particular, these were the effects of the rural geography upon young people in Pembrokeshire who were placed at a disadvantage due to the area in which they live, for example, lack of services such as public transport and areas which have limited access to broadband internet provision.

The findings presented within this study are intended to highlight issues inherent within a specific geographical location and related set of pupils and schools, the study was never intended to act as a generic study for all pupils and schools in all areas and was delineated within the confines of the county.

It is not possible to suggest that results and themes presented are applicable to other settings. The research I feel has unearthed valuable information regarding difficulties and challenges in reintegrating EBD pupils in rural settings and it would now be interesting to compare these findings in relation to other rural contexts i.e. to test the robustness and situatedness of variables identified.

Hadre et al (2004) in the USA found that in comparison to work undertaken in urban and suburban settings, little systematic research had been undertaken within rural schools. They noted that rural students had been identified as at risk of low motivation and of achieving little school success due, in part, to constraints in which rural schools operate. This was a theme evident in particular within the secondary schools in the county in that pupils often had low levels of self esteem and aspiration for their future selves and this was ingrained in the mentality of many families within the local communities.
They also considered that local community values may differ greatly and conflict with school based values which may be based upon a national rather than local rural focus. Therefore schools may be preparing pupils for lives which are markedly different to where and how they live currently leading to national versus local conflicts of interest which can lead to disengagement from education. It would be valuable I believe to undertake further research within catchment areas which have historically referred high and low levels of pupils to the PRU to investigate whether differences inherent within community ethos can be identified as possible causal factors for challenging behaviours within schools and act to inform interventions which may be beneficial within communities.

Wales has an ever changing social demography not least the disproportionate number of pupils from low income families compared to much of the rest of the UK. The NBAR (Reid, 2008) review found widespread concerns about significant numbers of pupils at both primary and secondary school level who attained literacy and numeracy levels well below their chronological age and the subsequent risk this may pose to develop behavioural issues. This is an issue especially pertinent in Pembrokeshire. PISA test scores for Wales rank lowest in the UK and scores within Pembrokeshire have lagged behind other areas of Wales. The reasons for which, are worth further investigation especially as issues could help explain patterns of pupil referral to the PRU.

Finally, the role of a PRU as it stands is relatively narrow in that a short term pupil stay followed by a reintegration to the mainstream education sector is viewed as the ideal pupil pathway and non-return to school viewed as failure. If as has been suggested there are a core of pupils for whom inclusion within mainstream education is difficult or does not meet their needs, then it is appropriate to suggest the remit of a PRU needs to evolve.

Rather than viewing extended periods of stay within a PRU by pupils for whom the relatively small and informal environment matches their needs as failure
provision should incorporate both short and long term placements as appropriate for need within the areas PRUs serve. Taylor (2012) suggests this be the case recommending that regulations on the length of time which pupils should spend in alternative provision should be relaxed and provision should be in place for as long as is necessary rather than a set timeframe. Future research could usefully be aimed at identifying alternative educational provision required to meet effectively the needs of pupils for whom mainstream education may be inappropriate.
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APPENDIX 1

Context of study

Geographical location, cultural and socio-economic indicators
Pembrokeshire is located in the extreme south west of Wales, it is a rural county with a total population of approximately 117,300 (2006 figures). Just under half of the population live within the five main towns of Fishguard (5,000), Haverfordwest (11,000), Milford Haven (14,000), Pembroke (7,200) and Pembroke Dock (8,700).

Due to Pembrokeshire's peripheral geographical location and rural nature it is poorly served by transport links. Over the past thirty years, the economic base of the county has undergone dramatic change with the closure of power, oil and defence establishments (although there has in recent years been considerable investment in power and LNG establishments in the south of the county) and rationalisation of public service jobs, agriculture and fishing. Agriculture, tourism and public services dominate the current economy and in overall terms, the tourism industry is the largest industry and employer with many of the jobs subsequently part time, seasonal and often unskilled and low paid. Skilled employment opportunities and activity within the manufacturing, financial and business service sectors are relatively low being less than half that of the national average.

Language and cultural divisions
Some 29.4% of the population classed themselves as having some form of knowledge of the Welsh language (from only being able to understand spoken Welsh to being able to speak, read and write in the language) as compared to
28.4% of Wales as a whole. 70.6% of the population classed themselves as having no skills in Welsh slightly below the figure for Wales of 71.6%.

**Income and earnings**
The 2007 annual survey of income and earnings (resident base) indicated Pembrokeshire’s median weekly gross pay for full time workers was £370 making it the third lowest of all Welsh unitary authorities with the comparative figure for Wales being £415. Despite lower household income levels, house prices in Pembrokeshire suggest a level of affluence in that the 2007 average price of £180,939 was 27.5% above the Wales average of £141,876 making house prices in the county the third highest in Wales.

**Qualifications**
The 2006 annual population survey indicated that 25.6% of Pembrokeshire’s working age population were graduates, above the Welsh average of 24.3%. By contrast just 13.3% of the working age population had no qualifications compared to 16.2% for Wales as a whole. This is perhaps surprising considering the relatively low level of earnings in Pembrokeshire and could indicate that there is a greater than average aspiration for education and qualification within the county compared to Wales as a whole.

**Poverty and deprivation**
The income domain in the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation reflects the proportion of residents claiming means tested benefits including those on income support, jobseekers allowance, working family tax credits and disability tax credit. The index showed Pembrokeshire to have pockets of poverty amid areas of relative affluence such as Monkton which are within the most deprived areas in Wales.
Whilst there are issues linked to low income and lack of skilled, well paid and permanent full time employment opportunities, where Pembrokeshire does experience deprivation is in access to services being the fourth most deprived authority in Wales in this domain.

The Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (WIMD) (2011) recorded that of 71 LSOAs (lower super output area) within Pembrokeshire based on overall rank, 28 were located within the most deprived 50% of LSOAs in Wales including 3 located within the most deprived 10% of LSOAs in Wales. In that sense only 39% of Pembrokeshire would be classed as being within the most deprived 50% in Wales compared to 61% (43) classed as being within the least deprived 50% in Wales. In the overall domain Pembrokeshire ranked as 15th of 22 local authorities.

The majority of the more deprived areas are located within the five main settlements in the county with 3 (11%) in Haverfordwest, 7 (25%) in Milford Haven, 3 (11%) in Pembroke, 6 (21%) in Pembroke Dock and 3 (11%) in Fishguard. The remaining 6 (21%) were spread across the county. It is from these relatively economically deprived areas of Pembrokeshire that the majority of pupil referrals to the PRU are made.

Although 43 of the LSOAs in Pembrokeshire were located within the least deprived 50% of Wales, this does not show the whole picture as there were variations between different indicators used in the WIMD.

In the income domain, 32 LSOAs (45%) were located in the most deprived 50% of Wales as compared to the employment domain, where 28 LSOAs (39%) were located in the most deprived 50% of Wales.
In the education domain, 29 LSOAs (41%) were located in the most deprived 50% of Wales as compared to the access to services domain 51 LSOAs (72%) were located in the most deprived 50% of Wales. Of these areas, 28 were located within the most deprived 10% of Wales.

What this data suggests is that there are pockets of relative deprivation in terms of unemployment and low income in the county; however, there is a wider reaching poverty in the sense of lack of access to services.
APPENDIX 2

Educational provision in Pembrokeshire

Behaviour Support Service

The BSS provides a range of support for pupils, parents, schools, teachers and other agencies, to help meet the needs of children presenting challenging behaviour, emotional and behavioural difficulties. Pupils are referred by schools through the County Council Inclusion Panel. The Service is committed to the belief that all young people are entitled to an education appropriate to their needs which will equip them for a productive adult life.

The service provides training, behaviour support packages, advice and off site placements for pupils between the ages of 4 and 17 years of age. It provides a continuum of support for pupils, parents, schools and teachers who are experiencing issues concerning challenging behaviour. The service aims to work alongside schools and parents to enable young people who are presenting challenging behaviour and/or have emotional and behavioural difficulties to remain within mainstream school wherever possible.

The aim of the service is to enable young people exhibiting challenging behaviour to remain within a mainstream education setting if possible and appropriate, and to facilitate this the service works with schools to provide pupil support, liaise with schools, parents and outside agencies to help pupils make the most of their educational opportunities, provide support and training for schools on issues of behaviour and work closely with schools and training providers to create positive educational opportunities for pupils placed outside of mainstream schools.
**Behaviour Support in Schools**

Every family of schools has a dedicated behaviour support teacher (BST) who is based within the secondary school three days a week and works the remaining two days within associated feeder primary schools.

Each school has the capacity to direct the way the support teacher is employed according to need and may include for example running a ‘time out facility or in school support unit or supporting individual teachers to deal effectively with pupil needs and challenges. The behaviour support teacher is responsible for maintaining contact with the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and for coordinating any referrals the school may wish to make.

**The Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)**

Pupils can be referred to the Pupil Referral Unit via the inclusion panel which meets fortnightly. Pupils will usually have attended the Phoenix provision and have worked with the behaviour support teacher within their mainstream school. Once referred to the PRU there are a number of groups to which the pupil may be assigned. These are:

**Rainbows (Nurture Group Provision)**

The Rainbows group is run at both KS1 and 2 with pupils referred to the PRU on a part time basis by mainstream school through the inclusion panel. Both groups will take part in their mainstream school for 0.5 of their timetable and receive nurture group provision for the remainder. The Boxall profile is used to ascertain levels of pupil need and links are maintained with mainstream school through visits and daily/weekly reports.
Phoenix group
All county secondary schools have a guaranteed placement within the Phoenix group every six weeks for KS3 pupils. Schools can decide which pupil to refer to if indeed the place is taken up. Pupils attending provision will do so for the full weekly timetable and have an option to return to mainstream school at the end of their placement providing that they have worked to achieve the targets set for them by school and if reintegration has been deemed to be an appropriate next stage in their school career.

Therefore, the aim of this group is to deal with pupil difficulties and help pupils to build the skills they need to be successful within the classroom. This can include a range of social skills and strategies which may increase the possibility of a successful return to mainstream school. If a reintegration is undertaken then it will be monitored by the school based BST for up to one term to ensure pupils are coping within the mainstream environment.

KS3A group
Pupils in this group may have transferred here from either the Phoenix group (if it was decided that they would be better served in continuing their education at the PRU rather than reintegrating to mainstream school) or from the KS2 Rainbows nurture group.

Sunbeams group
Pupils in this group will usually have transferred from another group in the PRU. Pupils will not only have exhibited behaviours associated with EBD but will have a range of complex educational needs affecting progress such as medical conditions like Autism.
SAGE
This is a satellite unit run by the PRU on a separate site some 5 miles from the PRU campus set up, to provide intensive support to pupils in upper KS2 and KS3 who are deemed to have significant needs. It has a maximum of ten pupils who will be referred to the unit via the inclusion panel with the agreement of BSS, mainstream school and additional agencies who may be involved with these pupils.

