

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

An evaluation of provision in a school designated as catering for pupils categorised as having 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' in the light of the perspectives and expectations of its various stakeholders

Thesis

How to cite:

Thomas, Ian Andrew (2002). An evaluation of provision in a school designated as catering for pupils categorised as having 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' in the light of the perspectives and expectations of its various stakeholders. EdD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2002 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the [policies page](#).

oro.open.ac.uk

IAN ANDREW THOMAS

Personal Identifier: M960260X

An evaluation of provision in a school designated as catering for pupils categorised as having 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' in the light of the perspectives and expectations of its various stakeholders

DOCTOR of EDUCATION (Ed.D)

Date of Submission: January 2002.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.	Page 1
CHAPTER 1: RATIONALE.	Page 3
Principal Stakeholders.	Page 3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.	Page 7
The Processes of Identification and labelling.	Page 7
From Labelling to Relocation.	Page 9
In or out: Inclusion or Segregation?	Page 12
Perceptions of Effectiveness.	Page 13
Effectiveness in the EBD setting.	Page 15
Reflections from practitioners.	Page 18
Conclusion.	Page 20
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY and RESEARCH PROCEDURES.	Page 21
Aims.	Page 21
Research Design.	Page 22
Generating the Data.	Page 29
i. staff.	Page 33
ii. pupils.	Page 37
iii. parents.	Page 41
iv. Farside Education Authority.	Page 42
v. Farside Local Authority.	Page 43
Analysis of data.	Page 44
CHAPTER 4: PHASE I MAIN FINDINGS.	Page 46
Introduction.	Page 46
Summary of main findings.	Page 46
Causality.	Page 48
Role of Line End.	Page 54
Criteria for Effectiveness.	Page 61

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION of PHASE I FINDINGS.	Page 67
Introduction.	Page 67
Causality.	Page 68
Role of Line End.	Page 71
Criteria for Effectiveness.	Page 74
i. addressing pupils' needs – academic and behavioural.	Page 74
ii. providing a safe, secure and positive environment.	Page 82
iii. reintegration into mainstream.	Page 83
Conclusion.	Page 88
 CHAPTER 6: PHASE II MAIN FINDINGS.	 Page 90
Summary of main findings.	Page 90
Addressing pupils'academic needs.	Page 94
Addressing pupils emotional/ behavioural needs.	Page 100
Providing a safe, secure, and positive environment.	Page 109
Reintegration into mainstream.	Page 116
Other factors.	Page 119
 CHAPTER 7: ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION of PHASE II FINDINGS.	 Page 125
Introduction	Page 125
Addressing pupils'academic needs.	Page 125
Addressing pupils emotional/ behavioural needs.	Page 132
Providing a safe, secure, and positive environment.	Page 137
Reintegration into mainstream.	Page 140
Other Factors	Page 143
Conclusion	Page 144
 CHAPTER 8: REFLECTIONS on the STUDY	 Page 148

APPENDICES

REFERENCES

APPENDICES.

A – L: STAFF PERSPECTIVES.

- A. Reasons why pupils might disrupt/become disaffected.
- B. Ideal qualities of teacher of 'EBD' pupils.
- C. Behaviours that cause most concern in class. (Staff.)
- D. What would make Line End the 'ideal' school?
- E. What do you want for Line End?
- F. What constitutes quality at Line End?
- G. Effectiveness criteria for Line End.
- H. Strengths and weaknesses of Line End.
- I
 - i. 114 – statement survey.
 - ii. Follow-up survey.
- J
 - i. Questionnaire schedule: PGCE student.
 - ii. Completed questionnaire: PGCE student
- K. Interview extracts:
 - i. Teacher A.
 - ii. Outreach Team.
- L. Questionnaire: Teaching and Learning.

M – T: PUPIL PERSPECTIVES.

- M
 - i. Why I am at Line End.
 - ii. Thoughts about Mainstream.
- N. What would make Line End the 'perfect' school?
- O. What should Line End be doing for me?
- P. Good and bad things about Line End.
- Q. 60 – statement survey.
- R.
 - i. Questionnaire: Teaching and learning.

- S. Follow-up survey (teaching and learning.)
- T. Interview extracts:
 - i. Year 11 pupil re. experiences of reintegration.
 - ii. Year 11 pupil.
- U. Data from Parents:
 - i. Written response for Annual Review.
 - ii. Personal perspectives during Annual Review.
 - iii. Interview extract from Year 9. Parent.
- V. Aims of Line End (1996).
- W. Extracts from Research Journal (reflecting field-notes from observation in the Field.)
 - i. Senior management team meeting.
 - ii. Management of the target-setting process.
- X. Government Reports on Line End's provision.
 - i. LEA 'mini-inspection' Report: 1996.
 - ii. Ofsted Report: 1996.
- Y. School Performance Data.

Abstract.

Line End is an 11-16 day school for pupils categorised as having emotional and behavioural difficulties (EBD). It is maintained by Farside Local Education Authority, and provides secondary education for pupils who are statemented as having emotional and behavioural difficulties. Some have additional learning difficulties, this assessment being based on reading ages that are considerably lower than their chronological ages, and scores in KS2 SATs that are below National averages. All referrals come through the local authority's special educational needs department; invariably, the pupils who are placed at Line End either transfer from the EBD primary unit, or are those who have been excluded from mainstream secondary schools within the borough.

The aim of the study is to establish the extent to which Line End is felt to be effective by its various stakeholders; and in establishing this position, it is first important to elicit the criteria by which the various stakeholders judge the school to be effective. The first phase of the study, therefore, is aimed at eliciting these stakeholder criteria, whilst the second phase focuses on the extent to which the school is perceived to be effective in its various areas of provision, based on these very criteria. A subsequent analysis of findings seeks to examine stakeholder perspectives, and the extent to which there is congruence and/or divergence of perspective amongst and between stakeholders might create conflict or tensions between and amongst stakeholders.

Findings from the first phase of the study suggest that there is broad agreement amongst stakeholders about what should constitute effective provision for Line End pupils: addressing both academic and emotional/behavioural needs effectively, providing a safe and positive environment in which to make such provision, and providing opportunities for the reintegration of pupils to mainstream where appropriate and practicable. These three areas reflect the three major aims of the school as outlined in the staff handbook, and alongside these as key indicators of quality, stakeholders included relationships between home and school, and the management/organisation of the school – the extent to which it was strategically or 'crisis' managed.

Findings from the second phase of the research suggested that the school was perceived to be effective by virtually all of its stakeholders – in some areas for some of the time. There were

differences of perspective within stakeholder groups, and sometimes differences of emphasis between stakeholder groups. These differences did not necessarily lead to tension, as it was possible for differing perspectives to co-exist; the tensions became evident when perspectives conflicted rather than co-existed, as the group or individual who held the greatest power would invariably have its way in translating its perspective into policy and practice.

CHAPTER 1: RATIONALE.

In setting up my study, the aim was to investigate the quality of education in the institution in which I worked – Line End School. In considering my own notions of quality, however, it was clear that they were not value-free, and as Cole and Visser (1998) argue:

“Effectiveness is not a value-free notion. Beliefs, preferences and practical necessities are embedded in the overt and covert aims set for these (EBD) schools by interested professionals and ‘client groups, which affect their judgement on what ‘effectiveness’ is. It is important to ‘unpack’ what the key players in these groups really think, and what they actually want of schools for pupils with EBD before pronouncing on the institutions’ success.” (P37)

The quality of provision, therefore, is not dependent upon one perspective, but those of a range of stakeholders, all of whom are involved in some way in the school. In examining the extent to which anyone might consider Line End to be a ‘good school,’ it was important to establish first who the ‘key players’ were, and then to approach these groups of stakeholders to establish their perspectives on the nature of ‘EBD-ness,’ before establishing the characteristics of a good ‘EBD’ school that would ensure a good education for its pupils. In pursuing the study in this manner, I was aware of the inherent complexity in the research, in that different perspectives on the nature of ‘EBD-ness’ would lead to differing perspectives on provision, and ultimately to evaluations of the effectiveness of the school’s provision.

Principal stakeholders.

Stakeholders are those who can be considered to have a stake or interest in a particular concern; in the case of my own study, the particular concern is Line End School, and its stakeholders can be seen as those whose involvement in and with the school are pivotal in its functioning, but who in turn depend upon Line End for their own livelihood or futures - the big investors of time, emotion, energy, support, hope - namely pupils, practitioners and parents, and to a lesser extent, our resource-providers, curriculum regulators and inspectors at both local (LEA) and national (DfEE/Ofsted) levels.

i. Pupils

The importance of recognising pupils as prime stakeholders in the policy, process and practice of education is widely acknowledged (Bird et al, 1981; Cronk, 1987; Gersch, 1987;

Macbeath et al, 1992; Cooper, 1993; Armstrong and Gallaway, 1996; Bennathon, 1996; Charlton, 1996; Davie and Galloway, 1996; Rudduck et al, 1996; Cole and Visser, 1998; Pearce and Hillman, 1998), and indeed, the Elton Committee (DES, 1989) urged practitioners not only to recognise the importance of eliciting pupils' views, but to also organise systems for doing so, and for taking the information generated into account in the management of the school.

Until recently there was little tradition in education of pupil involvement in the discussion, development and implementation of strategies aimed at addressing problems in the areas of behaviour and discipline within schools; models of effective pupil advocacy are relatively new, but for pupils designated as 'EBD,' there is seemingly a paucity of any substantial research in this area (Garner, 1991). This is due, in part, suggests Calvert (1975), to the low status of the pupil role, contrasted with the predominant role of the teacher, the latter defining the roles and expectations of the former

Listening to what children have to say, and establishing systems for doing so, can provoke the fears, prejudices and reservations of those who may see this development as threatening: there may be a deep-seated distrust in the competence of pupils to contribute to the improvement process, and/or a reluctance on the part of some practitioners to cede their prerogative as sole arbiters in the decision-making process (Wade and Moore, 1993; Rudduck, 1995). I feel it is important to involve pupils in the overall development of the school, however, for reasons of pragmatism and constructive strategic management; pupils are often observant, often capable of making analytical and constructive comments about their schooling, though not necessarily in the elaborated code of the professionals.

ii. Parents

Like their children, parents can be considered as important stakeholders, and it is therefore important to elicit their views regarding the effectiveness of the service provided by the school (Macbeath et al, 1992; Armstrong, 1995; Wade and Moore, 1993; Vincent, 1996; Ofsted, 1997; Clark and Power, 1998; Cole and Visser, 1998; Gillespie, 1998). Despite, however, the recognition in the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) of the importance of parental involvement in the education of children with special educational needs as 'equal partners', there would appear to be an implementation gap between this ideal and its translation into practice. There is often an expectation that parents will support the work of the school, but

rather than having an active role in the partnership, parents are expected to be passive recipients of information and decisions controlled and determined by the professionals (Cowburn, 1986; Goacher et al, 1988; Galloway et al, 1994). Power and enfranchisement for parents are more often illusory than real, the premise being that professionals are best placed to make the most impartial and appropriate decisions about educational provision. There is also a culture that sees parents as part of the problem rather than part of the solution (Galloway and Goodwin, 1979; Topping, 1983; Wood, 1988; Armstrong, 1995), and within such a culture, it is less likely that parents will be accorded the value and respect of equals by teachers within schools. They remain, nonetheless, important stakeholders, and as such have a right to have their views considered. Although for some the school might be, at present, little more than a child-minding facility, taking the time to ask them what they think, persuading them that their views are important, and encouraging them to see that they have an important contribution to make to the life of the school, may be the first steps in establishing a relationship that goes some way to narrowing the gap between the rhetoric and the essence of parent/school partnership.

iii. Practitioners

There is a range of research literature that points up the appropriateness of practitioners - namely teachers - as important stakeholders whose views are worthy of research (Reynolds and Reid, 1985; MacBeath et al, 1992; Cooper, 1993; Hopkins et al, 1994; Myers, 1996), though in my own research I have included classroom assistants in the study, as they are clearly an important aspect of school life, and are involved in institutional planning processes, and “service delivery” with the classroom. Teachers, however, are integral to the educational provision for pupils, being at the sharp end of service delivery, and therefore directly responsible for the quality of teaching and learning within the school. If, moreover, the ongoing goal for schools is for improvement and greater effectiveness, then such educational change will very much depend, as Fullan (1992) observes, on what teachers do and think; and if school self-evaluation, a vital aspect of the improvement process, involves reflecting on what actually happens within school, then it can be argued that practitioners are best placed to make the observations that might inform this process. I have also had to bear in mind, moreover, that more than being simply the researcher conducting the study, I am also a practitioner in the very environment in which the study is being conducted.

iv. Others

There is a number of other groups which can be considered as stakeholders. The LEA – Farside - can be seen as both service-provider and stakeholder, as, under government regulations, it is responsible for maintaining Line End School and for the placement of pupils at Line End School, and is ultimately accountable to parents for provision made by Line End (DfEE, 1996). The government, moreover, is a stakeholder, as it has the responsibility for standards in education through the DfEE, and for setting the national educational agenda; as such, it is responsible to the electorate, and in the drive to raise standards has appointed Ofsted as the arbiters of what constitutes acceptable levels of performance and provision by schools.