PRIDE provision
The PRU offers provision for pupils at KS4 at the PRIDE programme located on the same site as the PRU to which any pupils who have not reintegrated at the end of KS3 will transfer. Due to pupil demand, since 2008 the PRU has operated a year 12 programme where pupils have stayed on at the end of their KS4 studies to gain additional qualifications. At the start of the study the PRU also operated a small long term needs group at KS4 similar to the SAGE unit provision at KS3. This closed in 2008 and since then pupils have been absorbed into the PRIDE provision. Due to the fact that the study has concentrated on pupils attending the PRU in KS1-3 information concerning pupils in KS4 or above has not been included.

The PRU was inspected in October 2005. The report described the PRU as:

A civilised, caring and supportive community. Staff have an outstanding knowledge of the pupils and their needs, and ensure that appropriate support and guidance is provided for them.

And again in 2011 when ESTYN reported that:

In lessons pupils apply themselves well to tasks and accept responsibility for improving their own learning. Most pupils display positive attitudes and are fully engaged in the set topics. This is well illustrated by the volume of
work they complete. They develop the wider skills and resilience needed to support successful re-entry to their mainstream schools or to move on to the next stage in their learning.

School information
The average size of primary schools across the county as of September 2010 was 161 pupils. 24 schools were above average size and 37 were smaller than average.

Table 1: The number of primary schools above and below average size by family of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of pupils on roll at all mainstream schools in Pembrokeshire as of September 2010 was 17988. The average number of pupils on roll per family of schools was 2249 pupils, with a range of 775 to 3347 pupils; the largest family had 2572 more pupils than the smallest.

Table 2: The number of pupils on roll at Pembrokeshire families of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>1531.5</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>2605.5</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>3347</td>
<td>3195.5</td>
<td>1942.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Families of schools

Family A
As of September 2010, schools had a combined 1531.5 pupils on roll with 656 based at secondary school and 875.5 at eight feeder primary schools. Primary school size ranged from 27.5 pupils to 224 with the average roll being 109 pupils. Family A has the second smallest average size of primary school and second smallest secondary school in terms of number of pupils on roll.

Two feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these two schools was 176 pupils compared to 87 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

This family referred 24 pupils to the PRU with 4 (16.7%) referrals from feeder primary schools, and 20 referrals (83.3%) from secondary school. The majority of pupils referred by this family have been made by the secondary school of pupils within KS3. Family A ranked fifth in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school ranked fourth and feeder primary schools equal fifth.
**Family B**

Schools had a combined 775 pupils on roll with 494 based at secondary school and 281 at three feeder primary schools. Primary schools size ranged from 73.5 pupils to 106.5 with the average roll being 94 pupils. Family B has the smallest average size of primary school and smallest secondary school.

Two feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these two schools was 104 pupils compared to 73.5 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

Of referring primary schools, one was a community primary school the other a voluntary aided (Church in Wales) primary school. Both were English/Welsh medium.

This family referred 5 pupils to the PRU with 3 (60%) referrals from feeder primary schools and 2 referrals (40%) from secondary school. The majority of pupils referred by this family have been made by the feeder primary schools of pupils within KS1-2. Family B ranked seventh in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school and feeder primary schools both ranked seventh.

**Family C**

Schools had a combined 2251 pupils on roll with 1167 based at secondary school and 1084 at five feeder primary schools. Primary schools size ranged from 130 pupils to 370 with the average roll being 217 pupils. Family C has the largest average size of primary school in the county and the third largest secondary school.

Two feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these two schools was 339.5 pupils compared to 135 pupils at non-referring primary schools.
Both referring primary schools were community primary schools and English medium.

This family referred 13 pupils to the PRU with 4 (31%) of the referrals from feeder primary schools and 9 referrals (69%) from secondary school. The majority of pupils referred by this family have been made by the secondary school of KS3 pupils. Family C ranked sixth in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school ranked sixth and feeder primary schools equal fifth.

**Family D**

Schools had a combined 2605.5 pupils on roll with 1027 based at secondary school with 1578.5 based at nine feeder primary schools. The size of the primary schools ranged from 96 pupils to 391 with the average having 175 pupils. Family B has the third largest average size of primary school and the fifth largest secondary school.

Four feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these four schools was 201 pupils compared to 155 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

Of referring primary schools two were community primary schools, one a voluntary controlled primary school and one a voluntary aided (Church in Wales) primary school. All four were English medium.

This family referred 51 pupils to the PRU with 23 (45%) of the referrals from feeder primary schools and 28 referrals (55%) from secondary school. The majority of pupil referrals have been made by the secondary school of KS3 pupils. Family D ranked second in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school ranked third and feeder primary schools equal first.
Family E
Schools had a combined 2340 pupils on roll with 1124 based at secondary school with 1216 based at six feeder primary schools. The size of the primary schools ranged from 61 pupils to 313 with the average having 155 pupils. Family E has the fourth largest average size of primary school and fourth largest secondary school.

Four feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these four schools was 258 pupils compared to 91.5 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

Of referring primary schools three were community primary schools and one a voluntary aided (Catholic) primary school. All four were English medium schools.

This family referred 47 pupils to the PRU with 15 (32%) referrals from feeder primary schools and 32 referrals (68%) from secondary school. The majority of pupils referred by this family have been made by the secondary school of pupils within KS3. Family E ranked third in terms of the number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school ranked second and feeder primary schools fourth.

Family F
Schools had a combined 3347 pupils on roll with 1472 based at secondary school and 1875 based at ten feeder primary schools. The size of the primary schools ranged from 35 pupils to 570 with the average having 187.5 pupils. Family F has the largest average size of primary school in the county and the largest secondary school.

Five feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these five schools was 282 pupils compared to 93 pupils at non-referring primary schools.
All five referring primary schools were community primary schools. Four were English medium schools and one a dual stream school. It was not clear from the data as to which language group the referred pupil belonged.

This family referred 73 pupils to the PRU with 23 (32%) referrals from feeder primary schools and 50 referrals (68%) from secondary school. The majority of pupil referrals have been made by the secondary school of KS3 pupils. Family F ranked first in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU overall, the secondary school ranked first and feeder primary schools equal first.

**Family G**

Schools had a combined 3195.5 pupils on roll with 1288 based at secondary school and 1907.5 based at twelve feeder primary schools. The size of the primary schools ranged from 65.5 pupils to 310 with the average having 114 pupils. Family G has the sixth largest average size of primary school and the second largest secondary school.

Five feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these schools was 214 pupils compared to 120 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

All referring primary schools were community primary schools. Three schools were English medium schools and two dual stream schools.

This family referred 29 pupils to the PRU with 17 (59%) referrals from feeder primary schools and 12 referrals (41%) from secondary school. The majority of pupil referrals have been made by feeder primary schools of KS1-2 pupils. Family G ranked fourth in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school ranked fifth and feeder primary schools third.
Family H

Schools had a combined 1942.5 pupils on roll with 954 based at secondary school with 988.5 based at eight feeder primary schools. The size of the primary schools ranged from 73 pupils to 216.5 with the average having 123.5 pupils. Family H has the fifth largest average size of primary school and sixth largest secondary school.

Two feeder primary schools referred at least one pupil to the PRU. The average size of these schools was 76 pupils compared to 139 pupils at non-referring primary schools.

Both referring schools were community primary schools and both were Welsh medium.

This family referred 2 pupils to the PRU with both (100%) referrals from feeder primary schools. Family H ranked eighth in terms of number of pupils referred to the PRU, the secondary school had never referred a pupil to the PRU, the feeder primary schools ranked eighth.

There are patterns which emerge relating to referral, in particular that referrals are in the main from schools which are above average size, which are English medium rather than Welsh medium or bilingual, which at primary level are county primary as compared to voluntary aided or faith schools and from families of schools which serve relatively more urban and socio-economically disadvantaged communities as compared to more rural and socio-economically advantaged communities.
Appendix 3

QUESTIONNAIRE - SUCCESS FACTORS AND BARRIERS TO REINTEGRATION.

1. HAS YOUR SCHOOL EVER REFERRED A PUPIL TO THE BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT SERVICE?
   
   Y ( ) N ( )

2. HAS YOUR SCHOOL EVER REINTEGRATED A PUPIL FROM THE BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT SERVICE?
   
   Y ( ) N ( )

3. WHAT DO YOU FEEL CONSTITUTES SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION?
   
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

4. DO YOU FEEL ANY OF THESE FACTORS CAN IMPACT UPON THE SUCCESS OR OTHERWISE OF REINTEGRATION? (please highlight yes or no below)

   | PUPIL AGE: (Y) (N) | PUPIL PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL: (Y) (N) |
   | KEY STAGE: (Y) (N) | STAFF PERCEPTION OF PUPIL: (Y) (N) |
   | GENDER: (Y) (N)  | PUPIL REPUTATION: (Y) (N) |
   | REASON FOR INITIAL EXCLUSION: (Y) (N) | SCHOOL SIZE: (Y) (N) |
   | LENGTH OF TIME AWAY FROM MAINSTREAM: (Y) (N) | SCHOOL ETHOS: (Y) (N) |
   | PUPIL S.E.N: (Y) (N) | STAFF TRAINING: (Y) (N) |
   | PUPIL LITERACY LEVEL: (Y) (N) | SUPPORT FROM BSS: (Y) (N) |
   | PUPIL NUMERACY LEVEL: (Y) (N) | SUPPORT FROM LEA: (Y) (N) |

5. ARE THERE ANY FACTORS WITHIN YOUR SCHOOL WHICH YOU FEEL MAY IMPACT UPON THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF A REINTEGRATION?
   
   Y ( ) N ( )

6. IF YES, WHAT FACTORS?
   
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
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7. DO YOU FEEL THAT THERE IS ANYTHING MORE YOU COULD DO AS A SCHOOL TO IMPROVE THE SUCCESS RATE OF REINTEGRATION?

Y ( ) N ( )

8. IF YES, COULD YOU PLEASE GIVE EXAMPLES?

___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

9. DO YOU FEEL THAT FAMILY BACKGROUND/CIRCUMSTANCES CAN HAVE AN IMPACT UPON THE SUCCESS OF REINTEGRATION?

Y ( ) N ( )

10. IF YES, IN WHAT WAYS?

___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

11. DO YOU FEEL THAT THE PUPIL WILL INFLUENCE THE SUCCESS OR OTHERWISE OF THEIR REINTEGRATION?

Y ( ) N ( )

12. IF YES, IN WHAT WAYS?

___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

13. DO YOU FEEL THAT SCHOOLS RECEIVE ADEQUATE SUPPORT FROM THE BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT SERVICE WHEN REINTEGRATING PUPILS?

Y ( ) N ( )

14. IS THERE ANY WAY IN WHICH THIS SUPPORT COULD BE IMPROVED

(A) PRIOR TO THE START OF REINTEGRATION? Y ( ) N ( )

(B) DURING THE REINTEGRATION PROCESS? Y ( ) N ( )

(C) FOLLOWING THE REINTEGRATION? Y ( ) N ( )
15. IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED YES TO NUMBER 11, WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED?
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

16. DO YOU FEEL THAT SCHOOLS GET ADEQUATE SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE FROM THE LEA WHEN REINTEGRATING PUPILS?
   Y ( )   N ( )

17. WHAT ADDITIONAL SUPPORT DO YOU FEEL THAT THE LEA COULD OFFER?
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

18. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS CONCERNING PUPIL REINTEGRATION?
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE DESIGN OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE COULD YOU PLEASE WRITE THEM IN THE SPACE BELOW.
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
Appendix 4

Amendments to questionnaires
After analysing expert sample questionnaire replies, the data gathering instrument was amended. Some amendments were purely for presentational/layout purposes whilst for others questions were added/removed or information was asked for in a different format.

The questionnaire length was modified by shortening the questionnaire from three sides of A4 in the expert sample to two sides of A4 in the landscape sample. Authors including Roszkowski and Bean (1990) noted response rates for shorter questionnaires are greater than longer questionnaires and I was hoped this would have had a positive effect on main questionnaire response rates.

Secondly, the number of questions was amended from eighteen in the expert sample study to eight questions in the landscape study. In addition to reducing the number of questions, the question format was modified to allow for the gathering of increased quantitative data than that generated by expert sample questionnaires.

The expert sample questionnaire had nine dichotomous questions designed to filter to an additional open question, to allow respondents the opportunity to elaborate answers in greater depth. The landscape questionnaire layout was modified as it was felt that the layout was visually confusing and over complicated. The number of open questions was reduced from eight to six.

To gather opinion and also quantitative data on the expert sample questionnaire respondents were requested to indicate either yes or no as to whether they believed seventeen variables had an effect on reintegration success and then to rank in order the top five influential factors. After processing pilot questionnaires it became obvious that some respondents had either not ranked top five factors...
or did so incompletely. To increase response rates to this question and to gather more quantitative data, landscape questionnaire participants were asked to rank the influence of twenty three different factors from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The number of variables was increased based on information given by mainstream education practitioners during the pilot questionnaire.

Expert sample participants remained anonymous (they were not asked for their name nor the name of the school). Landscape questionnaires participants were asked to indicate their position within the school. This was not an attempt to identify participants rather to identify whether or not a participant’s position in school would have an impact upon their opinion of reintegration, for example, would a head teacher who may not be directly involved in the reintegration process have the same opinion as a SENCO who may be more heavily involved or, from a classroom teacher or LSA who may work with the pupil on a daily basis within the classroom?

Questions relating to school experience of referring/reintegrating pupils to/from the PRU were removed as such information had already been gathered from ex post facto analysis of pupil tracking data. Questions about how school (and their practices and policies) dealt with and had experienced reintegration to date were removed having decided instead to explore this in greater detail in follow up interviews, as pilot questionnaire replies had been vague and many of the landscape schools would have had no previous reintegration experience.
Appendix 5

SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

POSITION IN SCHOOL (HEADTEACHER, SENCO ETC):

1. WHAT DO YOU UNDERSTAND BY THE TERM REINTEGRATION?

2. WHAT DO YOU FEEL CONSTITUTES SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION?

3. FROM (1) LOW LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE TO (5) HIGH LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE COULD YOU PLEASE RATE THE INFLUENCE (with an X) OF THE FOLLOWING FACTORS ON REINTEGRATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE OF PUPIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL KEY STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON FOR INITIAL EXCLUSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH OF TIME OUT OF MAINSTREAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL S.E.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL LITERACY LEVELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL NUMERACY LEVELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF PERCEPTION OF PUPIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL REPUTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL ETHOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE AGENCY SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOUR SERVICE SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.A. SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. COULD YOU PLEASE GIVE A SCORE FROM (1) LOW LEVEL TO (5) HIGH
LEVEL OF INFLUENCE TO THE FOLLOWING FACTORS ON
REINTEGRATION:

(a) PUPIL FACTORS: (score = ).
(b) HOME FAMILY FACTORS: (score = ).
(c) ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS: (score = ).
(d) SCHOOL BASED ACTORS: (score = ).

5. WHAT DO YOU THINK A PUPIL COULD DO TO MAKE SUCCESSFUL
REINTEGRATION MORE LIKELY?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. WHAT DO YOU THINK A PUPIL'S FAMILY COULD DO TO MAKE
SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION MORE LIKELY?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE BEHAVIOUR SUPPORT SERVICE COULD DO TO
MAKE SUCCESSFUL REINTEGRATION MORE LIKELY?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE L.E.A. COULD DO TO MAKE SUCCESSFUL
REINTEGRATION MORE LIKELY?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS
QUESTIONNAIRE. IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT THE
QUESTIONNAIRE PLEASE WRITE THEM IN THE SPACE BELOW.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 6

Example of raw historical pupil tracking data set

The following tables show raw tracking data for pupils enrolled at the PRU in Pembrokeshire during the academic year 2001 - 2002.

The data is organised into 5 tables. The first shows the raw data as arranged on the spreadsheet gathered from the main PRU. The following tables show the same data but organised by pupil gender, PRU placement group family of schools from which they were referred and by type of move made during the academic year to allow clarity in search of patterns.

The tables give a variety of information gathered about each pupil. An NA in the table could either mean not applicable or not recorded.

To protect pupil identity each pupil has been assigned an identification number rather than use their own or a false name.

The tables show for each pupil who is registered as on the attendance register of the PRU their gender, the PRU group into which they are placed, their age upon referral to the PRU, their reading and spelling delay (if known) as determined upon their arrival at the PRU (in months) the mainstream school (or other) from which they are referred, the family of schools which they are referred from, the type of move they make (if any) by the end of the academic year and their destination.

Key to table shading

Random colour codes have been assigned to four main variables within the tables namely pupil gender, the PRU group the pupil was assigned to, the family
of schools from which they were referred and the type of move the pupil made during the academic year.

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRU group placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRU group placement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS1 R (rainbows)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 R (rainbows)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 A (assessment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNBEAMS</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHEONIX</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family of schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) FISHGUARD AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) ST. DAVIDS AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) HAVERFORDWEST AREA (A)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) HAVERFORDWEST AREA (B)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) MILFORD HAVEN AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) PEMBROKE AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) TENBY AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) PRESELI AREA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) OUTSIDE OF PEMBROKESHIRE</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of move pupil makes during the academic year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of move pupil makes during the academic year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) FULL TIME RETURN TO REFERRING SCHOOL</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PART TIME RETURN TO REFERRING SCHOOL</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) FULL TIME RETURN TO NEW SCHOOL</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) PART TIME RETURN TO NEW SCHOOL</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) HOME TUITION</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) REMAIN IN SAME GROUP WITHIN THE PRU</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) MOVE TO DIFFERENT GROUP WITHIN PRU</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) ALTERNATIVE PROVISION (USUALLY KS4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPIL ID</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7

Pupil outcomes 2001-2008 (evidence from tracking data analysis)

2001 – 2002
The most common pupil outcome was reintegration to mainstream school made by 21 pupils. A further 17 pupils transferred to another PRU group whilst the remaining 8 pupils stayed within their existing placement group throughout the year.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 17.7% transferred to a home tuition placement, 47.6% to another group and 35.3% to alternative provision.

Of those pupils who reintegrated to mainstream school, 61.9% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred, 19.1% made a full time transition to a new mainstream school, 14.3% reintegrated part time to the mainstream school which referred them and 4.8% transferred part time to a new mainstream school.

2002 – 2003
The most common pupil outcome was reintegration to mainstream school made by 13 pupils. A further 12 pupils transferred to another PRU group whilst 10 pupils remained within their existing placement group throughout the year.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 41.7% transferred to another group and 58.3% to alternative provision.

Of those pupils who reintegrated to mainstream school, 30.8% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred, 38.5% made a full time transition to a new mainstream school, 30.8% reintegrated part time to the mainstream school which referred them.
2003 – 2004
The most common pupil outcome was for pupils to remain within their PRU placement group with 59.4% of pupils doing so. 21.9% of pupils transferred to another PRU group whilst 18.8% reintegrated to mainstream school.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 85.7% transferred to another group and 14.3% to a home tuition placement.

Of those pupils who reintegrated to mainstream school, 50% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred, 33.3% made a full time transition to a new mainstream school and 16.7% reintegrated part time to a new mainstream school.

2004 – 2005
The most common pupil outcome was for pupils to remain within their PRU placement group with 65% of pupils doing so. Twenty five percent of pupils transferred to another PRU group whilst 10% reintegrated to mainstream school.

Of reintegrating pupils 100% returned full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred.

2005 – 2006
The most common pupil outcome was for pupils to remain within their PRU placement group with 55.8% of pupils doing so. A further 23.3% of pupils transferred to another PRU group whilst 20.9% reintegrated to mainstream school.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 90% transferred to another group and 10% to alternative provision.
Of pupils who reintegrated to mainstream school, 66.7% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred, with 33.3% making a full time transition to a new mainstream school.

**2006 – 2007**

The most common pupil outcome was for pupils to transfer to another PRU placement group with 61.7% of pupils doing so. A further 31.9% of pupils reintegrated to mainstream school whilst 6.4% remained within their PRU placement group.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 89.7% transferred to another group and 10.3% to a home tuition placement.

Of reintegrating pupils, 100% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred.

**2007 – 2008**

The most common pupil outcome was for pupils to transfer to another group within the PRU with 52% of pupils doing so. Forty percent of pupils remained within their PRU placement group whilst 8% reintegrated to mainstream school.

Of those pupils transferring within the PRU, 84.6% transferred to another group and 15.4% to a home tuition placement.

Of reintegrating pupils, 100% reintegrated full time to the mainstream school from which they were referred.
Appendix 8

Overview of reintegration patterns 2001-2008 (evidence from tracking data analysis)

2001 – 2002
Twenty one pupils reintegrated to mainstream school. Seventeen were male and four female.

Reintegration full time to the referring mainstream school was the most common move, made by thirteen pupils, (eleven male, two female), made by one pupil from KS1, four from KS2, three from the KS3A group, and five from the Phoenix group to schools within family E, F and G.

Reintegration full time to a new mainstream school was the second most common move made by three pupils, (three male, one female), made by one pupil from KS1, two from KS2 and one from the Phoenix group to schools within family B, D, E and H.

Reintegration part time to the referring mainstream school was the third most common made by three pupils, (two male, and one female) from KS1, to schools in family D and G.

Reintegration part time return to a new mainstream school was the least common, made by one pupil. The pupil was male, from KS1 to a school within family F.

Reading and spelling delay data (determined upon entry to the PRU) confirmed reintegrating pupils recorded an average reading delay of 38 months and spelling delay of 29 months, compared to an average reading delay of 24 months and spelling delay of 23 months for non-reintegrating pupils. Pupils who reintegrated
had a more significant delay in literacy skills than pupils who remained at the PRU.

2002 – 2003
Thirteen pupils reintegrated to mainstream school. Eleven were male and two female.

The most common type of reintegration move was a full time return to a new mainstream school made by five pupils, (four male, one female), four pupils from KS2 and one from the KS3A group to schools within family D, E and F.

The equal second most common type of reintegration move was a full time return to the referring mainstream school and a part time return to the referring mainstream school both undertaken by four pupils. Of those reintegrating full time, three were male and one female, all four part time pupils were male.