The Local Authority – as distinct from the Local Education Authority – can also be considered as one of the school’s stakeholders, as under the 1989 Children Act, it has responsibility, through its Social Services department, for those children who are the subject of court orders in terms of care and family placement. This responsibility includes oversight of educational provision, managed in Farside by a team funded jointly by the social services and education departments, and whose remit it is to visit ‘looked after’ children within the school environment, and liaise with schools and pupils regarding pupils’ individual needs, progress and any problems or difficulties that may need to be addressed. Since problems experienced by children with emotional and behavioural difficulties are manifest not only in school, but often within the home environment, there have always been a number of children at Line End whose home circumstances have led to them ending up in the care of the Local Authority. It is appropriate, therefore, to elicit the perspectives of the Local Authority regarding the role of Line End in relation to the children within their care, and the effectiveness of the provision being made for them, and this has been done through the LEA team with responsibility for looked-after children.

There is a number of other groups who can also be considered as stakeholders – governors, mainstream schools, the local community – whom I have not included directly in the study. My reasons for this are outlined in Chapter 8 of the Report – ‘Reflections on the Study.’

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The common denominator amongst the pupils for whom Line End was established to cater is the history of inappropriate behaviour that has led to their ultimate exclusion from mainstream schooling. Disaffection and indiscipline amongst school children, however, are not new phenomena, but rather a recurrent feature in the history of education (Highfield and Pinsent, 1952; Pritchard, 1963; Humphries, 1981; Ford et al, 1982; Furlong, 1985; Hurt, 1988).

The processes of identification and labelling.

The Education Act of 1981 gave birth to the descriptor 'EBD' – a label conferred on those pupils perceived as experiencing emotional and/or behavioural difficulties. 'EBD' however, - as 'maladjusted' before it - implies that all children thus labelled have similar problems/needs, and tends to be used as a generic term - a catch-all descriptor which may rest on arbitrary perspectives of behaviours, often outside of a significant conceptual framework and divorced from appropriate contextual factors. Consequently, it incorporates a range of sub-descriptors, including 'disruptive', 'disaffected', 'challenging', 'disturbed', which in turn suggests a conflict in perceptions regarding both the definitions of, and subsequently responses to emotional and behavioural difficulties. The most recent government guidelines on 'EBD,' however, have done little to clarify the issue: Circular 9/94 (DFE 1994, page 4) acknowledges that there is 'no absolute definition' whilst 'Excellence for all Children' (DfEE,1997, 8:1) confesses that 'defining this group is not easy.' Subsequently, there have been many efforts to differentiate between the various descriptors of pupil behaviour, and the labels conferred on children (Lowenstein,1975; Tattum,1982; Mortimore et al.1983; McDermott,1984; Lake,1985; Lloyd-Smith,1987; Norwich,1990; Galloway et al.1994; Corbett,1996).

The constructions of disruptive behaviour, however, are dependent upon the perspectives, expectations and values brought to the interpretation by the individual, and in the light of such a subjective approach, different interpretations of the cause imply different responses. Definitions necessitate a contextual consideration, as behaviour is both interactional and situation-specific, dependent upon the particular perspective from which such definitions are constructed. Thus, different schools will view similar behaviours differently, and will respond in different ways to the same behaviours - hence the variations in exclusion rates.

Within individual schools, moreover - despite whole school policies on behaviour management and school/classroom expectations, - teachers do expect and impose differing standards of behaviour within their own classrooms with the same sets of pupils. To the perpetrator, however, what is perceived by some to be an act of disruption, may be to him/her a legitimate response to a perceived irrelevance or injustice, or a coping strategy for those areas of school life which are problematic for them (Willis,1977; Peagam,1995). This was an important consideration in informing the direction of the initial stages of my own research, as it was important to establish as far as is possible the constructions of “EBD” made by the school’s various stakeholders, as these are ultimately linked to perspectives on the purpose and perceived effectiveness of provision.

It is also evident that although there are clear distinctions between definitions and application of the label ‘EBD’, virtually all models link ‘emotional’ and ‘behavioural’, taking little account of the ‘emotional’ (Bowers,1996; Maras,1996), the two descriptors - ‘emotional’ and ‘behavioural’ - tending to merge into one for those who use them; ‘emotional problem’ has simply become synonymous with an undesirable behaviour rather than with a state of mind or inner feeling. As a result, ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties’ are often seen as ‘treatable’ in the sense that they can be totally eliminated or drastically reduced, with an emphasis on appropriate strategies for classroom management, often based on behaviourist approaches. One aspect of the study, therefore, is to examine stakeholders’ perspectives of the role of Line End, and the extent to which evaluation criteria might be based on the extent to which the school is perceived to be successful in ‘fixing’ the behavioural problems of pupils. The difficulty that emerges from attempting to define behavioural disorders and create labels for individuals that are based on a multiplicity of perspectives and perceptions, is that we end up with what Galloway and Goodwin (1979) describe as:

“a rag-bag term describing any kind of behaviour that teachers and parents find disturbing.” (P32)

The irony of the labelling process, however, is that once initiated, it may end up perpetuating the very thing it is aimed at controlling (Hargreaves et al 1975), the paradox being that the institutional responses which are intended to control, punish or eliminate the deviant act begin to shape, stabilise and exacerbate the deviance. Norwich (1990) argues, however, that viewing all labelling as negative, and therefore wishing to abandon all labelling, presupposes that the identification of and provision for individual needs can be managed without the use

of some form of conceptualisation that accepts and recognises similarities and differences between individuals. Some needs, however, may be so complex that the identification of need is necessary to inform effective planning and provision in a collaborative way, though it is important that labels - or 'descriptors' - if used, should be done so in a non-stigmatising, non-judgemental and non-isolationist manner. Others, however (Tomlinson, 1994), would argue that labels such as 'EBD' are in themselves stigmatising and devaluing, and part of the research, therefore, is aimed at eliciting the perspectives of stakeholders regarding the effects of the labelling process upon the lives of Line End pupils.

From labelling to re-location.

The assessment and labelling of young people in education is an integral part of the construction of deviance within schools, which embraces the perceptions differing groups have of deviance and deviants, and the causal factors which are seen to create and perpetuate deviancy. Schools are seen to generate deviance and levels of poor achievement in those who do not, or cannot aspire to the cultural norms and expectations of the institution. Opposition and oppositional acts are simply seen as recalcitrance, and 'deviants' are created through the process of labelling those who do not conform (Bourdieu,1966; Hargreaves et al,1975; Sharp and Green,1975; Davies,1976; Apple,1979; Ball,1989).

It might be argued that, historically, the Special Education system has flourished because of the non-adaptability of mainstream classrooms and schools, and there is little evidence to suggest that contemporary classrooms and schools are any more adaptable, or accommodating, of a genuinely heterogeneous pupil population. Skrtic (1991) argues that the bureaucratic model of educational management, prevalent in most institutions, supports a non-adaptable structure, because it is founded on standardisation. Bureaucracies are performance organisations, configured to develop and hone the programmes they have been standardised to perform. These programmes tend to be output orientated, and inform the criteria by which a school may be evaluated and judged to be successful or otherwise - exam results, attendance figures, Ofsted reports, position in league tables. The standardisation of skills is intended, rhetorically, to allow for the accommodation of pupil diversity, but there is a limit to which the organisation can adjust its standardised programmes - and certainly variance between the limits exercised by different schools.

The bureaucratic organisation is therefore more likely to circumscribe heterogeneity through insistence on conformity and the practice of containment, forcing out those who will not conform, and cannot be contained, from the system. The existence of segregated provision, moreover, reaffirms and rationalises the mainstream culture which removes its most difficult pupils; this prevents teachers from recognising (and thus addressing) anomalies in their institutional paradigms, thus limiting the opportunity for effective innovation and development. Given the conflict between the needs of addressing pupil diversity, therefore, and the institutional needs of a bureaucratic organisation aimed at homogeneity, the system cannot help but create pupils who do not fit in. Pupils are subjected to and subjugated by practices which perpetuate this system, and as a result, they are either squeezed in, or squeezed out. This perspective holds particular significance in my own research, especially in relation to the data generated from eliciting the views of pupils at Line End concerning their experiences of mainstream school, and the views of those who have been involved with the reintegration process.

Although Mittler (1990) argues passionately that children with complex social and emotional difficulties need schools which will understand and make allowances for idiosyncratic, apparently anti-social and sometimes eccentric forms of self-expression, the evidence suggests that the case, in reality, is otherwise. Despite the expansion of off-site provision for EBD pupils, there is no evidence to suggest that the 'relocation' model has led to either an improvement in pupil behaviour in schools, nor a decrease in the number of referrals out of school for 'troublesome' pupils (Mongon,1987; McManus,1995; Armstrong and Galloway,1996). Indeed, Lloyd-Smith (1987) poses the question of whether the expansion of provision for EBD pupils has in fact contributed to the increased labelling of children as 'EBD'. On the one hand, it could be seen as a response to demand, but effectually, its existence might discourage the use of alternative within-school strategies for addressing the difficulties presented. Placement in such provision, moreover, may contribute to a socialisation process which not only reinforces a child's 'deviant' self-image, but also validates the perceived need for off-site provision in which to address the needs of that child. In reality, certain groups have the power to define the needs of others and to determine the provision that should be made for the needs that they themselves have decided upon. And within this process, the voices of the true 'clients' - the pupils and their parents - are often unsolicited, unheard, or unheeded (Hargreaves,1982; Goacher et al.1988; Galloway et al.1994; Armstrong and Galloway,1996.)

There is agreement amongst many writers and researchers regarding the within-school factors which may cause or exacerbate disaffection and disruption: McManus (1995, page 15) referred to them as the “social, cultural and environmental factors of school life”, whilst they are described, amongst others, by Herbert (1978), Saunders (1979), Holman (1980), Wilson and Evans (1980), Laslett (1982), ILEA (1984), Cooper (1993), DES (1978, 1987, 1990), DFE (1992, 1994). Bird et al (1981, page 9) observed quite succinctly that:

“Most disaffected behaviour could best be understood as an implied, if not articulate, critique of schooling.”

One of the considerations of my own research study, therefore, has been to evaluate the extent to which stakeholders perceive this to be the case in the mainstream schools from which many of Line End’s pupils have previously come. This may well reflect the perceived value put on certain pupils by the professionals involved with them, and may ultimately have a bearing on their educational career paths.

Despite the perceived role of schools in the generation of disaffection and deviance, however, there are other factors that are perceived to be significant in the causes of deviance, factors which inform the theoretical positions of those who seek to explain and rationalise its existence and impact within schools. Some have sought to interpret the causes of deviance within a framework of environmental and/or family variables (DES 1955; 1978a; 1978b; 1987; Laslett, 1982; Barker, 1977; Montgomery, 1992; Farrell, 1995; Downes, 1997; Wedge and Essen, 1982), or individual pathology (Cantwell, 1975; Barker, 1977; Brassard et al, 1987; The Department of Health, 1991; Collier, 1995). Consequently, an important aspect of the study has been to elicit stakeholder perspectives regarding causality, as such constructions are often significant in informing perspectives on provision, and the criteria by which that provision will be deemed to be effective.

These differing perspectives, however, are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but might be seen, alternatively, as different strands woven into the same tapestry. Furlong (1985) suggests that the multiplicity of insights into the phenomena of school deviance produced by differing theoretical perspectives, though incompatible in terms of single factor causality perspective, offer a wide range of different dimensions through the systematic exploration of deviance; what is lacking, he argues, is a framework within which these dimensions can be integrated. I would suggest that such a context should aim to take account not only of the

factors which impinge upon the lives of children - environmental variables both within and without the school - but also the meanings that children accord to these variables, consciously or otherwise, and the extent to which they inform and underpin responses within the school environment. Whatever the variables, however, Line End has become the educational home for young people whose behaviour is perceived to have crossed the threshold levels of their former mainstream schools. An important consideration, however, is whether the placement of children considered as having 'EBDs' in segregated provision is either desirable or appropriate, a consideration which continues to fuel the inclusion debate today.

In or out - inclusion or segregation?

The Warnock Report (DFE 1978, page 96, para. 6.10) recognised a need to retain segregated special schools for, amongst others:

“those with severe emotional or behavioural disorders who have very great difficulty in forming relationships with others, or whose behaviour is so extreme or unpredictable that it causes severe disruption in an ordinary school or inhibits the educational progress of other children.”

Although presented as a positive reason for maintaining special school, it acknowledges that their existence is not simply about meeting the needs of pupils in the most effective ways, but also about serving the needs of others - teachers, parents, LEAs, the local community, mainstream schools, governors, social services. Almost two decades later, the government has re-addressed the issue of special needs and separate provision (DFEE 1997; DFEE 1998), arguing that inclusion into mainstream education is a desirable goal for children with special educational needs, whilst acknowledging that for some it may not necessarily be appropriate. This has brought to the fore the debate between those who would argue for the full inclusion of every child in mainstream education - and the de-structuring of segregated provision - and those who would argue that, although full inclusion for all is a laudable ideal, there are those, in reality, for whom this would be both impracticable and undesirable.

It is argued (CSIE 1985,) that the practice of segregation has actually impeded the development of comprehensive curricula because it is based on a conflicting philosophy, dependent as it is on a selective model of education, whereby pupils are divided into homogeneous groups and educated in different schools - although 'EBD' pupils, in reality, do

not constitute a homogeneous group, despite the “ catch-all” labels constructed to describe them. Later writers (Dyson,1994; Ainscow,1995; Thomas,1995) argue a case for the desirability and practicability of full inclusion, suggesting that segregated provision represents, amongst other things: benign neglect, institutional abuse, self-interest on the part of those within the Special Needs structure, and the isolation and alienation of certain pupils based on a student deficiency model of need.