The full time reintegration move to the referring school was made by three pupils from KS2 and one from the KS3A group to schools within family C, E and F. The part time reintegration to the referring mainstream school moves were made by four pupils from KS1 to schools within families E, F and G.

Reading and spelling delay data confirmed reintegrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 34 months and spelling delay of 24 months, compared to non-reintegrating pupils who recorded an average reading delay of 55 months and spelling delay of 51 months. Pupils who reintegrated had a less significant delay in literacy skills than pupils who remained at the PRU.

2003 – 2004
Six pupils reintegrated to mainstream school. All were male.
The most common type of reintegration move was a full time return to a new mainstream school by three pupils from KS2 to schools within family A, C and E.

The second most common reintegration move was a full time return to a new mainstream school made by two pupils one from KS2 and one from the KS3A group to schools within families B and F.

The third most common move was a part time return to a new mainstream school made by one pupil from KS2 who moved to a school within family C.

Reading and spelling delay data confirmed reintegrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 34 months and spelling delay of 28 months, compared to non-reintegrating pupils who recorded an average reading delay of 30 months and spelling delay of 40 months. Pupils who reintegrated had a more significant delay in reading age but lesser delay in spelling age than pupils who remained at the PRU.

2004 – 2005

Two pupils reintegrated to mainstream school. Both were male.

The only type of reintegration move was a full time return to the referring mainstream school. This move was made by one pupil from KS2 and one from the KS3A group to schools within family D and E.

Reading and spelling delay data confirmed reintegrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 51 months and spelling delay of 56 months, compared to non-reintegrating pupils who recorded an average reading delay of 32 months and spelling delay of 37 months. Pupils who reintegrated had a more significant delay in literacy skills than pupils who remained at the PRU.
2005 – 2006

Nine pupils reintegrated to mainstream school. All were male.

The most common type of reintegration move was a full time return to the referring mainstream school made by six pupils. This move was made by one pupil from KS1, three from KS2 and two from the KS3A group to schools within family A, E, and F.

The second most common type of reintegration move was a full time return to a new mainstream school undertaken by three pupils. This move was made by two pupils from key stage 2 and one from the Sunbeams group to schools within family D, F and G.

Reading and spelling delay data confirmed reintegrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 32 months and spelling delay of 31 months, compared to non-reintegrating pupils who recorded an average reading delay of 34 months and spelling delay of 47 months. Pupils who reintegrated had a less significant delay in literacy skills than pupils who remained at the PRU.

2006 – 2007

Fifteen pupils reintegrated to mainstream school, eight were male and seven female.

The only type of reintegration move was a full time return to the referring mainstream school. This move was made by one pupil from KS2, two from the KS3A group and twelve from the Phoenix group to schools within family A, C, D, E and F.

Reading and spelling delay data confirmed reintegrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 24 months and spelling delay of 41 months. In comparison, non-reintegrating pupils recorded an average reading delay of 40
months and spelling delay of 52 months. Pupils who re-integrated had a less significant delay in literacy skills than pupils who remained at the PRU.

**2007 – 2008**
Two pupils re-integrated to mainstream school. Both were male.

The only type of re-integration move was a full time return to the referring mainstream school, a move made by 2 pupils from the KS3A group to schools within family A and F.

Re-integrating pupils displayed an average reading delay of 47 months and spelling delay of 24 months, compared to non-re-integrating pupils who recorded an average reading delay of 42 months and spelling delay of 54 months. Pupils who re-integrated had a more significant delay in their reading age but lesser delay in spelling age than pupils who remained at the PRU.
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Coding frame used to analyse landscape study questionnaire replies.

**QUESTION 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>RETURN/MOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>MAINSTREAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>NORMAL SCHOOL/CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>INCLUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>START AGAIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A1</td>
<td>TARGET/PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A2</td>
<td>TIMETABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A3</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A4</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A5</td>
<td>ATTITUDE/BEHAVIOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A6</td>
<td>STAF TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A7</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B1</td>
<td>FEEL PART OF SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B2</td>
<td>CONFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B3</td>
<td>NOT NEED SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B4</td>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B5</td>
<td>ATTITUDE/POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B6</td>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>TARGETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>FEEL PART OF/JOIN IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>ACCEPT SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>ATTITUDE/POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5H</td>
<td>STICK TO RULES/COOPERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5I</td>
<td>ATTEND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUESTION 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>SCHOOL LINKS/SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>REINTEGRATION OPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>LSA/IN CLASS SUPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>PARENTAL LINKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>RULES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUESTION 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>STAFF/(ADDITIONAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7E</td>
<td>LIASON WITH AGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTION 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>SKILLED STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8E</td>
<td>TRAINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8F</td>
<td>STAFF (ADDITIONAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8G</td>
<td>SCHOOL ETHOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8H</td>
<td>PLANING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8I</td>
<td>PARENTAL ATTITUDES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10

Questionnaire replies

(A) Expert sample questionnaire replies

Table 3: What constitutes successful reintegration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>% of primary</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>% of secondary</th>
<th>Total response</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration package</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable/Curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On site unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No disruption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.
Table 4: Impact of factors upon reintegration as rated by participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of yes responses</th>
<th>No. of no responses</th>
<th>% of no responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion reason.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time out</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil perception</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff perception</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSS support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School ethos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil SEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil numeracy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.*

Table 5: Factors within participants’ schools which may influence reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key staff member</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult lessons</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff resistance</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff ability</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff perception</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.*
Table 6: What could schools do to improve reintegration success rates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor to improve</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailored programmes</td>
<td>2 secondary</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time out room</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA support</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental relationships</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.

Table 7: Family impacts upon reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.

Table 8: Ways pupils can influence reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to return</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.
Table 9: How could support schools receive from the BSS/PRU be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary/record of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.

Table 10: Additional support which could be provided by the LEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staffing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual/protocol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.

Table 11: Additional comments concerning reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff tolerance</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions/Rigidity</td>
<td>1 secondary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside support</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream is inappropriate provision</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist provision</td>
<td>1 primary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note some participants may have provided more than one statement.
(B) Landscape sample questionnaire replies

Table 12: Statements relating to definition of reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Return/move</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Mainstream</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Normal class/school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Inclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Start again</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note: some participant’s answers will have contained more than one statement *
Table 13: Factors relating to the definition of successful reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 - Target/plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 – Timetable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 – Comm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 – Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 - Attitude/Behav</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 – Staff training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 – Individual need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 – Feel part</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 – Pupil conforms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 – No longer need support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 – Pupil can function</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 – Attitude/positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 – Make progress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note: some participant’s answers will have contained more than one statement *
Table 14: What can pupils do to increase the likelihood of a successful reintegration outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Targets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Join in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Strategies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Responsib.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – Accept support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G – Pos attitude</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H – Cooperate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I – Attend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Note: some participant’s answers will have contained more than one statement *

Table 15: What can the BSS/PRU improve to increase successful reintegration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Link/Supt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Comm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Package</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – LSA support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Parent link</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – Rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Note: some participant’s answers will have contained more than one statement *
Table 16: LEA based reintegration success factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Funding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Ext staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Staff train</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Liason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: some participant’s answers will have contained more than one statement *

Table 17: Key resources required for successful reintegration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>SENCO</th>
<th>Classroom practitioner</th>
<th>Inf/Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>Non-main school</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A- Comm.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Sk staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- Funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- Add staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G- Sch ethos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H- Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I- Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: some respondent’s answers will have contained more than one response *
Appendix 11

Copy of the semi structured interview schedule designed to allow the interview to flow based upon interviewee’s replies but to ensure key themes are discussed at each interview.

Interview schedule

1. How long have you been a head teacher?

2. Have you ever had experience of reintegrating a pupil from the PRU?

3. If yes was it a positive experience?

4. The reintegration process may be as individual as pupils, but what would you like to see put in place before a pupil is reintegrated?

5. What provision would you like to see put in place during the reintegration process?

6. What would you like to see happen after a pupil has returned to school?

7. There does not appear to be a standard definition of successful reintegration, how would you define it?

8. There are a number of barriers to a pupil reintegrating successfully. Do you feel there are any potential barriers in your school and if so, could you elaborate?

9. Are there any factors within your school that would increase the likelihood of a reintegration being successful?

10. Do you think there are any factors specific to Pembrokeshire that make reintegration either more or less difficult? If so what?
### APPENDIX 12

#### Coded Interview replies

**Table 18: Participant replies – school experience of reintegration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive statements (n = 14)</th>
<th>Negative statements (n = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School based (7)</td>
<td>School based (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process based (5)</td>
<td>Process based (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil based (1)</td>
<td>Pupil based (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/family based (1)</td>
<td>Parent/family based (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19: Participant replies – successful reintegration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of statements relating to definition of successful reintegration (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reintegrating pupil related statements (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and staff related statements (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pupil related statements (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process related statements (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20: Participant replies - school based factors influencing reintegration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential barriers (n = 30)</th>
<th>Potential success factors (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/staff barriers (17)</td>
<td>School/staff success factors (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil barriers (5)</td>
<td>Pupil success factors (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental barriers (4)</td>
<td>Parental success factors (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental barriers (3)</td>
<td>Environmental success factors (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU barriers (1)</td>
<td>PRU success factors (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 21: Participant replies - Pembrokeshire specific success factors and barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County barriers to reintegration (n = 15)</th>
<th>County success factors (n = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School issues (3)</td>
<td>School issues (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family issues (5)</td>
<td>Family issues (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues (2)</td>
<td>Cultural issues (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/urban differences (1)</td>
<td>Rural/urban differences (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues (1)</td>
<td>Language issues (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic issues (1)</td>
<td>Economic issues (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside agencies (1)</td>
<td>Outside agencies (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport issues (1)</td>
<td>Transport issues (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 13

Example of transcribed interview

Transcription of interview 2

Location – Office of head teacher at secondary school (A)

Time and date – 3.35 - 4.15pm (approx) Wednesday 16th June 2010.

Interviewee – Head teacher (female) of the secondary school.

General notes and thoughts – the meeting took place in the head teacher’s office which was large, spacious and cool on what was a hot afternoon. A secretary led me to the office where the head teacher was seated behind her desk drinking a cup of coffee. She remained seated and gestured to me to sit at a table opposite her desk.

She did not appear immediately at ease and was more formal at the beginning of the interview than the head teacher in interview one had been. There were no interruptions throughout the interview and after a somewhat guarded start, questions were answered readily and in depth and the interviewee was very polite and helpful.

The head teacher was keen to stress throughout the interview that the school and the staff do all that they can to avoid sending pupils to the PRU. As a result those that do get sent there are generally older pupils who have exhausted all the options and strategies that the school will have put in place for them and consequently many will not reintegrate to the school but remain at the PRU or alternative provision.
At the end of the interview when the recorder was switched off there was approximately 20 minutes chat about the progress of a pupil from her school who I had taught at the unit and how positive the pupil had been and of the importance of parent’s behaviour in guiding their children and setting themselves as positive role models.

**Interview transcription**

*Me:* to start with may I ask you how long you have been a head teacher?

HT: ten years.

*Me:* and has that always been at this school?

HT: yes.

*Me:* and in that time have you ever had the experience of reintegrating a pupil from the PRU?

HT: yes we’ve had some (pause) but not really a significant amount because most of the pupils who have gone from us to the PRU have been given lots of chances before they are sent so by then we have really exhausted all the strategies we can put in place we don’t send them to the PRU lightly.

*Me:* thank you, in terms of those pupils you have had reintegrate would you say it had been a positive experience?

HT: (long pause) um not that I can recall really no.

*Me:* ok …
HT: because (pause) the underlying issues that were causing the problem behaviours were so serious that they were still effecting the child even after a period of time away. I don't think that the PRU was able to significantly reduce these underlying effects (pause) so that when they did return to school our mainstream expectations of these pupils quickly resulted in crisis which was what we saw their initial behaviour as um a crisis response to underlying causes.

Me: thank you, um this is a general question really but if you were to reintegrate a pupil from the PRU again, what would you like to see put in place before the process started?

HT: (long pause) for it to work well their progress in subjects especially the core subjects has to be maintained whilst they are away from the school so that when they are reintegrated (pause) they do so back into subject rooms and if they have chunks of work missing due to not being here then they are obviously playing catch up straight away (pause) they may not know or understand as much of the work as their peers and as a result we too are playing catch up.

Me: would you say this is a greater problem the older the pupil is?

HT: oh definitely yes.

Me: um in terms of the recent reintegration you have been involved with; do you think that anything could have been done to improve the process?

HT: (pause) the children who we have sent to the PRU really have (pause) let me start again um lack the coping strategies to deal with what is going on in their lives outside of the PRU or outside of the school (pause) its (pause) there is so much happening in the rest of their lives that I feel that the PRU lends itself well (pause) um the more relaxed atmosphere and work patterns although still rigorous are more suited to deal with the often chaotic home lives of these pupils
as there is often less academic pressure on the pupil there, a higher teacher pupil ratio means that pupils don’t tend to present their problems so acutely at the PRU. Um in some cases the PRU may feel that the pupil is ready to make the move back to mainstream but the problem we have is in terms of staffing levels (pause) we don’t have the staffing levels to devote to these children as in addition to them we also have other children with behaviour difficulties that we are trying to deal with at the same time and our workforce is limited and getting more limited due to funding constraints.

Me: from personal experience I’ve found that some pupils cope very well with the PRU environment in comparison to the mainstream schools um I don’t see this as a failing on the part of the schools rather the PRU can be a better fit for the needs of some of the pupils referred there?

HT: indeed (pause) in the last few years I am more and more convinced that what is needed is a more holistic approach to these children and their problems and in effect schools and PRUs are left on their own to deal with them (pause) whilst still meeting their educational needs but what is really needed is intensive family therapy, individual therapy, work on boundaries and what is and isn’t acceptable behaviour. (Pause) I think in many cases these children are unhappy children because they have not been parented properly (pause) for too long I think the rhetoric from central government has been that schools are failing these children but I think that the damage has been done to these children probably before they are five years old and then they and we as schools are permanently in a state of catch up and despite our efforts, these efforts are so small in comparison to the effects of their home culture (pause) a lot of what we done with children by the end of term gets undone. We are ready for pupils in September and even with some who are not really potential candidates for the PRU spend weeks undoing the negative influences of the holidays but try to get pupils back into more positive speech patterns, to not swear at staff or mouth off
immediately and slam doors because that is what they are exposed to on the outside.

Me: we find a very similar pattern ourselves following a school holiday especially in terms of getting to bed at a reasonable hour and um having to get up to catch the bus on a school morning. (pause) do you think anything could be done or that you could get additional support to help once these pupils have been back in school for a period of time?

HT: (pause) um if the parents stuck to the agreements they make with us when we agree to reintroduce them to the school and were able to impose boundaries that were meaningful and consistent then that would I feel be more helpful than anything. (pause) one of the major factors with the children we have most difficulties with is that they are always out on the street no matter what time of day or night I or a member of staff happen to be passing. They never seem to be at home rather um they are in a large crowd and are copying and reinforcing their behaviour habits rather than being under the moderating influence of a responsible adult at home. So (pause) we um would like and need a lot more help and support from parents of these children without that we don’t stand a chance (pause) um some of the children we have here have been very close o being sent to the PRU and are at their last chance, when parents have realised this (pause) and it is pointed out that any move will be on a one way ticket not a revolving door (pause) some parents realise how serious the problem is and will start to parent their children more purposefully and that child (pause) will often as a result make it to the end of their time with us at school.

Me: I think it’s very interesting the stress you put on the responsibility of parents and the lack of parenting in some cases (pause) are there are schemes that run in the county to um improve this?
HT: there is the Plant Dewi scheme of course but it is patchy (pause) I think that if parents realised just how they can be at the root cause of a child’s problems rather than constantly looking for other people to blame (pause) what we find when we talk to parents is that they say ‘oh well we can’t do anything with them’ but when we ask ‘what strategies have you tried?’ it’s obvious that they have tried nothing or if they have only for a couple of days before giving up. My thoughts these days are that many of our parents have got themselves into the situation where they are scared and intimidated by their own children. (pause) even in my office boys will talk to their mums in such a way even in front of me that you can see that the mums are scared of them, they have allowed their sons to dominate and it may be too late to address that.

Me: that’s a common pattern we see at our unit with boys who have a dreadful opinion of and attitude towards their mums.

HT: yes and what these boys don’t realise is that these women often the sole carers, have their best interests at heart and are doing their best for them.(pause) the other thing we do is in terms of the curriculum and teaching styles (pause) we do recognise that different pupils have different learning styles and also that some students may have the pressure eased by removing maybe two or three subjects from them so that they have more time to spend at our nurture class working one to one or with peers to catch up in their core subjects. Even those pupils who have been to the PRU we often find have at least one option they really like and carry on with but the problem we have is that these are children that find it difficult to stay in one place for any period of time and will quite often be seen wandering around the school which is unacceptable.

Me: thank you um just a few more questions really um one of the things I have struggled to find is a standard definition of what successful reintegration is. What would you define a pupil reintegrating successfully?
HT: one that can go to class with his or her peers (pause) learn (pause) just be absorbed back in and be an ordinary mainstream pupil again, possibly with extra support and that's fine but (pause) one who generally blends back into the background who may be doing a shortened version of the curriculum or following other accredited courses and that they manage to stay until the end of year eleven. (Pause) a feeling of belonging is often what matters to these children um that they are in the end of term photos and get their shirts signed on the last day of term they like making it to the end just like anyone else.

Me: again thank you um you mentioned earlier (pause) some possible barriers to reintegration such as lack of parental support do you feel that there are any potential barriers in your school?

HT: barriers that could effect these pupils are a very strict uniform rule for example which I am not prepared to compromise on at all because I think (pause) no I know that when children conform to uniform it helps them to conform to school rules and they are more or less saying that they but into what this school is trying to achieve and that they want to be part of it. I think (pause) sometimes as well intentionally or otherwise that there is a prejudice in teachers or staffs mind about these pupils and we work really hard to overcome that (pause) we do have a policy here of no revenge, no raking over the past, once they've done the detention or whatever the situation is dealt with and over. Nothing is to be thrown back in their face and we make a great effort if they do come back to use to welcome them, we never say things like ‘oh you’re back from the PRU how long are you going to last this time?’ (Pause) I think there may have been that attitude in the past but it certainly does not happen now and if it were to happen I would consider it a very serious misdemeanor by that member of staff.
Me: that leads me on to my next question really um you stress there about how pupils are welcomed back but do you think there are any other factors within your school which may help the reintegration process along?

HT: bear in mind that you have to recognise that my comments are made from a situation where we haven’t really had that many pupils come back so I am no expert in the field (pause) so I can really give an expert opinion but based on my experience I would say that the role of the head of year is essential and we are very lucky to have very good SEN links and a very good behaviour support teacher who works with us. (pause) what we say to them is don’t blow up go and sit outside (pause) we do have a time out card which they are encouraged to use if they feel like blowing and my door and that of the assistant head is always open to them and they know that.

Me: thank you

HT: we do have experience of children who may in other schools have been sent to the PRU. Our behaviour policy is well known to the children and reinforced every September. If a situation does arise the first thing I ask is not what the child has done but ‘what did the teacher do?’ (pause) have they followed procedure and because each of us follow procedure at least most of the time the children know we are consistent (pause) this consistency can’t just be in pockets um if a child swears at a member of staff for example the first thing they always ask me is ‘am I suspended?’ and I reply ‘I don’t know yet let me listen to all the evidence’ (pause) has the teacher followed procedure?

Me: thank you again (pause) just one last question for you um lots of previous studies have focused on larger urban areas especially in England rather than a county like Pembrokeshire (pause) do you think there are any factors in Pembrokeshire that make reintegration more or less successful?
HT: (long pause) I have read studies about Birmingham and Kent for example where pupils were reintegrated to a new school but head teachers had complained about systematic abuse of this by schools in leafier areas getting rid of problem children and I think such a system in this area would be a disaster (long pause) I’m not saying that Pembrokeshire is perfect (pause) far from it but (pause) I think in the rural areas there are so few job opportunities and so few (pause) there is such a (pause) there isn’t the multiplicity of roles for children to see in their home lives or town or local area. It’s not a monoculture as such but almost is in terms of employment opportunities for boys um traditionally low paid and not particularly demanding (pause) I think that mitigates against aspirations and a lot of these children feel bad about themselves and it’s very hard then to pin aspiration to them of striving to achieve something in the future as they don’t see it around them. There are hardly any professions living around here and hardly any different sorts of jobs on offer and I think that’s a huge factor in that we can’t give them something to look forward to (long pause) I know it’s a little off question but I think its very relevant (pause) because they don’t see difference here and I also think in areas where families have stayed for generation after generation after generation that the values these children get from their home life aren’t necessarily the most positive (pause) parents haven’t handed down coping strategies or installed resilience within their children (long pause) what I’m saying I suppose is that these children have a very narrow small slice of life without realising that there is anything else out there or other ways of being or coping or of impressing people (pause) without some way of getting them to look at different perspectives then this is a big problem.

Me: thank you …

HT: I have spoken to countless children in my own rural area who have never been to Swansea or Cardiff never mind Bath or Manchester or London and probably don’t know where these places are (pause) I think the reinforcement of an unhealthy culture is a major factor (pause) for change to happen schools in
areas of any deprivation need twice the staffing ratio and need to work with families um (pause) there should be family rooms in all primary schools heavily staffed for parents to be encouraged to work with their children I also think that mental health services in Pembrokeshire are appalling as a lot of our pupils who end up in crisis have mental health problems which may or may not have been identified but very rarely are addressed (pause) if it wasn’t for the education sector in Pembrokeshire I don’t know where some of these kids would be as I have never met a more concerted effort to try and sort these problems but it all seems to come from education (long pause) which is very joined up in this county but we need more (pause) I read somewhere that a child spends about 16% of their time in school and asking schools to continuously try and undo what happens in the rest of their time is unrealistic and is asking us to perform miracles.