Others, however (AWCEBD,1995; Pisano,1991; Lingard,1996), argue that there is a point beyond which mainstream schools should not be trying to cope, where, for example, a child has internalised so much damage from hostile circumstances that they must be given more help, even if it is segregated. Removal, they suggest is to a sanctuary, rather than to a punishing segregation. Mainstream schools, for some, may be a place where they feel isolated, different, rejected - those whose EBD needs are so extreme that it is in no-one’s interests for them to remain in mainstream, nor does an emphasis on integration improve the prospects for them. Such provision does not necessarily represent a lack of commitment to the ideals and practices of integration and inclusion, but rather the acceptance that the range of strategies available within a mainstream setting simply have not worked with and for some pupils, and consequently tolerance levels have been reached and passed within the system and organisation of the school. In the light of such arguments, therefore, it is an important aspect of the study to elicit the perspectives of stakeholders regarding the role of Line End. The aim has been to investigate pupils’ experiences of mainstream school and the processes of labelling, and the extent to which both pupils and parents feel that the goal of placement in mainstream is either desirable or realistic, given past experiences of mainstream and current perspectives of the present placement at Line End.

Perceptions of effectiveness.

As the major focus of my study is the perceived effectiveness of Line End, and the criteria which are felt to be important in informing such evaluations, an examination of perspectives on what constitutes ‘effectiveness’ in education - both mainstream and special - will be useful in locating my own study of Line End, and the evaluation of its policies and practices. There has been extensive research over the last 20 years into those factors which can be associated with effective schools (Rutter et al, 1979; Mortimore et al, 1988; Tizard et al, 1988; Reynolds, 1991; Cuttance, 1992; Silver, 1994; Sammons et al, 1995; Elliott,, 1996; Stoll and

Fink, 1996; White, 1997), strongly contradicting the assertions of earlier American research (Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972) that school differences accounted for only a small percentage of differences in pupil attainments. Much school effectiveness research has been aimed at producing generalisations across samples of schools, based on the generation and analysis of quantitative data (Reynolds, 1992; Gray et al, 1996); it is therefore apposite, in relation to my own study, to assess the pertinence of this mainstream methodology when considering an evaluation of provision in an EBD setting, where data generation does not lend itself to a largely quantitative approach. Research into school improvement, on the other hand, has tended to be informed by qualitative data generated from case studies of individual schools. It will be valuable, therefore, to examine the criteria by which mainstream schools are considered to be effective, the extent to which these are appropriate to informing evaluations of EBD special schools, and the criteria by which EBD schools have been judged to be effective - or otherwise - in the recent past. The defining of a school as 'good' has always involved not only an evaluation of its practices, argues Silver (1994, page 5) but of the way its aims have been established - "the multiple expectations and judgements of multiple constituencies" – supporting my own view about the need to elicit multiple perspectives within the study.

The criteria by which the effectiveness of schools has been widely evaluated, however, have tended to centre on schools' academic attainments (Slee and Weiner, 1998; Lingard et al, 1998.). Many, though, have argued against too narrow an interpretation of achievement when assessing the effectiveness of a school, and for the recognition of a wide range of outcome measures (Gardner, 1983; Riddell and Brown, 1991; Blakey and Heath, 1992; MacBeath, 1992; Cuttance, 1992; Gray, 1995; Perkins, 1995; Creemers, 1996; Goleman, 1996; MacGilchrist, 1997). Mortimore (1992, page 156) argues that:

“the adoption of a broad range of outcome measure is essential if studies are to address, adequately, the all round development of students, and if they are to be used to fudge the effectiveness of schools.”

It may be easier for schools, however, to promote the academic attainment of those pupils whose outcomes reflect positively on the image of the school amongst the local community. One of the dangers, moreover, is that although many children in the system are not failing, they are judged to be so by a reporting system that recognises success for the individual by the number of A-C grades at GCSE and for the institution by the % of pupils gaining these

grades. It may well be, however, that certain children are indeed being failed, due to a disproportionate amount of effort and attention being paid to those pupils who are most likely to 'succeed' according to the narrowly defined interpretations of academic success that much of the education system seems enslaved to.

It is important, therefore, to differentiate between the characteristics of effective schools as outlined in the literature, and the criteria by which a school is judged to be effective by its various stakeholders; the former, I would suggest, are process-based and fairly uncontroversial; the latter, however, are less objective, inextricably linked to the varying perspectives of the institution's stakeholders, and therefore more likely to generate debate and division. This is reflected in Phase I. of my own study, which is focused upon eliciting stakeholders' perspectives and expectations of the role and function of the school.

Effectiveness in the EBD setting.

In eliciting stakeholder evaluations of Line End's effectiveness, it is appropriate, I feel, to consider perceptions of effectiveness in the EBD setting, and to examine the extent to which the 'effectiveness characteristics' pertinent to mainstream, obtain for off-site EBD provision, and the extent to which the criteria used to judge an EBD school as 'effective' differ from or mirror those criteria by which a mainstream school might be judged 'effective.' If pupil performance in SATs at Key Stage 3, and GCSEs at Key Stage 4, is an indicator of a school's effectiveness, then off-site EBD provision is deemed to be giving cause for concern, as many schools/units are seen not to be meeting statutory requirements in relation to the curriculum, and many pupils are seen to be performing below national averages academically (Thomas, 1997; Ofsted/DfEE, 1995; Wylie, 1998). Whilst acknowledging that many 'EBD' Special Schools often appear to be caring places, Ofsted suggests that they offer a poor academic education, leading to low achievement - though Wylie (1998) mitigates this view by arguing that the interplay of teaching and learning is at its sharpest in working with those within the education system that are seen as being the least biddable.

The task of evaluating the effectiveness of EBD schools is less than straightforward, due to the multiple perceptions regarding the criteria by which contemporary EBD provision might be judged 'effective'. Effectiveness after all, argue Cole and Visser (1998), is not a value-free notion bound up, as it is, with the open and covert aims established by the various

stakeholders, which ultimately affect judgements on what exactly it is that constitutes 'effectiveness'; it is therefore important to define exactly who the main stakeholders are, and to establish their perspectives on provision and what they want and expect of EBD schools, before any pronouncement can be made on the institutions effectiveness. This has particular relevance for my own research, and has in fact given it both focus and direction, as before I could initiate my evaluative study, it was important to first address the values, aims and expectations of the school's various stakeholders, once, of course, I had identified who they were.

The concern of some (Beedell, 1993; Marchant, 1995; Peagam, 1995; Greenhalgh, 1994; Laslett, 1995) is that a system of evaluation that is dependent upon schools' and pupils' responses to delivery of the National Curriculum, disadvantages many pupils in EBD settings. It is argued that for such children, it is vital that the environment is such that they feel secure enough to risk the kind of setbacks that have previously alienated them from a mainstream setting; an inflexible focus on delivery of the National Curriculum which stresses predominantly quantifiable academic attainment targets can rekindle and exacerbate the disaffection that has brought them to this provision in the first place. It is important, therefore, to recognise the affective and academic curricula as being inter-dependent and integrated parts of the whole provision if the needs of EBD pupils are to be appropriately met (Greenhalgh, 1994). Too often, however, there seems to exist an artificial separation between the two, with the focus of provision concentrating on one or the other. A polarisation of viewpoints based on differing theoretical frameworks has consequently emerged, between those who feel that the needs of 'EBD' pupils are best met through the curriculum (Bull, 1995; DfEE, 1996; Ofsted, 1997), and those who feel that the emotional and behavioural difficulties experienced by pupils should be the primary focus of provision, best addressed through a therapeutic approach (Laslett, 1977; Lake, 1985; Orr, 1995). Such perspectives will naturally inform practice within schools, and it has therefore been an important part of my own study to elicit the views of stakeholders – particularly Line End staff – regarding the primary function of the school, and the means whereby this might be addressed.

The most recent research findings, however (Cole et al, 1998), suggest that pupils in EBD schools want experiences that match those enjoyed by their friends in mainstream, older pupils recognising the importance of GCSEs and the relevance of SATs. This reflects, possibly, a desire for similarities with mainstream to be highlighted, rather than differences,

although presumably the problem of motivating pupils to meet the challenges of a mainstream-type curriculum still has to be addressed. Indeed, academic success can be a therapeutic experience for pupils whose past educational experience have so often been hallmarked by failure, in terms of raising self-esteem and motivation, and further enhancing achievement, both behaviourally and academically. Research into pupils' views on behaviour management (Millham et al, 1975; Chaplain and Freeman, 1994; Sanders and Hendry, 1997) suggest that children like and desire teachers who are firm but fair, those who will exercise control and discipline over those who would be disruptive, and aspects of my own study are directed towards eliciting stakeholder views on behaviour management practices at Line End, and the extent to which they are considered to be effective in addressing pupils' needs and enhancing the overall effectiveness of the school's provision. Cole et al (1998) report the findings of an Ofsted inspection of an EBD school with a traditional, directive style of behaviour management: 'imposed order', as seen by the researchers, was viewed by the inspectors as contributing to the success of the school in enabling pupils to gain control over their own behaviour, resulting in a positive effect on the quality of learning in the classroom. This reflects an earlier view (Redl and Wineman, 1952) that controls imposed by authority figures from without are more likely to lead to the development of controls from within.

Although it is felt by some that the criteria by which schools are considered to be effective should be the same for special schools as they are for mainstream, it is accepted by others (Mortimore et al, 1983; Dowling and Osborne, 1985; Ling, 1987; Lund, 1989; Bull, 1995) that in the light of the range of difficulties faced by many 'EBD' special school, it may be impracticable to use the same effectiveness criteria that obtain in mainstream for the evaluation of such schools as Line End, based as they are on measurable pupil outcomes at KS3 and KS4. This range of problems often include: a limited or compromised curriculum enforced by a lack of certain subject specialists; limited opportunities for pupils to socialise widely compounded by the difficulties of reintegration into mainstream; the expense in terms of staffing; the stigma associated with such provision; the isolation of staff from co-workers in other schools; buildings and resources that are often inadequate. Dowling and Osborne (1985) suggested that placement meant the loss of good peer models, (and indeed, parents are often concerned about the placement of perceived 'deviants' within one environment, the concomitant 'sin-bin' label, and the image of the school within the community), negative expectations from mainstream teachers, and the de-skilling of mainstream teachers vis-a-vis the behaviour management of EBD pupils.

Evaluations of off-site 'EBD' provision have thus often focused on perceived weaknesses in curriculum provision that are considered to result from some of these concerns (Topping, 1983; DES, 1989; 1989b; Mortimore et al 1993). Balanced against this, however, there is evidence - from the same sources - of benefits in the more flexible approaches of staff, and the opportunities for innovative practice that offer something different for pupils from that which they have rejected at mainstream; it often gives rise, however, to problems of reintegration because of the conflicting aims, objectives, rules, expectations and ethos between off-site provision and mainstream schools, a theme that is investigated in the evaluation of provision and practice at Line End. Ling (1987) reflected upon the tensions between wanting to attend a special school, and the underlying philosophy of reintegration, and ultimately leaving it. Provision, he said, was based on positive inter-personal relationships between staff and pupils, the aim of which was to provide stability and safety, facilitated, partly, by the small numbers within the school. The mainstream, on the other hand, can be perceived as threatening and anonymous, and given the choice, many pupils would prefer to stay where they are. The Elton Report (DES 1989a) too, recognised this dilemma, acknowledging that special schools and units strive to create a therapeutic environment, to foster an ethos of acceptance and trust, to raise self-esteem, and a sense of belonging. Giving priority to emotional needs and the development of such an environment, however, may be difficult to reconcile with the demands of the subject-based national curriculum, and might reduce the likelihood of pupils being successfully reintegrated into mainstream, an issue reflected in the perspectives of stakeholders in my own research study, and in some of the findings relating to the experiences of pupils who have been reintegrated into mainstream from Line End.

Reflections from practitioners.

Since my own study focuses upon the perspectives of the school's various stakeholders, it may be appropriate to include the reflections practitioners in EBD schools and units, outlined in the findings of Dfee/Ofsted (1998), and Cole et al (1999). Although many acknowledged that reintegration and inclusion into mainstream schools should normally be the aim for children being catered for off-site, it was felt that the primary role of EBD schools was to prepare children to take up their roles in society. Where reintegration was deemed practicable, however, it was recognised that the effectiveness of the EBD school in facilitating it was dependent, to a large extent, on how effective the 'receiving' mainstream

school was in translating a policy of inclusion into practice. For inclusion to be effective, it is argued, mainstream schools need to ensure that the school culture and prevailing attitudes are conducive to it. In the light of the potential barriers to successful reintegration - the reticence of mainstream schools to take pupils with emotional and/or behavioural difficulties, inappropriate/ineffective in-school support mechanisms - EBD schools may find themselves in the invidious position of being judged on the effectiveness of their policy and practice of reintegration, when the success or otherwise of such programmes may be largely determined by factors that are outside of their control. On the other hand, however, there is the danger that there might be a reticence on the part of such schools to initiate/facilitate, programmes of reintegration, based on a possessive/over-protective attitude to their pupils.

It is also acknowledged by practitioners that many parents express a conscious preference for their child to be in a special school, with the more generous pupil/teacher ratio, and more intimate and less formal working environment, where there are perceived to be greater opportunities for success than have previously been experienced in mainstream. These, I accept, are the reflections of practitioners at senior management level rather than the findings of a rigorous research project. They do correlate, however, with aspects of my own research, in relation to pupils' experiences of mainstream schools in general, and reintegration in particular. Since one of the aims of Line End is to provide opportunities for reintegration for pupils, then it is appropriate to examine the extent to which stakeholders feel this policy is effective, practicable – or even the extent to which it is felt to be desirable.