Me: well thank you very much once again for your time…

HT: thinking of parents again (pause) I was speaking to a senior member of staff the other day who related an incident in his class to me. He was telling a pupil off for something and whilst doing so suggested that his own daughter would never think of behaving in such a way ‘of course not’ replied the boy ‘she has parents who care’. That made the teacher he said feel about 2 inches tall and really put him in his place but it does illustrate the difficulties that we as schools have to try and cope with.

The interview ended

General conclusions – I felt that despite initially appearing guarded the head teacher opened up and became more talkative and chatty as the interview went on especially at the conclusion when we chatted informally about some pupils that we had common experience of dealing with for an additional 45 minutes.
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Section 1

Introduction

The PDP empowers individuals through reflection, recording, action planning, execution and evaluation. Thus it can be used not just as a method of charting progress but the reflective nature of the progress in itself can become a tool for additional learning.

The PDP process can

• offer the individual clarity regarding what learning has already taken place and how this can be effectively communicated to others
• help identify areas for future development
• provide opportunities to develop specific skills
• increase confidence and effectiveness
• improve general skills

There is wide scope and flexibility as to how the document can be structured due to absence of a fixed framework which means it can be adapted to suit needs of individuals at different stages of their career and development. However, the need to be reflective and to plan skills development is important to all learners and practitioners and I found the PDP to have been useful during my development as a researcher and as a part-time student.

The Post Graduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2008 suggested that the part-time doctorate has proved an important pathway to widening participation in doctoral study through allowing professionals at differing stages of their career to become engaged with the research process, to enhance their professional practice or to allow a transition to a new area. If Cardiff Metropolitan University did not run the course on a part-time basis I would not have had the
opportunity to enter into a research study as I am not in a position to study on a full-time basis.

The 2008 PRES gathered views of both full and part-time researchers across UK institutions. The results reflected that the research experience and doctoral programmes differ between full and part-time researchers and, part-time researchers responding to the survey alluded to additional difficulties and increased pressures not necessarily experienced by full-time colleagues due to the part-time nature of their research often undertaken alongside full-time work commitments. These increased difficulties experienced by part-time researchers may explain for example, why only 48% of part-time researchers complete their study within a ten year period compared to 76% of full-time research students and, with those who did complete stressing the tremendous resolve and necessary personal commitment to the research process and experience.

I can identify with many of the lows and highs which part-time researchers identified within the 2008 PRES which I shall discuss in later sections.

I have kept a file of documents and a reflective log, with information relating to what I consider to have been landmarks in my research career, for example, choosing the research topic, choosing methods to gather and analyse data, completing a literature review, receiving and analysing completed postal questionnaires, interviewing education professionals and writing up the thesis and forming conclusions.
Timeframe of research milestones and landmarks

**Table 1: Year one 2007-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone/landmark</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Enrolment on EdD course</td>
<td>Excitement and enthusiasm at the onset of a personal challenge and voyage of discovery and the opportunity to achieve something worthwhile of benefit to my pupils, myself and my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Completion of analysis of professional context and study area for research chosen.</td>
<td>This allowed for an audit of my professional practice and context and highlighted areas which could be improved and form the basis of a research project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Year two 2008-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone/landmark</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Completion of literature review</td>
<td>This facilitated an increased awareness of prior research relevant to the study and highlighted a lack of comparable research undertaken within a rural Welsh setting. It additionally allowed for the synthesis of key concepts and issues relating to reintegration and the understanding of a substantial body of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestone/landmark</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>Completion of ontological, epistemological and methodological review</td>
<td>This allowed for the acquisition of key research paradigms which facilitated an increased understanding of research methods. The differentiation between qualitative and quantitative strengths and weaknesses helped inform the decision to proceed following mixed research methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Completion of initial analysis of historical pupil tracking data to inform expert sample postal questionnaires.</td>
<td>I felt a sense of purpose as a researcher having analysed live data which was searched with the aim of identifying influential variables with results used to inform the questionnaire stage of data gathering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Replies received and analysis begins of expert sample questionnaires.</td>
<td>Questionnaire responses highlighted the importance of additional variables not identified through historical data analysis which opened new avenues of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Completion of expert sample questionnaire analysis with data used to inform a follow up landscape sample postal questionnaire.</td>
<td>Analysis confirmed some beliefs regarding reintegration but suggested other variables needed consideration. A landscape questionnaire was needed to elicit wider views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestone/landmark</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>Completion of analysis of landscape sample questionnaire. Analysis of both questionnaires used to inform expert sample interviews.</td>
<td>Analysis confirmed many beliefs regarding reintegration and suggested avenues for a semi-structured loose interview questioning route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Expert sample interviews completed.</td>
<td>Relief that data gathering phase of research had ended and excitement at obtaining final piece of the puzzle from which to inform conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Completion of expert sample interview analysis</td>
<td>This allowed the drawing together of factors noted by historical tracking data and questionnaire response analysis and their relation to the real life experience of reintegration and the formation of conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Milestone/landmark</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011-</td>
<td>Write up of thesis for formal submission.</td>
<td>This has been in equal measure enjoyable and frustrating in committing to paper my results and recommendations of the last four years of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Preparation for and completion of mock viva voce examination.</td>
<td>This was an area of concern as I lack confidence in formal interview settings yet I found the experience to be useful through the provision of constructive feedback and proved to myself the ability to articulate and orally present my findings which were not so successfully committed to print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Formal submission of written thesis.</td>
<td>A mixture of pride in acquiring and understanding a substantial body of knowledge regarding the issue of pupil reintegration, relief in finally submitting the written thesis and frustration with my efforts concerning the length of time taken to complete the thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2

Personal Reflective Statement

The majority of the following information is taken from my personal reflective log which is not included within this Professional Development Portfolio in its entirety as it is a personal document.

I attended university straight from school then continued on to a study for a PGCE in secondary education immediately after graduating with a BA degree in Geography. Upon completion of my PGCE I gained a full time position as a Geography teacher at a small north Wales secondary school. In 2000 I returned to my home county of Pembrokeshire. Finding it difficult to secure a teaching position within commuting distance, I was fortunate to secure a position on a temporary contract to cover an 18 month secondment at a large high school in Carmarthenshire some distance from home. It was during this period of job searching I decided to enhance my own learning and academic qualifications, in part to satisfy my own intellectual curiosities and gain a sense of fulfilment and partly in an attempt to make myself more attractive to potential employers within a very small, settled and crowded job market.

Whilst bringing up a small child and facing a lengthy daily commute I began studying part time with The Open University on a distance learning basis for a Masters degree in Education MA(Ed). The last year of study coincided with the completion of a Post Graduate Certificate in Professional Studies in Education (PGCPSE) again, with The Open University. I found it a struggle at times to juggle the demands of my professional and home life allied to commuting, and although I was proud of my achievement in gaining the qualifications, I believed I was not fully able to realise my true potential due to the competing demands on my time. This has continued to be an issue throughout the period of study for the professional doctorate, however one of my strengths is that I enjoy study and this
has helped me to cope with a considerable workload during my professional life and I believe I have learned to manage my time more effectively and prioritise competing demands on my attention.

In particular, PRES (2008) highlighted the competing areas for attention upon part-time researchers especially those in a similar position to me working full-time alongside carrying out research, having a young family and living at some distance from the University campus. There have been times when I have been able to devote extended periods of time to my research yet there have been greater periods during which work and family commitments have necessitated the research taking third place in my list of priorities.

Due to the nature of the pupils attending the unit at which I work, long term planning of schemes of work, for example, is difficult and I have to take a more fluid day to day approach to lesson preparation. Due to very little if any PPA time during school hours I will on average spend 15-20 hours a week outside of the school day undertaking preparation and marking has, over the last twelve months, been compounded by preparation for an ESTYN school inspection. During the summer term I am also employed as an assistant GCSE examiner with the WJEC exam board which during June-July can add a further 25-30 hours work per week to an already full timetable. As a result, research activities, at least in the initial phase, were relegated to ad hoc periods of time and when they could be fitted in. This, I believe impeded progress whilst in later stages having found a relatively uninterrupted slot during the week in which to concentrate on the research has helped the study progress.

The Masters degree was a modular course with credit for completed modules collated to achieve the qualification. My selection of modules was influenced in part by my interests, but with an eye upon career development. Being employed on temporary contracts and as a supply teacher for much of the time during which I undertook the MA(Ed) I received no CPD opportunities. I became an
active learner and took ownership of my professional development. I focused upon modules relevant to my interests and professional circumstances at the time.

I first studied the module ‘Professional Development for Special Educational Needs Coordinators’ as despite not holding such a role I wished to increase my knowledge of special educational needs as I was increasingly working with pupils thus labelled and felt my initial teacher training and CPD to have been lacking within this area. This module strengthened my view that pupil SEN should not be viewed in isolation rather that they occurred within the specific setting of the school and that factors within the school could act to overcome or exacerbate difficulties pupils faced depending upon what both the school and pupil were willing or able to offer.

This was followed by the module ‘Leading and Managing for Effective Education’ as, having taught for seven years at this point, I was seeking a Head of Department or pastoral position and believed the module would help me achieve such a role through adding theoretical skills and knowledge to my professional experience.

Whilst studying for my final module I found myself in the difficult position of working as a short term supply teacher which limited my module options as the majority required students to be employed within or have regular access to an educational establishment, so that the small scale practitioner action research project required to fulfil the modules could be completed. I was left to study the module ‘Child Development in Families, Schools and Society’, as this could be studied without school access. It was a module studied through necessity rather than choice and I did not achieve the levels of success which I had within prior modules and was disappointed with my results. I had become frustrated and disillusioned through not being able to secure a suitable teaching position after
four years of actively searching and this had a direct negative effect upon my commitment, attitude to studying and subsequent achievement that year.

As I gained more experience supply teaching, the majority of the work was within the primary education sector despite my PGCE training focusing upon the secondary education sector. I wished to increase my employability and knowledge of issues within this sector and chose to study for a PGCPSE in ‘Developing Practice in Primary Education’. I was interested in converting to working within primary education full time, and although I was gaining valuable classroom experience, I felt I lacked the necessary theoretical background regarding primary education and believed the course would afford the opportunity to improve my knowledge.

By 2004 I had almost given up on achieving a teaching position in Pembrokeshire. The only regular employment I could gain was on the shop floor of a supermarket whilst being employed one evening a week as a tutor at a stage one Welsh adult night class which provided an opportunity to work within the further education sector. I applied for a teaching position with the Pembrokeshire Behaviour Support Service working with pupils who displayed issues relating to EBD and challenging behaviour. I had not particularly enjoyed working with such pupils in a mainstream school setting and as a young naïve teacher found the presence of such pupils within a class both unsettling and a challenge. Applying as a last attempt to gain a teaching post, I did not expect to still be in the role and enjoying it in 2012!

Although there had been generic CPD relating to challenging behaviour and special needs during my time at mainstream, I felt it was insufficient to meet the needs of the pupils I now worked with. I had taken a break from studying but had regained a thirst for a new challenge both personal and academic and decided to apply for study for the Professional Doctorate in Education (EdD) as a part time student. My desire to undertake this course was borne out of a wish for a
personal challenge and possible career enhancement, rather than having an immediate topic in mind which I wished to research.

Having gained the MA(Ed) I wished to challenge myself further and was motivated by taking my studies to a higher level. I found the initial choice of research area difficult as, although it related to my professional role, it covered a topic over which I have neither control, nor any direct input into in the workplace. This took a term of evaluating my own practice and the work of the PRU before choosing to study the topic of pupil reintegration from the PRU to mainstream schools and the factors within the local area which could impact upon the success or otherwise of such a move.

As part of the MA(Ed) I had undertaken a piece of small-scale practitioner action research within each of the modules studied to produce a dissertation. To this end I had carried out research within four areas: namely, improving provision to meet the needs of newly enrolled KS3 pupils with Autism in a mainstream secondary school; introducing and evaluating the impact of differentiating work based upon the different learning styles of a class of KS3 pupils who displayed challenging behaviour and learning difficulties; evaluating the impact upon learning and pupil behaviour that the language of instruction exerted upon pupils in a bilingual primary school year six class; and finally, a personal reflection of my own perspectives towards education, classroom practice and pedagogical awareness. I had enjoyed undertaking these projects and developing ideas in a real world setting and was excited about the possibility of carrying out a larger-scale piece of research, which I hoped would benefit my intellectual growth, professional knowledge, career development and, equally importantly, the pupils with whom I work.

PRES (2008) suggested that part-time researchers were generally older than their full-time counterparts upon commencement of research and to have had a larger gap between completion of initial degree and commencement of research.
The mean age for part-time researchers at commencement was 37.6 years compared to 27.3 years of full-time researchers. Upon enrolment on the doctoral programme I was 32.6 years and had completed my initial degree and subsequent teacher training some twelve and eleven years previously and my Masters degree one year previously. As the Masters degree was completed through distance learning, it had been eleven years since I had last studied at a physical university campus.

Being older than the majority of full-time students and with only sporadic attendance at campus I can identify with conclusions from the PRES (2008) that part-time researchers experience a sense of isolation and of not being integrated within their University, department or with research peers. However, many PRES respondents identified that these feelings of isolation were, to some degree, overcome through support from their supervisors. Again, I can identify as I feel a debt of gratitude to my supervisory team in particular, who have supported me alongside staff at the research department who have kept me informed of events which the university runs, for example, through the Professional Doctorate Committee who organise social events to integrate researchers and facilitate peer networking opportunities whilst supporting the needs of research students and academic associates. This has to an extent reduced feelings of isolation associated with being a ‘lone’ researcher.

I can also identify with 60% of part-time researchers whose studies are self financed as alongside issues relating to time demands, the research has incurred financial burdens. Many part-time self funded researchers expressed greater dissatisfaction with support received from employers than did funded or full-time colleagues. Although I have received moral support from close colleagues I have in many ways been left to complete this research alone by my employers.

My feelings towards the EdD experience are summarised in the Wordle diagram below. Words in capital letters express positive feelings or experiences I have
encountered throughout the EdD course and research process whilst those in lower case express negatives. Positive statements outweigh negative statements to the ratio of 22:15 suggesting that overall the EdD process has been a positive experience.
Figure 1: Personal reflection upon the professional doctorate experience
Section 3

Personal Reflection on Professional Role

My professional experience can be briefly summarised as follows:

Seven years working as a secondary school teacher, teaching Geography (KS3-4), History (KS3) and Welsh (as a second language – KS3-4). Four years were spent teaching on a permanent full-time basis in a north Wales secondary school, almost two years on a temporary full-time basis covering a long term secondment in a south west Wales secondary school and one year on a temporary part time-basis at a West Wales secondary school.

Eight years working as a teacher within the SAGE (long term KS2/3) unit, part of the Pembrokeshire Behaviour Support Service. This has involved working with pupils within KS3 but has included pupils from upper KS2 (years five and six) and pupils in KS4 (years ten and eleven) when necessary. I teach the majority of curriculum subjects including English, Humanities, Art, PHSE, ICT, Food Technology and Welsh/Welsh studies.

The above periods include eleven years as a GCSE Geography assistant examiner with the WJEC (2001- to date), daily supply teaching (KS1-4, 2002-2004 both English and Welsh medium schools), tutor at stage one Welsh adult night class (2001-2005), shop floor assistant at a national supermarket (2004) and student ID badge production assistant (2004) at a Further Education college.

Having moved from the mainstream education sector to alternative provision at the PRU (following a period of time supply teaching at both primary and secondary level), my focus has shifted from that of a secondary school subject specialist to a focus upon working with pupils with challenging behaviour who have experienced negativity within and rejection from the mainstream school.
environment. Having been referred initially to the PRU, they have subsequently been transferred from the main PRU site to the SAGE unit and are now; therefore, two steps away from a mainstream school return.

These pupils, at least upon arrival at SAGE, are often vulnerable, distrustful of staff and authority and are damaged by previous negative experience to the point where they are uninterested in receiving an education.

My role now has been extended from delivering one area of the curriculum to fixed age group classes to delivering the majority of the curriculum to not just mixed ability but mixed age classes (it is possible to have pupils aged between nine and fifteen years in the same group).

More importantly, however, the role involves acting as a positive male role model which many of these pupils lack elsewhere in their lives and to provide a safe, enjoyable nurturing environment which pupils feel comfortable in attending and can make academic progress without fear of ridicule from peers concerning the often large gaps in skills and knowledge which characterise many of these pupils and which may be painfully evident within a mainstream school setting.

Working at the SAGE unit can be an isolated experience in the sense that there is a small number of staff and pupils and that the unit is physically separated from the rest of the Behaviour Support Service and mainstream schools. Although there is some communication with other education partners in the county, it is limited. I believe I have approached my work with the best of intentions relating to meeting pupil needs but there is little feedback as to whether you make a positive difference to the lives of these vulnerable and often damaged pupils. There has also been recent negative press attention concerning previous practice at the main PRU site which although never took place at the SAGE unit casts a negative perception across the whole service.
Undertaking the research has affirmed from the literature review and responses to questionnaires and interviews that what we aim to achieve at SAGE is in the best interests of pupils, for example, forging a sense of belonging within pupils. This could help to explain why pupils who displayed sporadic attendance at mainstream school will often display attendance rates of over 90% at the unit.

It is unlikely (though not impossible) that these pupils will reintegrate to a mainstream environment, and in all likelihood, will remain at SAGE from initial referral to at least the end of KS3 (and in some cases beyond if pupils and families feel that they are unlikely to succeed in transferring successfully to the KS4 PRU provision). Therefore their stay in a small group environment will be for an extended period of time (an average stay is often between two and four years). As a result many of the barriers evident to these pupils in a mainstream school are eroded away to an extent that my role at times, feels like a surrogate parent rather than teacher. Indeed, throughout my teaching career I have endeavoured to treat pupils in my care in a manner commensurate with how I would expect my own child to be treated by his teachers.

The pupils who attend SAGE can be viewed as some of the most challenging in the county in that they have been referred to the PRU by mainstream schools and subsequently, transferred from the PRU to SAGE as the placement has either been unsuccessful or the pupil has become disengaged at the PRU yet is not in a position to reintegrate to mainstream school. The pupil, it has been decided, will benefit from the small group longer term provision that SAGE can provide.

Pupils often arrive with a negative reputation and staff previously working with them will have their ‘battle stories’ to tell. Staff at SAGE make a concerted effort to avoid these negatives. We give the pupil time to settle at the unit and the opportunity to form our own judgements of these pupils rather than allowing our perceptions to be influenced by negativity from outside sources. From the
literature review I feel this to be a key reason to the success we achieve in building relationships with these pupils as it allows them a fresh start without the need to behave in ways which may have been ingrained and reinforced by staff opinion in previous settings.

When dealing with negative behaviour it is important to remember that challenging behaviour is a response to factors often hidden from staff at the time and that it should be challenging behaviour which is dealt with rather than the pupil. When reading prior reports of how these pupils behaved in previous settings, in many cases they describe a pupil we do not recognise at the unit, as their efforts and behaviours are often far more positive than what has been previously displayed in other settings. This research has confirmed the simple truth behind one of the six key principles of nurture groups namely ‘all behaviour is communication’.

I became interested as to why many pupils were referred to SAGE, as I felt that many would have been candidates for reintegration if they had displayed the generally positive behaviour exhibited during their time at the unit for extended periods at the PRU. Yet they were in the position of being two reintegration transfers away from mainstream school return. I became interested as to why only some pupils will reintegrate from the PRU to mainstream school, why only some reintegration moves prove successful, and should a pupil remaining long term at the PRU be seen as success, even if it does not fit the conventional remit of such provision, namely short term temporary provision?

I have always felt education to be important to my life and I believe that teaching is not merely a job but a vocation. I have always associated a sense of pride with my career choice and subscribe to the idea that a teacher should be a reflective practitioner (Schön, 1991) to ensure their continued effectiveness within the profession. I have always attempted to evaluate and inform my own teaching and professional practice in an attempt to promote and support pupils’ learning.
and enthusiasm for education. What this period of study has offered has been far more than an opportunity to reflect upon my practice, rather it has afforded me the opportunity to become a teacher researcher.
Section 4

Reflection on Learning and Planning for Development

Following the MA(Ed) with The Open University the EdD with Cardiff Metropolitan University has afforded the opportunity to develop my understanding of research skills and methodological paradigms. My professional background is that of school teacher, and prior to the MA(Ed) I had no previous experience of research, or research skills training and I have found this aspect of my studies both interesting and challenging.

Whilst the MA(Ed) afforded opportunities to complete four small-scale pieces of practitioner action research, the professional doctorate has provided greater opportunity and challenge to develop theoretical knowledge and a range of skills which have proved invaluable in undertaking the research. Training offered by Cardiff Metropolitan University has increased my knowledge of research methods and afforded me an opportunity to study qualitative, quantitative and mixed research methods which informed my research design. This included for example questionnaire purpose, design and analysis, interview design technique and analysis, interview transcription and the formation of coding frames.