As researcher – practitioner within my own school, finally, it is important to ensure that I have used research methods appropriate to the context of the study. In my research, therefore, I have adopted a predominantly qualitative research design, based on the study of a case, which offers depth rather than breadth - 'thick description' of 'detail, context, emotion, and the webs of social relationships' (Denzin, 1989:P83), and pays full attention, to unofficial and unforeseen aspects of what is being investigated. Case-study is seen as being able to make a valuable contribution to educational research methodology generally (Stenhouse,1980; Stenhouse,1982; Burgess,1984; Goetz and LeCompte,1984; Hegarty and Evans,1985; Entwistle, 1988; Nias,1991), and is felt to be particularly appropriate for the study of special education (Corrie and Zaklukiewicz,1985; Hill,1995). There are, however, those who would acknowledge the limitations of case-study methodology – the inability to generalise from the particular - and the dangers of subjectivity and researcher bias (Hargreaves, 1982; Burgess,

1983; Hutchinson, 1988; Vulliamy & Webb, 1992). What is ultimately important is that the study of a situation has been informed by a rigorous and critical approach to data collection, and a rigorous and critical analysis of the data generated.

Conclusion.

It can be seen from a survey of the relevant literature that there exists a multiplicity of perspectives, expectations and interests in relation to children experiencing and presenting difficulties in school. Depending upon the particular perspective and theoretical framework within which one constructs an interpretation of the development of provision for pupils designated as experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties, it will be seen as either a reflection of the interests of those in positions of authority for reasons of social and professional expediency, or as a reflection of the desire of caring professionals and interested others to address the perceived needs of a vulnerable group of children in an effective and appropriate manner. There is also the other consideration, of course, that provision has, and is based, on elements of both these perspectives.

With a continuing emphasis on the management of pupil behaviour within schools, the needs of this small minority of pupils are not being clearly addressed - especially since the predominant construction of deviance is informed by a within-child/deficit model of individual pathology. Until this issue is addressed, therefore, the aim of greater inclusion in mainstream school life for a greater number of pupils designated as being 'EBD' is far from realisation, whilst the rhetoric of full inclusion for all, propagated by some, remains the dogma of idealism rather than the "critical pragmatism" (Skrtic, 1991) needed to inform serious debate about how reintegration and inclusion can become more meaningful and effective for a far greater number of pupils. There is also a pressing need to establish what constitutes good practice in those schools specifically designated as 'EBD Special', as a means of addressing and meeting pupils' needs as effectively as is practicable. Here, however, is the rub: who determines what constitutes 'good practice,' and by what criteria? The reality of multiple stakeholders suggests that there will be multiple perspectives, and it is therefore the aim of this study to investigate the multiple perspectives that inform the evaluations of effectiveness in one particular establishment, and the criteria by which such evaluations are made.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH

PROCEDURES

Aims.

The fundamental aim of the research is to evaluate the provision in a school designated as catering for pupils categorised as having “emotional and behavioural difficulties” in the light of the perspectives and expectations of its stakeholders. It would therefore seem appropriate to tease out sub-questions that need to be answered prior to answering the main question.

A. What constitutes ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties?’

Without a clear view of the difficulties in learning implied by the term ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties,’ it is not possible to evaluate the success of the school in addressing such difficulties. I therefore posed the following questions:

1. How do the various stakeholders perceive the reasons why pupils are placed at Line End school - including the pupils themselves?
2. What are the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the particular needs of these pupils ?
- 3 How do stakeholders perceive the role/function of Line End, and what is perceived to constitute appropriate provision in addressing pupils’ needs?

B. What are appropriate success criteria for an ‘EBD’ school?

Evaluations of the effectiveness of provision made by a school will differ according to the multiple-perspectives of its various stakeholders, and the success criteria against which such evaluations are made will be informed by the differing values, expectations and perceptions of these stakeholders. The formulation of expectations, moreover, will be variously informed by one’s own educational philosophy and the theoretical framework within which it is constructed - notwithstanding the wide and differing range of individual experiences that each participant will bring into the institutional situation - and an understanding, for some, of the research findings (Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992; Hopkins et al, 1994; Sammons et al, 1995), which outline the key characteristics common to effective schools. My research questions, therefore, aim to elicit the expectations of stakeholders, and their perceptions of school effectiveness:

4. What are stakeholders perceptions and expectations of ‘quality’ provision at Line End, and by what criteria might the school thus be judged to be effective ?

5. To what extent are stakeholders' perceptions of such criteria compatible, and to what extent might differing perspectives create tensions and dilemmas within the school?

C. How effective is the school's provision and practice?

These research questions are aimed at establishing the perceptions of stakeholders regarding policy and practice within the school, and the extent to which the provision made by the school is considered to be effective, based on their own perceptions of the criteria by which evaluations of such effectiveness might be made.

6. Based on the criteria suggested by stakeholders, in what areas of provision/practice is the school perceived to be effective, and/or in what areas otherwise ?
7. To what extent do differing perspectives on the effectiveness of provision at Line End create tension and conflict within and amongst stakeholder groups, and what are the implications for practice?

I am aware of an overlap in some of the areas covered by these questions, and recognise too that in the process of the research, further questions were likely to be thrown up that would need to be addressed, bearing in mind that any questions or issues that arose through the process of the research should link closely with the focus of the research itself.

Research design.

For the sake of conceptual clarity, I have separated out the research study into Phase I and Phase II, and for each separate stakeholder group, the two phases were sequential. In addressing the main focus of the research - an evaluation of the effectiveness of Line End as perceived by its stakeholders, it was necessary first to establish the criteria by which such evaluations are made, and the factors which inform these criteria - stakeholder constructions of 'EBD', perspectives of causality, and the perceived role of the school in addressing pupils' needs. This constitutes Phase I of the study. Based on these criteria, Phase II is concerned with establishing the extent to which stakeholders perceive the school to be effective, and the extent to which there is agreement and/or divergence between and amongst stakeholder groups. As a practitioner in school, I have to use research methods appropriate to the context of the study. Data for both phases were generated predominantly through survey methodology, through written questionnaires completed both individually and in small groups, and through interviews. The survey of staff perspectives was most often facilitated

through group discussion during in-service training sessions, as staff were used to this forum as a means of generating and exchanging views and observations. A similar approach was used with pupils, whereby the survey of their perspectives was accommodated within the classroom in their own teaching groups, as this was a familiar environment for them, which provided the greatest opportunity for pupils to speak openly and freely about what they felt. Data from these were supplemented by observation, and the analysis of relevant documentation. A mixture of research methods also helped to facilitate the triangulation of the data generated.

Questionnaire/Survey

This method of data generation is useful in providing a snapshot of respondent's perspectives, which can be used to inform further, more detailed research based on an analysis of findings. Its relative merits and demerits have been variously discussed by Oppenheim (1966), Youngman (1987), Cohen and Manion (1980), Bell (1987). The questionnaire is useful on a number of counts:

1. Since it can be administered in situ, there is a very high level of return, as the administrator/researcher can hand out and collect in the response sheets. (After one such questionnaire with staff, I asked them to complete a short follow up questionnaire over a couple of days, and the return rate dipped noticeably.)
2. It is very time efficient, and can be administered in fixed periods of time.
3. In situ, the researcher is on hand to explain anything that is unclear in the questions.
4. The perspectives of a greater number of respondents can be elicited, and offers all 'players' the chance to have an input.
5. Analysis of data is relatively straight forward, as most of the questionnaires involved closed-question responses based on tick-boxes. The few open-ended question based surveys took more time to analyse, and were more akin to concise interviews.
6. It provides a broad database and can elicit a comprehensive overview of perspectives.
7. It offers anonymity so that respondents can safely impart perspectives on sensitive issues.
8. It can engender a feeling amongst respondents that their views are important and listened to.
9. It can be very focused. The researcher able to target quite specific areas of school life through it.

Though useful, however, there are limitations in the use of questionnaires: they are quite 'broad brush' and provide indicators rather than fine detail, breadth as opposed to depth, and are not suited to data collection on behaviours, attitudes, motivation. The questionnaire is only useful, moreover, if, as according to Frankfort-Nachmias and Frankfort-Nachmias (1992) it translates the objectives of the research into specific questions, and Bell (1991), who suggested that for a questionnaire to be successful, it must be capable of collecting the type of information required to address the research questions, and should be easily understood by respondents. In constructing the questionnaire, therefore, my aim was to pose questions that would not only address the research questions directly, but would also provide some insight into the way that the perspectives of respondents had been constructed. I therefore formulated a series of my own questions which, though informed by extensive reading - particularly in the area of School Effectiveness/Improvement - reflected more idiosyncratically the research questions informing the study, and the information needed to address and answer these questions.

In terms of response rate, moreover, in situ questionnaires fare much better than postal questionnaires, and it is for this reason that I elected not to elicit the perspectives of parents through this method. When the views of parents have been sought in the past, over a range of separate issues, the response rate has always been poor. This is due to the apathy of some, whilst for others, school matters are not seen as being a priority when balanced against other daily concerns. For some parents, however, basic literacy is a problem and a questionnaire either taken home or posted might prove to be incomprehensible and/or perceived as something threatening to them.

When administering the questionnaires, the same procedures were followed with both staff and pupils:

1. The purpose of the questionnaire was made clear at the outset.
2. I gave all respondents my assurance of confidentiality
3. I explained how the findings of the questionnaire/survey would be disseminated, and the ways in which they would help inform the overall plans for school development and improvement.
4. I gave staff sufficient time to read over any material, so that anything that was not clear could be clarified. With pupils, I read out each question, slowly and twice, then went

through all the questions again once I had finished, to ensure that all pupils could access the questionnaire, including those with literacy difficulties.

Interview

As a means of generating data, the interview provides greater depth than that afforded by survey/questionnaire - a key technique of data collection, argue Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) - though as a means of eliciting perspectives and information from respondents, there are both advantages and disadvantages for the researcher, outlined and argued variously by Brenner (1985), Burgess (1984), Wragg (1987), Woods (1986), Robson (1994), Silverman (1993), Cohen and Manion (1994), Holstein and Gubrium (1997), Miller and Glassner (1997), Prior (1997), Silverman (1997).

Arguments that outline the advantages of the interview as a research tool suggest that:

- i. because of its interactive nature, the interview process allows for the interviewer to react to, and follow up on responses that given, and allows for a more probing investigation than would be facilitated by a questionnaire (Powney and Watts, 1987).
- ii. the interview, if tape-recorded, provides a verbatim account of what is said, and therefore the accuracy of utterances can be guaranteed.
- iii. analysis of interview transcripts can lead to avenues of further investigation, and can inform follow-up interviews for clarification, confirmation, elaboration, explanation. (Bell,1993).
- iv. it allows the interviewer to step into the shoes of the interviewee, and to view the world as they do themselves (McCracken, 1988).

Despite, however, the clear advantages of the interview as a research tool, there are a number of potential drawbacks of which the researcher should be aware:

- i. although interviewees might give their permission for the interview to be tape-recorded, it might inhibit freedom of expression in some respondents, who may not always be prepared to answer questions openly. This is not to say that people are deliberately deceitful, but rather often have a built-in sense of self-protection, and might feel that to be totally open on certain issues may constitute a risk of personal compromise. This validates one of the arguments of Woods (1986), that one of the most important attributes of interviewers - along with curiosity and naturalness - is trust. Much, therefore, depends on the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee, the trust that one has in the

- other, and the guarantee of confidentiality and, if appropriate, anonymity.
- ii. one of the problems when interviews are not tape-recorded relates to the ‘detail of utterances’ in what I would term ‘contemporaneous participant note-taking’, as unless the interview is recorded verbatim through shorthand, then the interviewer has to select when to note down verbatim comments, and when to simply note down the gist of what has been said, and ensure that the sum of the parts produces an accurate whole.
 - iii. respondents may give the responses that they feel the interviewer expects, or wants to hear.
 - iv. it can be a time-consuming activity, especially the transcribing of interview records.

In setting up and executing the interviews with staff and pupils, I followed a set of procedures, outlined as follows:

- a. I selected the interviewees and sought their permission for a tape-recorded interview in the near future, explaining in general terms what I wanted to talk about.
- b. A week before the interview, I confirmed the exact time and location of the interview, and gave the staff involved a sheet of ‘guiding’ questions, so that they would have some time to organise their thoughts.
- c. For the interview, I selected locations where there would be the least likelihood of interruption, and at the start, explained the purpose of the interview, and how I intended to use the findings. I also said that once I had transcribed the interview I would go over it with interviewees - giving a copy to staff and giving a verbal summary to pupils - so that they could affirm, or otherwise, their contributions/ perceptions.
- d. At the outset, I also gave assurances of confidentiality when the work was written up.
- e. I invariably started off the interview with a question aimed at making interviewees feel relaxed, usually about themselves and some personal details/circumstances.
- f. Although I used as a reference a set of prepared questions – outlined later in the section - in view of the study’s exploratory and investigative nature, I used them more as a structure within which to probe and foray for the insights, explanations, opinions and perceptions of interviewees.

Observation (participant/non-participant.)

Observation is a valuable means of data-collection and its potential benefits and drawbacks have been variously outlined by Bailey (1978), Spradley (1980), Fetterman (1988), Hitchcock and Hughes (1989), Patton (1990), Robson (1994). A distinction is often made between participant and non-participant observation: whilst non-participant observers aim to distance themselves from the subjects of the study - although they can still influence events - participant observers immerse themselves in the research environment, 'going native' as Denzin (1970) describes. The dividing lines between the two, especially in case study research, however, are not as necessarily clear cut as might be assumed, as by virtue of my role within the school I am most often - or become - a participant in events, as I am often drawn into the very situation that I am observing, and become participant in it. Nevertheless, there are clear advantages to being a participant observer in my own study:

- i. I can get close to what I am observing, and observe from the inside
- ii. It provides a variety of opportunities, often unexpected, for collecting data
- iii. By virtue of my position, I am able to manipulate situations in order to create data-collecting opportunities
- iv. My knowledge of and experience in the case-study environment ie. Line End, can provide an accurate context in which the events being observed can be interpreted.

There is, however, the question of whether people should know they are being observed, and whether permission should be sought to record the observations. The dilemma of 'unstructured' observation is that on the one hand it offers opportunities to record real situations and natural behaviour, the danger being that people's behaviour will almost certainly change if they know they are being observed, whilst on the other hand it could compromise relationships and an atmosphere of trust if it was discovered that such observations were being made and recorded. Out of the many activities that participants engage in - their many behaviours and interactions, their spoken words and conversations - choices have to be made about what to observe systematically, and what to record when what is seen and heard is a day to day aspect of school life. Establishing a pre-determined observation 'itinerary' is less problematic than controlling for observations made of, and in, the instances that constitute the milieu of everyday school life, especially those observed in the unstructured areas of time and place of school life. As researcher in situ, I must select from all that I observe those instances that I record; it is essential, therefore, that what is recorded is both informed by and addresses the research questions that inform and drive the

study. The basis for my selections, however, rests on the meanings that I construct from what I observe, which lends itself to the potential for subjectivity and bias on the part of the researcher: it is easy to see what one wants to see as a means of confirming one's own interpretations, perspectives and constructions of meaning, and it has been my aim in this aspect of the study to gather such data which both addresses the focus of the study as outlined in the research questions, and triangulates data from other sources.

Observation in the field of the school has aimed to locate stakeholders' perspectives within the wider social and historical context of the school, and much of it has been in structured situations, particularly in meetings: staff meetings, in-service training sessions, SMT meetings; meetings with pupils/parents. In each instance, I made contemporaneous notes where I felt it to be appropriate, and wrote these up into a research diary after the event. Where this was not practicable, I wrote up my recollections after the event, recording the germane verbatim utterances where possible. They were reviewed regularly during the analysis of other data - rather than being subjected to a discrete and focused analysis per se - and supplemented by comments regarding my own interpretation and construction of their relationship and relevance to other data.

Documentation.

I referred to documentation which related to the role/function of Line End - the aims of the school taken from the 1996 School Handbook, and documentation relating to performance indicators/monitoring and evaluation data. These included:

- i. Attendance Figures (1992-1998)
- ii. HMI Report (1987)
- iii. LEA pre-Ofsted mini Inspection (1996)
- iv. LEA Behaviour Support Plan
- v. Ofsted Inspection (1997)
- vi. Post Ofsted Key Issues
- vii. Reintegration Records (1992-1997)
- viii. Annual Reviews (1998/99: Parent/pupil contributions)

As a means of conducting textual analysis of the documents, I followed the guidance of Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) where appropriate and practicable, by asking a series of questions:

- How, by whom, for whom and for what purpose has this particular document been written?
- When, and by whom might they be read, and with what outcomes?
- What is written, and what is omitted?

When presenting data in the Report and writing up Findings, I have sought, in all instances, to protect the anonymity of the school and the local authority, and have changed the names and initials of all those who have been involved in the study –staff, pupils, parents, LEA and LA representatives. In isolated cases, certain individuals might be recognisable by their roles by some people, but where this happens it is only because it is unavoidable, as their ‘contribution’ to the study is felt to be both significant and important.

Generating the data.

Data that are pertinent to the particular phase of the research have been generated in three ways; these are through specific research exercises with specific stakeholder groups – or individuals from those groups – administered as a means of generating data for:

- either Phase I or Phase II.
- both Phase I and Phase II.
- Phase II, but where further data have been extrapolated from the analysis of stakeholder responses that may appropriately address areas of focus in Phase I.

In examining the extent to which provision made by Line End was felt to be effective by its stakeholders, I felt it important, for the first phase of the research study, to:

- establish stakeholder perceptions of the particular area of educational provision made by Line End within the wider educational environment, and their constructions of the ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties’ descriptor with which the pupils had been designated. [Research questions 1-3.]
- establish the various perspectives of stakeholders regarding the criteria by which the effectiveness of provision at Line End might be evaluated, and the values and expectations which inform them. [Research questions 4-5]

Based on stakeholders’ perceptions of the criteria by which the effectiveness of provision at Line End might be evaluated, the second phase of the research focused on the extent to which

Line End's stakeholders felt the school to be 'effective,' and the implications of differing and conflicting stakeholder perspectives for practice. [Research questions 6-7.]

Tables 1 and 2 outline the data elicited from staff and pupils, and highlight the research tools used, and the phase of the study and the research questions to which they relate. The 'focus' section of the tables represents individual sessions conducted with the particular stakeholder groups, during which the pertinent data were generated, whilst the 'location' section indicates where the pertinent data may be found. Data indicated as being in the appendices will also have been summarised in the appropriate Findings section of the Report.

Table 1: Data generated from staff.

FOCUS	Research Tool used	PHASE	Research Questions.	Location of data.
Reasons for pupil disruption.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I	1	Appendix A.
Understanding of the 'EBD' pupil.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I	2.	Main Findings: Phase I.
Role/function of Line End.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	3.	Main Findings: Phase I.
Qualities of teachers of pupils with 'EBDs.'	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	2.	Appendix B.
Behaviours causing concern in class.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I	2.	Appendix C.
What things would make Line End the 'ideal' school?	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	3, 4.	Appendix D.
What do you want for Line End?	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	3, 4.	Appendix E.
What constitutes 'quality' at Line End?	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	4.	Appendix F.
Effectiveness Criteria.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	4.	Appendix G.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Line End's provision.	Small group (3/4) survey. N = 13.	I.	6.	Appendix H.
Role of the school.	Individual 114 statement survey. N = 15.	I and II.	3, 4, 6.	Appendix I
Evaluation criteria.	Follow-up questionnaire. N = 15, 12 returned.	I and II.	3, 4, 5.	Main Findings Phase II.
Evaluations of effectiveness.	Tape-recorded interviews. N = 5.	I and II.	2,3,4,5,.6	Appendix K; Main Findings Phases I and II.
Overview of Line End's provision (PGCE student)	Questionnaire.	I and II.	3, 4, 6.	Appendix J.
Addressing academic needs.	Individual questionnaire N = 18.	II.	6, 7.	Appendix L.
Effectiveness of reintegration policy	Tape-recorded interview – 2 outreach teachers.	I and II.	1,2,3,5,6.	Main Findings Phase I and II.

Table 2: Data generated from pupils.

FOCUS	Research Tool used	PHASE	Research Questions.	Location of data.
Why are you at Line End?.	Small group survey. [form gps of 6/7.] N = 34.	I	1, 2.	Appendices Li and Lii.
What would make Line End the 'perfect' school?.	Small group survey. [form gps of 6/7.] N = 32.	I	3, 4	M.
What should Line End be doing for me?.	Individual survey. N = 32.	I.	3, 4.	N.
Good and bad things about Line End.	Individual survey. N = 35.	I and II.	4, 6.	Appendix O.
Role of Line End	Individual 60 statement survey N = 34.	I and II	3, 4, 6.	Appendix P.
Evaluation criteria.	Follow-up survey N = 33.	I and II.	3, 4, 6.	Main Findings Phases I and II.
Evaluations of effectiveness.	Tape-recorded interviews N = 10.	I and II.	1,2,3,4,6.	Appendix T; Main Findings Phases I and II.

Addressing academic needs.	i. individual questionnaire. N = 31.	II.	6	Q
	ii. Follow – up whole group survey. N = 35.	I and II.	3, 6.	R.
Ethos/ Environment.	i. individual bullying survey. N = 35.	II.	6.	Main Findings Phase II.
	ii. follow-up whole-class survey. N = 35	II.	4, 5, 6.	Main Findings Phase II.

Data from parents came from the documentation from Annual Reviews (Appendices Ui/ii.) and from interviews (Appendix Uiii.) informing findings appropriate to both phases of the research. LEA perspectives were drawn from relevant documentation, as were the perspectives of DfEE/Ofsted, data informing the findings for both Phase I and II. Data from both participant and non-participant observation were initially recorded in note form, and then written up into a research journal, an extract from which can be seen in Appendix W. Extracts from Government inspections of Line End – a 1987 HMI Report, and the 1996 Ofsted Report, is in Appendix X, whilst data for attendance from 1992 – 1998, and the reintegration of pupils to mainstream from 1992 – 1997, are included in Appendix Y.

As a means of ensuring transparency and integrity throughout the study, it is important to outline in appropriate detail the means whereby the data were generated from the various stakeholder groups, and in the following section, the information outlined in skeleton form in Tables 1 and 2 is expanded upon in the following section. I chose not to replicate the same questions and methodology with each group, but chose, rather, to use questions and methodologies that I felt to be the most relevant and appropriate for each individual group as a means of generating data in the most pragmatic and effective manner. Because, moreover, data that were generated from particular sessions were often pertinent to both Phase I and Phase II of the research, I have outlined what has been asked of stakeholders and the specific research questions being addressed, rather than separating out the research procedure into the two discrete phases.

Staff.

In eliciting the perspectives of staff, I relied predominantly on survey/questionnaire within a series of in-service training sessions. 13 staff were involved in the first full training day, 9 teaching staff - including the senior management team of three - and 4 classroom assistants.

In generating data in these sessions, staff were divided into groups of three or four (with at least one non-teaching member of support staff in each group) and asked to 'brainstorm' and discuss ideas, recording them on a piece of flip-chart paper. After a set time, the groups came together in a plenary session and presented their responses, one by one, to the whole staff, this forming the basis for open discussion on issues that emerged from group findings. Notes were taken on what was said, and written up into a research journal subsequently.

In investigating the constructions of emotional and behavioural difficulties, each group was asked to consider the following questions:

- a. What are the reasons why some pupils in schools (generally) disrupt and/or become disaffected?
- b. What is your understanding of a pupil designated as 'EBD'?
- c. What do you perceive as being the role/function of Line End School?
- d. What are the perceived strengths/qualities that a teacher of 'EBD' pupils might be expected to have? [Research Questions 1 – 3.]

The aim of this exercise was to establish and analyse the range and breadth of perspectives relating to how practitioners viewed the pupils with whom they worked on a daily basis, and to establish the links between constructions of the 'EBD' pupil, and the perceived role of Line End. As a final exercise after this session, I asked all staff to jot down, individually, the five behaviours that caused them most concern in class [Research Question 1.] after which I collected the papers and collated the responses later on. This was done to establish the extent to which there was a pluralism of perspectives amongst the small staff group at Line End in terms of one small aspect of school life, and, through further investigation and analysis, the extent to which differing perspectives - and their consequences - are worked out in the life of the school.

In eliciting perspectives as to what constitute appropriate success criteria, staff were asked to work in small groups to address the following questions:

1. What factors would contribute to making Line End the 'ideal' school?

2. What do you want for Line End - for pupils, for staff, for the school as an institution?
3. What constitutes quality at Line End?
4. By what criteria might Line End be judged effective?

[Research Question 3-4.]

By establishing staff perspectives on the aims and expectations of provision at Line End, an evaluation of effectiveness might justifiably be based on the extent to which it is felt those aims are being realised, and the extent to which the school is judged to be fulfilling the expectations of stakeholders.

At a subsequent training session, the same 13 staff were asked, in small groups, to consider what they felt to be the strengths and weaknesses of provision at Line End. Findings highlighted not only perceptions of how effective Line End was felt to be in certain areas, but also the criteria by which staff would judge the school to be effective or otherwise, criteria that were not necessarily articulated when staff were asked to consider this issue.

[Research Questions 4 and 6.] There was clearly a divergence of opinion about the relative importance of the academic and affective curricula – reflected also in the literature (Bull, 1995, Orr, 1995) This led to the construction of a 114-statement survey regarding the role of the school and the extent to which it was felt this role was being fulfilled, (Appendix Ii) administered and completed individually by staff. This was informed by and reflected staff perceptions generated in an earlier in-service training session: the analysis of the data from these sessions provided the themes which informed the construction of the survey, in which staff were asked to respond to statements about what the school should or should not be doing in terms of policy and provision, and the extent to which these things were reflected in day to day practice. The subsequent analysis of the findings allowed for the triangulation of data from a range of staff responses. The collated findings of the survey were handed out to staff a week later, with a short questionnaire asking staff to respond to the findings of the survey.

This questionnaire posed the questions:

1. In what areas of school life do you feel staff are generally agreed?
2. In what areas of school life are there differing perspectives/viewpoints amongst staff?
3. Of these areas, which do you feel should be addressed as a matter of importance?

4. In what areas of the school is there general agreement on effective practice?
5. Where is it felt we are being less effective than we might?
6. Are there any other observations from the survey that you feel are worthy of note?