An important initial stage in my development, as both a learner and researcher, was to gauge my personal strengths and weaknesses against potential training opportunities offered as part of the doctoral programme, to address gaps in my knowledge and shortcomings. I have attended a range of training courses offered on the programme as best as the constraints of geographical distance and full time teaching commitments have allowed.
Table 6: Examples of professional doctorate training courses attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Skills and knowledge acquired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research process</td>
<td>Research project design should focus upon an original research idea which can be investigated and reinvestigated. Methods are only as valid and as appropriate as the questions asked by the researcher and that methods chosen should be for a distinct purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for research – data analysis</td>
<td>Statistics are a tool rather than an aim which allow for objectivity and investigation of relationships of association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative methodologies – principles in practice</td>
<td>Qualitative methods are loosely structured and allow for the open ended emergence of grounded theory generation. They can develop an initial understanding of an issue and help understanding different perspectives between groups and categories of people. Methods include interviews. Quantitative methods are conclusive in purpose. They attempt to identify evidence regarding cause-and-effect relationships. Methods include surveys and questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative in research</td>
<td>Narrative research allows the researcher to study how different people experience the world around them. It focuses upon experiences of individuals, incorporates context and place in the story and is collaborative between the researcher and participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews – data collection and transcription</td>
<td>Interviews may be seen as objective as they provide a narrative of the research mediated through the voice of the researcher. That transcription is crucial with accuracy of recording and interpretation paramount.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAGE staff have been considerate in allowing time to attend seminars etc but there have been limits to time available to me which has curtailed the amount of training opportunities I could attend. I have been unable to attend wider conferences and seminars which would have been extremely useful in broadening experience through encouraging meetings with a wider range of researchers and their interests. I have, however, been impressed with the
training sessions offered by the doctoral programme, finding them informative and accessible, even to those like me with a very minimal research background and these courses have shaped my practice and informed my decision making throughout the research process.

I initially struggled to select a suitable focus for my research topic but was mindful that it should be interesting, challenging and directly benefit pupils in my care and found the choice of research methods to employ to gather data, subsequent analysis and how these methods would pertain to my professional context equally difficult. In the early stages of the research, I did not have a precise idea of the parameters of my research topic, and had to think very clearly about the area which I wished to research, the way I was going to approach it and how I could fit it into my professional context.

Training courses led to the decision to follow a mixed method approach incorporating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to gather and interpret data across phases of research. Quantitative research methods were employed within the first stage of ex post facto data analysis of pupil tracking data. This data informed the second stage of educational practitioner questionnaires which incorporated both quantitative data analysis of rating scale data for example, and qualitative analysis of written response. The final stage included expert practitioner interviews which focussed upon a qualitative narrative analysis of the lived experience of participants relating to reintegration. Narrative research highlights the importance of considering multiple perspectives and the existence of context bound constructed social realities as important (Muller, 1999, 223).

By attending training sessions and tutorials, I had the occasion to discuss my research design with many academic professionals. These have proved to be extremely useful and have allowed me to think in a way that goes beyond the confines of my habitual work environment and professional practice. It has been
both refreshing and stimulating to encounter different perspectives and to meet new people from diverse fields of research and education.

As the research progressed, the focus of the study shifted. Initially, I was concerned with how the perspectives and opinions of those involved in the reintegration process namely reaching staff, the pupil and their parents would influence the success or otherwise of a transition. What became clear from the literature review and responses from questionnaires and interviews was that these perspectives were only one set of variables. What I increasingly came to focus upon were the specific situational factors which influence reintegration of individual pupils in individual schools and, generic situational as well as attitudinal factors inherent within the rural context within which the research took place.
Section 5

Skills Analysis, Training and Research Activities

The extensive training provision available afforded me the opportunity to identify ways I could manage my learning and ensure gaps in skills and knowledge were filled.

I attended several research skills training sessions, for example, the use of Endnote and SPSS but concluded, due to geographical distance from University and full time work constraints necessitating infrequent attendance on site, that although these resources were excellent, I would not benefit from their use as I would not be able to attend often enough to fully implement the technology.

After debating the merits and pitfalls of employing quantitative and qualitative methods, research training highlighted a third approach: a mixed method approach which suited my strengths and interests, the context in which research took place and these mixed methods grew and developed in response to need during the study.

The research followed an organic grounded trajectory rather than being rigidly planned following a set path from the onset. It took three stages to gather data each of which informed the next, starting with an audit of historical referral and reintegration figures (ex post facto research) from the year 2000, including figures predating my employment at the PRU. This was with the aim of placing the research into a contextual timeframe and to generate data to analyse referral and reintegration patterns and possible variables of influence. This generated large amounts of quantitative data.

Secondly, I wished to elicit perspectives of fellow educational professionals within the county. I work at a small isolated unit and have little opportunity to network or
liaise with fellow teachers and as a result I chose to implement postal questionnaires to gather both qualitative and quantitative data subsequently manipulated and analysed for patterns of response.

A final stage was to undertake face-to-face semi-structured interviews with a selected expert sample of questionnaire respondents including, primary and secondary schools from mainstream provision and from the PRU (alternative provision).

Due to geographical, work and financial constraints, I have been able to attend no more than one conference; and as a delegate, rather than a speaker. Consequently I carefully researched which conference would best afford the opportunity to network and make contact with professionals which had a direct relevance to my area of research.

I chose to attend a two day conference organised by the Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties Association (SEBDA) during April 2011. The SEBDA organisation is a charitable organisation which exists to promote excellence in services for children and young people experiencing SEBD.

The organisation campaigns for improved services for those experiencing SEBD and for those who work with them, provides support to professionals working within this field and is concerned with increasing social inclusion through making mainstream schooling increasingly supportive towards such labelled pupils. They accomplish these goals through the provision of training, dissemination of good practice and through engagement with policy makers to inform and influence decisions concerning this often marginalised group of pupils.

Due to unforeseen staff absence through illness at my unit I was only able to attend the second day – Saturday 2\textsuperscript{nd} April 2011. Following careful selection of a relevant conference on the day, there followed a consideration as to which
presentations to attend. Following a presentation by keynote speaker Barbara Knowles I attended two further presentations chosen due to their relevance to my research topic. I was especially concerned as to how successful reintegration could be improved within mainstream schools; as to why some pupils prefer the PRU environment and actively seek to remain there rather than reintegrate and I attended presentations most closely associated with this issue.

The first presentation by David Colley concerned the establishment of nurture groups in a secondary school setting which considered the practicalities of extending a relatively common KS1-2 provision into KS3 and above. Although the SAGE unit is not a nurture group I believe that it exhibits elements of nurture group provision. The PRU also operates both a KS1 and KS2 nurture group whilst there are a number of primary schools within the county who offer nurture group provision.

Currently, and throughout the period of research no secondary school within the county has operated nurture group provision, however, I believe such provision or provision which incorporates the key principles of nurture groups namely: learning is developmental; a safe base environment; promotion of esteem; recognition that behaviour is communication; a focus upon language and crucially the notion of provision facilitating a transition for students may enhance reintegration practices currently in operation for pupils from the PRU returning to a mainstream school setting.

Such a group within a secondary school may replicate aspects of provision at the PRU to which pupils responded positively, before being considered candidates for reintegration. Such provision may act as a transition unit, for example, allowing pupils to make a structured staged return to the mainstream environment whilst attending a smaller unit on site with fixed staffing similar to that at the PRU at which they met success.
A second presentation concerned the importance attached to a pupil feeling a sense of belonging to a school and factors which may help or hinder this, presented by Rachel Leonard. To be successful all pupils need to feel that school is a safe place containing people who care about them and where their needs for support, respect and friendship formation will be met and where they may find help to work through difficulties. Children who feel they belong are happier, more relaxed and exhibit fewer behaviour problems. They learn better, are more motivated and subsequently are more successful.

I believe that one reason why pupils at SAGE generally exhibit lesser behavioural difficulties than in previous settings is that they forge a sense of belonging and attachment to the unit and build up positive relationships with staff. It is an environment in which they feel safe. Conversely, a lack of a sense of belonging and attachment to school may have been a factor in their extended exhibition of challenging behaviour which preceded their PRU referral. In the majority of cases it is to the same school within which issues arose that pupils will attempt to reintegrate. If they left with little sense of attachment or belonging to the school, I believe it will hinder their prospects for a successful reintegration. Therefore mainstream schools need to encourage this sense of belonging, for example, through transition days keeping pupils involved with school activities and positive peer friendships.

In addition to the formal presentations, I found the opportunity to discuss issues with other conference attendees as members of a shared professional community the majority of whom were located in English urban settings and to compare issues pertinent to reintegration in their context to those in which my research was conducted (rural, Wales) to be useful. This informal discussion suggested that there were maybe generic barriers and facilitators to reintegration operating across all settings yet there were also definite situational factors specific to where the reintegration was to be attempted.
Whilst undertaking the professional doctorate, I have given two presentations to peers and staff at Cardiff Metropolitan University. These have included discussing the professional context of my research and what I had learned from undertaking the review of relevant literature. This afforded me an opportunity to disseminate findings and discuss ideas with research peers in a professional community, to take advice from research peer feedback from fellow researchers employed within an educational context. Research training and activities are summarised in the table below.

Table 7: Research activities and their benefit to research study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research activities</th>
<th>Benefit to research study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional doctorate programme training courses</td>
<td>These provided new skills such as SPSS and Endnote training, ethical considerations, research paradigms, data gathering, management and analysis, literature searches and interview techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting at professional doctorate programme events</td>
<td>These allowed for staff and peer review of work, increased self confidence as a researcher and member of research community and resulted in identification of further themes to research and identification of personal gaps in knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at professional association conference</td>
<td>This allowed for knowledge gathering, generation of new ideas, location of research within a wider national and professional context and networking opportunities with fellow educational professionals and researchers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On reflection, I have realised that pursuing the professional doctorate has not just enhanced my subject knowledge concerning the reintegration of pupils from a PRU to mainstream school and the theoretical and practical application of research methods. I have also developed a range of transferable skills which I hope to be beneficial in pursuing future career options such as a leadership or
responsibility role within the PRU or mainstream school or, a move into an educational advisory or research role.

Pursuing the doctorate has led to the achievement of a set of attributes, skills and knowledge which I hope to be of personal benefit in addition to being of benefit to current and prospective future employers.

Loosely based upon the Employability Lens from the Vitae Researcher Development Framework (2011), these enhanced skills can be grouped within three categories.

**Knowledge and intellectual abilities**

- A demonstration of an understanding of a substantial body of knowledge relevant to an area of professional practice including an improved knowledge of factors influencing the reintegration of pupils from a PRU to mainstream school and the particular influences pertaining to a rural bilingual authority.

- Improved knowledge of qualitative, quantitative and mixed research methods and their application to specific research settings which, allowed for the selection of appropriate methods and design an appropriate methodology to generate new knowledge within my project.

- Enhanced ability to analyse data, evaluate findings and identify and solve problems.

- An awareness of the ethical considerations concerning research and those appropriate to my project.

**Personal effectiveness**
• Increased resilience and perseverance in the face of obstacles and increased confidence in my own professional abilities.

• Increased independence including being proactive and taking responsibility for my career development.

• Increased ability to prioritise work and research tasks. Time management in the face of competing demands and to fulfil tasks within set timeframes.

• Ownership of career professional development opportunities (CPD) and enhancement of professional reputation and esteem.

Research organisation and engagement

• Personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in the conceptualisation, design and implementation of a project to generate new knowledge and inform professional practice.

• Setting goals and targets and implementing plans to meet them.

• Enhanced knowledge of appropriate communication and dissemination mechanisms and flexibility of delivery to match the needs of a specific audience.

• The creation and interpretation of new knowledge through original research.

• An ability to make informed judgements on complex issues within a specialist field often in the absence of a complete data set.

• To communicate ideas and findings clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences.
• The ability to recognise, acknowledge and collaborate with the efforts of others.

• The ability to build relationships within both professional and academic settings.