Staff were subsequently surveyed, individually, regarding their perceptions of pupils' learning, the questionnaire taken directly from Beresford et al (1996). I elected to use it as a means of eliciting staff perspectives on how the school was seen to address pupils' academic needs, and how effectively it was felt this was being done, as findings from earlier parts of the research suggested that the quality of provision in addressing pupils' academic needs was one of the important criteria by which the effectiveness of the school might be evaluated. Data generated for these aspects of the research can be seen in the appropriate appendices. (A – L.) During this time, a questionnaire was completed by a mature student who worked a two week placement at Line End as part of her PGCE. Although two weeks is barely sufficient time to formulate a perspective that is informed by an intimate and experienced understanding of practice and provision within the school, I felt it might be an informative exercise to elicit the views of an outsider who, for a brief period, became accepted as an insider, and whose observations and perspectives were unaffected by any history of internal relationships or other significant agenda. This exercise initially started off as an intended interview; I gave Mrs R. a list of questions that I wished to cover (Appendix Ji) and set up an interview for the following day. The following morning, however, she gave me a word-processed set of responses to the questions (Jii.) saying she preferred to do it this way rather than being interviewed.

Finally, I tape-recorded a series of interviews with five of the nine full-time staff at Line End. My aim was to generate information from teachers whose experiences and histories represented different points on the professional continuum. Teacher A had taught at Line End for 20 years, and had no direct experience of mainstream teaching. She had, however, taught under 3 separate heads, and had clearly experienced a number of significant changes in provision and practice during her time there. My aim was to establish her perspectives on the provision made by the school over time, and how her own perceptions of 'EBD' had been formulated and shaped by her own experiences. It was also important to elicit her views on the criteria by which Line End might be judged effective, whether these had changed over

time, and the extent to which she felt current provision and practice to be effective. It could be argued that an institutions ability and willingness to adapt to changing environmental circumstances - political, economic, demographic, educational - is one criterion by which effectiveness may be judged, and therefore eliciting the views of Teacher A seemed appropriate as a means of evaluating this. An extract from this interview, as a means of presenting some of the raw data, can be seen in Appendix Ki.

Teachers B, C and D were asked to respond to the questions:

1. What do you perceive the role/function of Line End to be? [Research Question 3]
2. Do you feel the school is effective in fulfilling its role/function? [Research Question 6]
3. What criteria do you feel would be appropriate in evaluating the effectiveness of Line End's provision? [Research Question 4]
4. Based on these criteria, to what extent do you feel that Line End is being effective, and to what extent otherwise? [Research Question 6]

Teacher B had worked at Line End for 2 years, having worked previously as the SEN co-ordinator in a nearby 11-16 comprehensive school. Teacher C had worked at Line End for 5 years, and came as an NQT straight from University. He therefore has no experience of teaching in a mainstream school, nor any other educational institution (bar teaching practice), his working life to date being spent at Line End. Teacher D had worked at Line End for a year, and had worked 10 years previously for 3 years at Line End Junior. In the intervening period, he had left teaching for a while, but had later returned to a series of short-term contracts in mainstream primary schools. Teacher E had been at Line End for a term, having recently taught science at an all boys 11-16 comprehensive in the authority. Although her very recent experience of mainstream provision was not unimportant, what was of greater significance to the study was the generating of data that related to her expectations of the policy, provision and practice of Line End, her initial impressions as she adjusted to working there, and the relationship between the two after her first term; it was also of interest to note how her expectations and perspectives might have changed over that period, and whether, for example, the criteria by which the effectiveness of the school might be judged as she started, were the same criteria after a term.

I also chose to interview two teachers from the schools outreach team, who worked in mainstream schools to support those pupils whose challenging behaviour was perceived, by the school, to be putting them at risk of exclusion, and who had a foot, as it were, in both

camps. In generating these data, I tape-recorded an interview with both teachers together (Appendix Kii.) based on the following questions:

1. How do you see your role as an outreach team members within the Farside EBD service?
2. How do mainstream teachers perceive your role?
3. What support do pupils who are perceived as having challenging behaviour, receive in the schools you work in?
4. To what extent do you feel that the problem of challenging behaviour is perceived by mainstream schools as being 'within child'?
5. How might structures and practices within a school impact upon the life of a child who is perceived as having 'behavioural difficulties'?
6. How do you feel children acquire the 'EBD' label, and is it justified?
7. What are the extent of your dealings with pupils who've been reintegrated from special provision?
8. Is there hope for Line End's reintegration policy?
9. By what criteria would you judge the effectiveness of the schools you work in?
10. By what criteria would you judge the effectiveness of Line End.
11. Based on these criteria, and from what you observe when you are here, do you consider Line End to be an effective school?

Pupils.

In eliciting the perspectives of pupils I endeavoured to keep the questions as simple as possible, so that there was as clear an understanding as practicable as to what they were responding to. I was able to use a teaching period to start a discussion with each class in the school based on the research topic that I wished to investigate, asking pupils to consider and respond to various questions. Rather than asking them to write down their views - the process of writing being threatening to some – they simply gave their responses verbally, and 'brainstormed' responses were written onto the chalk-board, and used to inform open discussion amongst pupils on the issues that arose from the questions under consideration. With a maximum of seven pupils in each class, it was a manageable exercise, and ensured that the flow of conversation and discussion could continue uninterrupted. I recorded in a notebook pupils' verbatim responses in discussions, and as soon after each session with each year group as was practicable, the data were collected and collated, and subjected to qualitative content analysis at a later stage.

The first stage of research with pupils concerned their understanding of their own positions within the educational system and their experiences of schooling, based around the question: 'Why do you feel you have ended up at Line End?' I felt that this would generate useful data regarding pupil perspectives about the purposes of education, how they felt they had been served by it in a mainstream setting, and the extent to which these perspectives informed their understanding of their placement at Line End. [Research questions 1-3.] Out of a possible 40 pupils who were on role at the time, 34 were present throughout the week when this aspect of the research was carried out. Pupils were subsequently asked what they felt would make Line End their 'perfect' school, and in a follow up lesson were asked to respond to two related questions: what do you feel Line End should be doing for you? Would you like to go back to a mainstream school? [Research questions 3-4.] The aim of these questions was to establish what pupils wanted/expected from their education, generally, and from Line End in particular, and the extent to which Line End, in their views, was able to make that provision. Responses would also inform the criteria by which pupils would evaluate the extent to which the school was 'successful' in meeting their felt needs and expectations.

A further survey of pupils was aimed at eliciting general impressions of what they liked and disliked about the school, as a means of establishing their evaluations of the effectiveness of Line End's provision, and also extrapolating from the responses the tacit criteria upon which these evaluations are made. [Research questions 4 and 6.] Pupils were asked to respond to the questions: what are the things in Line End that make it a good school, and what are the things don't you like about Line End, and what would you change to make it better. 35 pupils in total were involved in this exercise. Subsequent to this, pupils (34) were asked to respond, individually, to a bank of 60 statements, to which they could simply agree or disagree. This exercise replicated, in a simpler form, that which was presented to staff at a parallel stage, the aim being to provide an overview of the areas of school life where provision was felt to be effective or otherwise

After a qualitative content analysis of these findings, through which responses were collated and categorised into emergent themes, a further survey was conducted with each pupil, which focused on their attitudes to academic experiences within the classroom. 31 pupils in total responded YES/NO to 11 statements for each of the 13 subjects they studied:

1. I like/enjoy it.
2. I find it easy.

3. I find it interesting.
4. I muck about in it.
5. I usually learn something.
6. I set targets for myself.
7. My teacher sets targets for me.
8. I feel I am improving.
9. I get rewards for doing well.
10. I like the teacher.
11. I can see the reason for studying it.

Following this survey, I prepared a set of follow-up questions which I asked of each group as a whole, aimed at encouraging pupils to elaborate on their survey responses, and to provide greater detail of their experiences and feelings about life within the classroom. Responses were noted down from the 34 pupils who were present during these lessons.

1. What sort of things do you like/enjoy in lessons?
2. What sort of things do you find difficult?
3. What sort of things do you find interesting?
4. How do you muck around?
5. Why do you muck around?
6. What sort of targets do you/your teacher set for you?
4. Do the targets help you in your learning?
5. How do you feel you are improving in your learning?
6. What are the things you like about those teachers you like?
10. What are the things you don't like?.

A subsequent survey of 35 pupils was aimed at eliciting experiences of bullying, prompted by findings from the earlier phase of the research relating to 'effectiveness criteria' for Line End, which suggested that bullying was a pertinent factor in pupils' evaluations of the school's effectiveness – what the school was getting right. Pupils were asked, individually, to state whether they had been bullied in school, and whether they had bullied other pupils. This was followed up by whole-group discussions, based on the results of this survey, where pupils had the opportunity to relate their own experiences and observations, with notes taken contemporaneously, and collated after the lesson. Data from these aspects of the research can be seen in the Appendices. (M – T.)

Finally, I tape-recorded structured interviews with ten pupils, which comprised 4 year 7 pupils, 2 year 9 pupils and 5 year 10 pupils, a representation of pupils spanning the continuum from induction in year 7 to dispatch at year 11. With the year 7 pupils, I conducted the interviews in their first half of the spring term at the school. Out of a possible six pupils (one place was not filled until the summer term,) the two pupils who had the best 'disciplinary' record, and the two who had the worst, based on the records of pupils who had been sent out/walked out of class during the period September - December of that academic year, were selected for interview. The initial part of the interview focused on their experiences pre-Line End, and was aimed at finding out how they perceived their 'route' to Line End, and the labels that had been placed upon them, building upon the group work undertaken at an earlier stage. This related to the research questions dealing with stakeholders' perceptions of the reasons for placement at Line End, and pupils' perceptions of their own needs.[Research Questions 1 and 2.] From this point, I sought to elicit their expectations of the school [Research Questions 3 and 4] and having had time to settle in, the extent to which they felt these expectations were being realised in the short term.[Research Question 6.] The questions I asked of these pupils were:

1. What school were you at before you came to Line End?
2. What sort of things did you like about it?
3. Are there any things you didn't like?
4. Why do you feel you came to Line End rather than a mainstream school?
(For those pupils who had come from Line End Junior, I also asked why they felt that they had ended up at Line End Junior from their last mainstream primary.)
5. Now that you're at Line End, what do you want to get from being here?
6. Would you eventually like to go to a mainstream secondary school?
7. How do you feel you've settled in since you've been here?
8. What are the things you like about Line End?
9. Are there any things you don't like?
10. What sort of things would make the school a better place?

The two pupils interviewed from year 9 were selected because they were both being considered for reintegration to mainstream. Halfway through their secondary school career, the interview gave them an opportunity to look back on their experiences in the first half, and reflect on their expectations of Line End when they first started [Research Questions 2-4] and the extent to which these had been fulfilled.[Research Question 6.] It also encouraged them

to look ahead, to articulate their expectations for their remaining years in compulsory education, and the role they perceived Line End playing - if any - in the fulfilment of these expectations.[Research Questions 3-4.]

The four year 11 pupils I interviewed represented a range of experiences. One pupil had been reintegrated into a mainstream school from Line End when he was in year 9, but the placement lasted less than a year, and he returned full-time to Line End. (An extract from his interview, which relates to his experiences of reintegration, can be seen in Appendix Ti.) Another pupil had come to Line End in the first term of year 10, having been permanently excluded from his mainstream school, and by the closing stages of his time at year 11, was perceived by staff to have become disaffected, and as a result of inappropriate behaviour in class and around school, he was sent home eight times in the space of the spring term, his parents having to accompany him back to school on each occasion. Another pupil, one of the three girls on role at the time, had all but stopped coming in, and I managed to secure my interview with her on the day that she came in to complete her GCSE Art coursework. (Extracts from her interview can be seen in Appendix Tii.) The focus of this interview was to elicit her perspectives on the role of Line End [Research Question 3] and the extent to which she felt Line End was effective in fulfilling this perceived role. [Research Question 6.]

Parents.

I felt that the most effective way of generating data from the greatest number of parents would be through a short interview; these could then be supplemented by parents' contributions to the Annual Review of pupils' statements. An example of a written contribution by a parent who was unable to attend the review can be seen in Appendix Ui, whilst the contribution made by a parent in the Review itself, and noted down by the SENCO chairing the meeting, can be seen in Appendix Uii. Analysis of the documentation from the Annual Reviews was based on the submissions of 29 parents, recorded by the school's SENCO responsible for organising the reviews, and written up into the Annual Review Statement

In setting up the interviews, I sent letters to all parents asking them if they would be willing to participate in a short interview - about 30 minutes - explaining that in planning for school improvement, I felt that the views and opinions of parents were an important part of the process. Of the 40 letters sent out to parents/carers, I received 25 positive replies. I asked each of these 25 parents, first of all, why they felt their children were placed at Line End. I

then asked them how they felt the school should be providing for their children, and what things, for them, would make Line End an effective school. Following this, I then asked them how they felt the school was performing – based on their own expectations of the school’s role – and the extent to which they felt it was being effective in providing for their children.

At the start of the first interview, I asked permission to tape-record, but the parent said she preferred it not to be tape-recorded, because she didn’t feel comfortable with it, but she assented to me taking notes. Based on this, I took the decision simply to take notes during each interview, after securing permission from parents, and after the interview I read back the notes to parents to check for accuracy. (An extract from the interview with the parent of a Year 9 pupil can be seen in Appendix Uiii.) In each interview, the anonymity of parents was offered and guaranteed.

Farside LEA.

Eliciting the perspectives of the LEA proved to be more problematic than I had anticipated. After securing the agreement of the assistant education officer (SEN) from Farside Education Authority to complete a short questionnaire, I handed over a sheet with three questions:

- i. How do you perceive the role of Line End within Farside’s overall educational provision?
- ii. What might be considered as appropriate criteria for effective provision at Line End?
- iii. Based on those criteria, to what extent do you feel Line End makes effective provision for its pupils?

I felt it important to establish not only the LEA’s perspectives on these issues, but the extent to which they might reflect constructions of pupils designated as having emotional/behavioural difficulties. The Education Officer for Special Education felt, however, that it was not appropriate for him, or any of his staff, to complete it, but rather it would be more appropriate for one of the ‘elected members’ to do so.

At a later stage I also approached the educational psychologist allocated to the school to ascertain whether she was prepared to be interviewed about her perspectives on the role of Line End, effectiveness criteria and the extent to which she felt Line End to be effective in its

provision. An interview, however, was not granted, but rather it was suggested that members of Farside's Advisory Service would be better placed to answer such questions, as they were all registered Ofsted Inspectors, and were therefore more au fait with the Ofsted criteria for effectiveness, which the EP felt were the most appropriate means whereby the effectiveness of Line End might be evaluated. The only two advisers who had had direct contact with the school since the inception of Farside's EBD Service in 1992 - and the only two, therefore, to be in a position to offer informed evaluations of the school's effectiveness - were those who conducted a 'mini-inspection' of Line End - referred to by the LEA beforehand euphemistically as a 'healthcheck' - prior to a full Ofsted inspection. By its own admission, however, it was "possible to make only limited judgements about attainment and progress from the evidence seen."

This may well have been due to the limitations of time, the inspection involving two advisers in the school for only two days. The inspection was based on the Ofsted framework, and the criteria used to inform evaluations of effectiveness are those that were used by Ofsted the following year. I approached one of the advisers during the formulation of the school's post-Ofsted Action Plan with which she was involved, with a view to conducting an interview with her. (the other having taken up a new post in an inner London education authority.) She declined my invitation, however, on the grounds that there was nothing that she could add that was not contained in her own inspection report, or the subsequent Ofsted report. Consequently, I had to rely mainly on documentary sources as a means of eliciting the LEA perspective on the role/provision of Line End – the Authority's Behaviour Support Plan - drawn up in response to Section 527A of the 1996 Education Act (DfEE, 1996) which places a duty on LEAs to prepare a statement setting out their arrangements for the education of children with behavioural difficulties – and the LEA inspection Report, the only documents – other than the school's – which relate to the role and function of EBD provision within Farside.

Farside Local Authority.

In eliciting the perspectives of the Local Authority, I approached Mr. V, a member of the 'looked after children' team – the Local Authority's representative responsible for the oversight of the education of 'looked after children' – and asked him if he would be prepared to contribute to the research study by being interviewed about his perceptions on the 'EBD-ness' of the pupils for whom his service was responsible, how he perceived the role of Line

End, and the extent to which he felt the school was effective in fulfilling its perceived role. I wrote out a number of questions aimed at providing a structure for the interview, which he took away to peruse. Before I was able to arrange an interview date, however, Mr. V. returned the form, having filled it in after discussing the questions – and appropriate responses - with his line manager, who had suggested a written response rather than an interview. The questions they responded to were:

1. What, to you, is an 'EBD' pupil?
2. What do you feel the role/function of Line End to be?
3. What do you feel should be the indicators of quality that would define Line End as being an effective 'EBD' school?
4. Based on these criteria, to what extent do you feel that Line End is an effective 'EBD' school?
5. Are there any areas where you feel improvement might be made?

Analysis of data.

Initial analysis of Phase 1. findings followed fairly closely the model outlined by Marshall and Rossman (1989), constructed around the five stages of: organising the data; generating categories; testing the emergent themes against the data; searching for alternative explanations; writing up the findings. It involved, in the first instance, categorisation of data by source: data generated from the various stakeholders were separated out and collated under the headings of pupils, staff, parents, field-notes, documentation. From this point I conducted a content analysis of the findings based upon the headings under which the research questions were grouped:

- Constructions of EBD, subdivided into:
 - i. perceptions of the 'EBD' descriptor.
 - ii. perceptions of causality.
 - iii. the perceived role of Line End.
- Criteria against which the effectiveness of Line End might be evaluated.

Having done this, I then analysed further the data elicited from the major stakeholders, and from the responses from each group established a set of categories within which these responses could be located. From here, I was able to examine the extent to which the

categories pertinent to the various groups were similar and/or different, and the extent to which stakeholders' constructions of 'EBD' informed their expectations of Line End's provision for its pupils. The final analysis sought to elicit the various criteria on which stakeholders based their evaluations of the school's effectiveness, the next stage of the research.

The analysis of those questionnaires where a choice of responses was available – the 114-statement staff survey, the 11-statement pupil survey regarding academic 'engagement,' staff survey re. the school's response to pupils' academic needs - involved working out and recording for every question the number (and then percentages) of responses falling into each response category, the percentage being of the total sample. Responses were then analysed for agreement, significant divergence of opinion, working on the premise of Anastasi (1982) that any percentage between the highest and lowest 25 - 33% is acceptable in claiming broad agreement of response. Analysis of the open-ended questionnaire - whereby respondents were asked to make a list of responses to an initial question - facilitated the categorisation of responses into a number of 'areas' that reflected aspects of Line End's provision. These categories were then used in the construction of subsequent 'closed' questionnaires, where respondents were asked to answer in one of four ways; analysis of these responses served not only as a means of generating valuable data per se, but also as a means both of triangulating other data, and of informing the construction of later interviews.

In analysing the interviews, tape-recorded interviews were transcribed to provide accurate accounts of what was actually said. All data from all interviews - both tape-recorded and otherwise – were then coded into emergent themes/categories; once the categories had been constructed and data collated appropriately, I was able to note down any ideas that emerged regarding the significance and implications of the data for my research focus.

CHAPTER 4: PHASE 1 MAIN FINDINGS.

Introduction.

The data that have informed the findings for the first phase of the research have been based upon an investigation of the perspectives of stakeholders in relation to their understanding/construction of ‘emotional and behavioural difficulties,’ and their perceptions of the criteria by which Line End might be judged effective. Particular constructions of ‘EBD’ will automatically lead to particular views of what needs to be done to address ‘EBD’; effectiveness criteria, moreover, will be largely informed, not only by stakeholders’ constructions of ‘EBD’, but by their understandings of pupils’ past histories and present needs, and their expectations of and for the school, in terms of its role in addressing these needs. The methods by which these data have been generated are outlined in the Methodology and Research Procedures section of the Report (Chapter 3), as are the means by which findings have been collated and analysed.

Summary of Main Findings.

Causality.

In considering ‘EBD-ness’ and why pupils end up at Line End, staff, pupils and parents felt that pupils’ difficulties within mainstream, and mainstream responses to these difficulties, often caused and/or exacerbated problems of adjustment to the mainstream regime. These difficulties were often in relation to work and perceived/actual levels of support, and task frustration was often perceived to lead to inappropriate behavioural responses by pupils. Staff also felt that home circumstances was a significant variable, whilst some parents felt that their children’s ‘EBD-ness’ was a medical condition, and needed to be addressed through medication.

The role of Line End.

In terms of Line End’s role, staff, pupils and parents all felt that addressing both pupils’ academic and behavioural needs, providing opportunities for reintegration into mainstream, preparing pupils for the world of work, and establishing a school environment that was safe and secure for pupils were all important aspects of the school’s role. In addressing pupils’ behavioural needs, however, staff felt the role of the school was to empower pupils to change their behaviours, whilst pupils and parents saw the role of the school as being to ‘fix’ the inappropriate behaviours of pupils.

Effectiveness criteria.

When considering effectiveness criteria, all stakeholder groups felt that Line End could be considered to be effective if it fulfilled its perceived role. Staff, pupils and parents felt that if the school successfully addressed pupils' academic needs – through maximising the academic potential of each pupil (staff) and through improving reading and getting external qualifications at Key Stage 4 (pupils and parents) – then Line End can be considered as effective in this area. If the school is felt to be successfully addressing the emotional/behavioural needs of pupils, moreover, then it can be considered effective in this area also. This might be evidenced through appropriate behaviour management systems consistently implemented (staff), through support systems that are fair and exercised consistently (pupils), and through the improvement of pupils' behaviour. Another criterion for effectiveness was based on the perceived quality of the school's ethos and environment; this included positive relationships within school (staff), pupils feeling safe and secure within the school environment, the absence of bullying (pupils and parents), and the fact that children are happy, want to attend, and stay in school (parents). The other main criteria by which the effectiveness of the school would be evaluated were the quality of home/school relationships (staff, parent, the LEA and Ofsted,) and the management/organisation of the school – strategic or crisis management? (staff)

Conclusion.

It is clear, therefore, that the wide-ranging, and sometime diverse, perspectives on the role of Line End reflect the individual constructs of pupil disaffection and deviance, and other pertinent issues regarding special educational needs, the wider educational and vocational environment, and the relationships between the variables that are felt to impact upon the school's provision and pupils' lives. Whilst it can be seen that there is broad agreement amongst stakeholders regarding what they want for Line End's pupils, there are clearly differences of opinion about how this might most effectively translated into practice, and hence there emerges a range of criteria by which the effectiveness of Line End's provision will be evaluated by its stakeholders.

Causality.

Staff:

In response to the question: “What is an EBD pupil?” in a staff training session, the following perceptions emerged, after staff had brainstormed their ideas in small groups and recorded them on flip-chart paper. Each of the following is a verbatim comment written down on paper during this exercise.

- A little shit who does not let you get on with your lesson.
- Pupil whose behaviour deviates from “normality” or impedes the learning of himself and/or others.
- Behaviour does not take account of hierarchy of school.
- Someone experiencing low self-esteem.
- Poor self-image due to detrimental history/relationships.
- “Shifting-sand” home circumstances.
- Pupils with “maladjusted” parents.
- Pupil who does not fit into any other category - need to label.
- Learnt behaviours at home not really socially acceptable.
- Children with characteristics which take them away from the ‘norm’.
- Children who are under-stimulated, under-achieving.
- Pupils emotionally damaged by lack of love.
- Neglected pupils - through abuse (physical/emotional/sexual).
- Products of poor parenting skills.

The response from staff regarding the behaviours causing most concern in class resulted in a list of 38 separate behaviours, ranging from low level infractions of classroom expectations, to behaviours that were considered to compromise the learning of others and the good order of the classroom (Appendix C), an indication, as Howard (1992, p.392) put it, that challenging behaviour is “subjective, not objective; relative, not immutable - as concerned with classroom management and the curriculum as with problems with the pupil or his/her background.”

During discussions amongst staff which took place during the plenary session, in which comments were noted down and written up into field notes after the session (Appendix A),

many pupils were perceived to have become disaffected with school, and could see little value in education and learning. They had fallen into cycles of low/under achievement, poor motivation, low self-esteem - each exacerbating the other - where inappropriate and mostly disruptive behaviours had masked their real needs. Consequently, many staff felt that pupils had become locked into downward spirals of inappropriate behaviour from which they were unwilling or unable to escape. There was also a cultural issue that was explored, which related to behaviour management strategies and practices; there was a perceived link between pupil aggression, and the punitive, sometime aggressive responses by staff to pupils' challenging behaviour - both in mainstream and at Line End - which was felt to create a cycle whereby institutional and individual behaviours both inform and are informed by the culture of the school.

In perceptions of causality and why pupils become disruptive or disaffected, Line End staff felt that variables that impacted upon the life of the child - home circumstances, emotional state, processes of education – were seen as important factors in pupils' disruptive behavioural responses/ disaffection in school. The predominant causal factors identified by staff were:

- i. Dysfunctional family/home circumstances.
(Changing home circumstances, 'maladjusted' parents, poor parenting skills, abuse - physical, emotional, sexual).
- ii. 'Within' child problems.
(Poor self-image, dyslexia, hyperactivity/other 'medical' conditions, attention-seeking, poor communication skills, low frustration/boredom thresholds, basic naughtiness, insecurity, learned behaviours, personality.)
- iii. Within-school factors.
(Teacher expectations too high/low, school culture, task frustration, task boredom, temperature of room.)
- iv. The 'fun' factor. (Some pupils are disruptive at times, simply because it is good fun.)

Pupils:

Pupils do not apply the descriptor 'EBD' to themselves, but recognise that they are at Line End because of difficulties they have experienced in previous schools. Pupils openly admitted that it was often their own inappropriate behaviour that had led to these difficulties, though some said that such behaviour was coupled with difficulties with learning. In response to the question: 'Why do you feel you have ended up at Line End?' [Research Question 1-2] during group discussions with pupils in year groups, the following responses were elicited:

"...a bit to do with my reading..." (Daniel: Yr. 8.)

"...I missed my SATs..." (Ryan: Yr. 7.)

"...I'm dyslexic..." (Daniel: Yr. 9.)

"...we need to catch up on some more work..." (Michael: Yr. 10.)

"...it's because we're thick..." (Micky: Yr. 7.)

"...some of us because we're not all that smart..." (Chris: Yr. 7.)

Some pupils suggested that their naughtiness was a response to the frustration generated by the inability to cope with the work:

"...I had learning difficulties - other people could do the work and I couldn't, so I disturbed the rest of the class..." (Billy: Yr. 7.)

"...if I can't do my work I rip it up..." (Allan: Yr. 8.)

Some, however, suggested that problems were created or exacerbated by the attitudes and responses of teachers:

"...the headmistress was horrible - she gave you lines for making mistakes by accident..." (Liam: Yr. 8.)

"...I hated the teachers - they wouldn't help me with my work..." (Kevin: Yr. 8.)

"...if I can't do my work, they tell me to do it on my own, and I get annoyed..." (Paul: Yr. 11.)

"...work was hard, and we needed help..." (Lee: Yr. 10.)

Other pupils felt that the organisation and resourcing of the school put them at a disadvantage:

"We do think for attention, but there aren't enough teachers to help you."
(Stephen: Yr. 10.)

"Teachers couldn't come to you straight away - there were too many people in the class." (David: Yr. 11.)

Others, moreover, felt that at times, the mainstream school discriminated actively against them:

“They don’t want their school given a bad reputation from pupils who are expelled from other schools. They find a reason to kick them out.”

(David: Yr.10)

“We’re the rejects - we’re not given a chance.” (Sally: Yr.10.)

“They labelled me straight away: ‘You can come here but we’ve read your reports. We don’t want any of your messing about here.’” (David: Yr.9.)

“We’re stereotyped. As soon as they read the reports, that’s it. You’re the bully, you’re the bad one - you’ve got no choice about it. You haven’t got a chance.” (Paul: Yr. 10.)

Whilst these comments reflect the perception that they were given few, if any, chances in mainstream, some felt that as far as attending Line End was concerned, they were given no choice:

“I’m here so I didn’t get excluded from my other school.” (Mark: Yr.9.)

“I was supposed to go to Normal High School - I got a letter saying they was looking forward to me going there. Then on the day I was supposed to start there, a letter came saying I was starting at Line End.” (Liam: Yr.8.)

“I didn’t get a choice. I was at Line End Junior and they said I had to come to Line End.” (Ryan: Yr.7.)

“I would have liked to try it, but I wasn’t given a chance; it was a choice between Line End or a home tutor.” (Martin: Yr.7.)

“I should have gone to mainstream, but wasn’t given a chance.” (Alan: Yr.8.)

Some pupils were aware, too, of the relationship between the label they bore, and the stigma attached to it:

“If you say you’ve been to Line End, you won’t get a proper job.” (Simon: Yr.9.)

“I didn’t get a paper job ’cos I said I went to Line End. Two weeks later I said a different school and got the job.” (David: Yr.9.)

“I feel ashamed to say what school I go to.” (Wayne: Yr.9.)

Some felt, finally, that their placement at Line End was linked to family/home circumstances:

“I’m fostered.” (Chris: Yr.7.)

“My brother came here, so we chose Line End.” (Kenny: Yr.9.)

Parents:

Parents’ views on the causality of ‘EBD’ were elicited from both the 25 parental interviews and the documentation from the Annual Reviews of pupils’ statements. Although parents might not use - or even recognise - the descriptor ‘EBD’ in relation to their own children, their reflections on the behaviour of their children constitute their own constructions of ‘EBD’, viewed within the context of the educational experiences that have led the children to Line End, and the perceived causal factors that have informed and determined the paths they have taken. These constructions are also evident in how parents view the role and function of Line End, as in accepting that the school is there to address the needs of its pupils, parents are generally clear about how they perceive these needs. There was a feeling amongst many parents that the problems experienced by their children are because of their unwillingness or inability to behave appropriately, and for some it was a case of the children having ‘gone off the rails’:

“I want everything the school can do to put him back on the rails...” (Yr.8.)

“I want him to learn to behave a lot better than what he has been.” (Yr.8.)

In examining perceptions of causality, parents came up with a number of observations. One parent felt that inappropriate behaviour was caused by emotional difficulties, for which no professional help was made available:

“He’s had a lot of trauma in his life - he saw his best friend killed...

I was promised counselling but nothing’s ever been done.” (Yr.10.)

With eight pupils on the school roll having been prescribed the drug Ritalin for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) some parents clearly felt that inappropriate behaviours and difficulty in school were the symptoms of a medical condition, with one parent suggesting that the lack of expertise amongst Line End staff regarding ADHD only served to exacerbate the difficulties experienced by her child in school.

One parent acknowledged social difficulties experienced by her child - the seeming inability to integrate appropriately or effectively with other pupils - and the problems that this led to:

“Inability to interact with other children successfully - his and other

children's education would suffer immensely." (Yr.7.)

For two other parents, there was simply no answer. They were unable to find a rational reason as to why their children behaved as they did:

"Haven't got a clue. People who have attempted to help have also been baffled, but also marvel at how well he manipulates different situations." (Yr.8.)

"We wish we knew." (Yr.7.)

Of the 25 parents interviewed, however, the majority (18) located the problem within the child:

"We were hoping that he would be able to go to mainstream, but it was felt his behaviour was too unpredictable and he was too immature." (Yr.7.)

There was an awareness, furthermore, of the impact upon educational progress in mainstream school:

"He had not developed educationally enough to keep up with others." (Yr.7.)

"Lack of concentration resulting in being way behind in his academic work." (Yr.7.)

DfEE:

In Circular 9/94 (DfE, 1994) the DfE attempted to define 'emotional and behavioural difficulties' – a term given birth by the 1981 Education Act (DES, 1981) - but simply ended up with a catch-all description of the parameters within which emotional and behavioural difficulties might fall. They lie, suggest the DfE:

'on a continuum between.....those that are challenging but within expected bounds, and those which are indicative of serious mental illness. (They) range from social maladaptation to abnormal emotional stresses.....they become apparent through withdrawn, depressive, aggressive or self-injurious tendencies.' (para 4)

This is clearly still current thinking, as in one of the most recent publications on provision for 'EBD' pupils (Ofsted, 1999, page 7) Ofsted uses Circular 9/94 descriptor as 'a working definition of EBD'

In terms of causality, it is acknowledged that there are a number of interacting factors that might lead to pupils experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties. Constructions of causality which cite the school environment as being a significant factor, however, seem even more generalised than those which seek to define and describe 'emotional and behavioural difficulties,' and could equally relate to the causes of indiscipline within the school generally, rather than simply relating to those pupils perceived to have emotional and behavioural difficulties. There is recognition, however, that children might be adversely affected by particular home or family circumstances, such as family break-up, inappropriate parenting, mental health problems in other family members, all of which may, in some cases, create or exacerbate emotional and behavioural difficulties for children.

The role of Line End.

Staff:

Staff perspectives on the role of Line End, elicited from a small group brain-storming session, suggested that the school was perceived to have a number of functions to fulfil:

1. The containment of difficult pupils.
2. The reintegration of pupils into mainstream education.
3. The provision of an appropriate curriculum.
4. The changing of pupils' behaviour.
5. The provision of a safe, secure, supportive environment for pupils.
6. The maximising of pupils' academic potential.

These reflect clearly the school's institutional aims which are outlined in the Staff Handbook, regarding the addressing of pupils' academic and emotional/behavioural needs within a safe, secure environment. Findings from the 114-statement survey (ii.) suggested, however, that staff are clearly divided as to the relative importance of the academic and affective curricula - 53% of staff feeling that addressing the academic needs of pupils should be the most important focus of the school – though in response to another question, 66% of staff felt that addressing the EBD needs of pupils should take precedence over curricular needs.

These perspectives were reflected and enlarged upon during the one to one interviews with teaching staff in response to a direct question about what they understood the role of Line End to be. All staff agreed that providing opportunities for the reintegration of pupils to

mainstream, wherever practicable, was an important role of the school, and there was agreement, too, on the importance of addressing pupils' perceived emotional/ behavioural needs if this was to become a realistic and viable prospect. The views of the five interview staff, however, illustrated a divergence in perceptions of emphasis on the extent to which the addressing of behavioural needs should – or should not – take precedence over the addressing of academic needs, reflecting the same divergence of perspective seen in the findings from the 114-statement survey.

Facilitating changed behaviour in pupils, and providing the appropriate structures within which this could be addressed, was seen as an important role of the school by Teacher A:

“I think we need to help the pupils manage their own behaviour; I'm sure it's possible but I think these sorts of kids need a lot of guidance and support.”

This for some, however, is only the means to a desired end - the reintegration of pupils to mainstream education wherever and whenever practicable.

“If a child's been taken out of mainstream, it's because that child's got particular problems that need to be addressed, but with a view to returning that child to mainstream when these problems have been addressed. It's the school's job to educate the child, because it's a school, but to do it in a way that the child's problems - if you can do it - can be addressed.” (Teacher D.)

“I also believe our role is to try to reintegrate pupils back to mainstream, so maybe we need to be providing better structures for enabling these kids to get back into mainstream.” (Teacher E.)

Appropriate preparation for a return to mainstream involves not only the addressing of behavioural needs, however, but the assessment and addressing of pupils' individual academic needs.

“The role of the school should be to prepare kids academically and behaviourally to be in a position where they can get back to mainstream school and survive in mainstream school. A lot of the things that are preventing them from going back to mainstream are legitimate behavioural targets that we should be looking to intervene in. At least here they're in that position where you're able to intervene in their behavioural problems, in their behavioural cycles - but also underpinning

that with an academic, broad-based aims as well.” (Teacher C.)

“We’ve got to help kids achieve their academic potential, to help children enhance what education they’ve got so far. Also we’ve got to develop their social skills.”

(Teacher E.)

For one of the teachers, finally, the fulfilment of one of the school’s roles - meeting pupils’ academic needs - was largely dependent on the extent to which addressing the behavioural needs of pupils was effective:

“We should be aiming to maximise their academic potential, but to do that they have to modify their behaviour.” (Teacher B.)

Pupils.

In finding out what pupils perceived the role of the school to be, there were some very clear ideas about what Line End should be aiming for. In response to the question: “What should Line End be doing for its pupils?” the 32 pupils surveyed offered a range of ideas (Appendix N.) which suggested that the school should be:

1. Providing pupils with a good education. [26 pupils]
2. Changing people’s behaviour. [21 pupils]
3. Preparing pupils for the world of work. [10 pupils]
4. Providing a safe, secure, non-bullying environment for pupils. [18 pupils]
5. Preparing pupils for reintegration into mainstream. [8 pupils]

Preparing pupils for reintegration into mainstream was important for some pupils, especially the younger ones. For some pupils, mainstream was perceived to offer a ‘better’ education, simply because it was a mainstream school:

“You get more GCSE’s - more education in mainstream.” (Allan: Yr.8.)

“You get a better education ‘cos it’s a mainstream school.” (Liam: Yr.8.)

“They do harder work in mainstream. I’d behave better in a normal school.”

(Chris: Yr.7.)

Others, however, recognised that it was their inability - or unwillingness - to fully access the work, that caused problems for them in mainstream.

“The work was hard and we needed help.” (Daniel: Yr.8.)

“Here you get more help and shorter lessons.” (Kenny: Yr.9.)

Some saw the role of Line End in terms of being within an ideal educational environment, whereby reintegration into mainstream was buttressed by on-going support, and the provision of a ‘safety-net’, just in case:

“I’d have a special unit in a school, so you could go to calm down and maybe say for a couple of months if you need to.” (Peter: Yr.11.)

“They should have a behaviour unit with teachers to help you.” (Wayne: Yr.9.)

“I’d want someone from Line End to come and see how we’re doing.” (Daniel: Yr.8.)

“They should have a massive school and a small school like Line End at the side, and when you’re ready to get back into the big school you could.” (Paul: Yr.11.)

For those whose expectation and desire was that they would remain at Line End - predominantly those pupils in Years 9, 10 and 11 - there was an expectation that the school should be preparing pupils for life after Line End, whether with work, examinations or preparation for the world of work.

“ I’d like to get good work, GCSE’s, getting a job.” (Paul: Yr.10.)

“ Should get you educated, good qualifications and a job, so you don’t ruin your life.” (Shaun: Yr.10.)

Parents.

The perspectives of parents in relation to the role/function of the school, taken from the 25 parental interviews, reflect expectations that the school should be addressing both the academic and behavioural needs of the children. There seems to be an acceptance that the behaviours of their children are often socially unacceptable and self-damaging, not least in the long-term, and that the role of the school is to educate, somehow, the pupils’ thinking as a means of changing behaviour through a clear understanding of the potential consequences of inappropriate behaviour.

Of the parents questioned, over half (15) saw the role of Line End as being to remediate inappropriate behaviours - to ‘fix’ the problem. For many of the parents of lower school children, this meant preparing them for reintegration to mainstream, some aware of the stigma attached to Line End as a special school.

“I want him to go to mainstream. There’s a stigma attached to special schools.” (Yr.8.)

“I went to a special school and got nothing out of it. I want him to have a decent education.” (Yr.9.)

Of the parents whose children might realistically be considered for reintegration – those at Key Stage 3 – three parents were keen that their children did not return to mainstream:

“He’s not ready to go back to mainstream. I don’t honestly think he’d make it - it’s like a bubble waiting to burst.” (Yr.9.)

“I want him to be happy in school. He never was in mainstream, and he never will be. That’s why he’s never going back.” (Yr.8.)

“He came home last Friday and said he’d seen Mrs. W. (the school EP) about going back to mainstream, and I said ‘No way, you’re not going. You’re stopping where you are.’ He’s happy where he is, and there’s no way I’m letting him go into a mainstream school - he wouldn’t last; no, he’s staying where he is.” (Yr. 9.)

Reintegration apart, parents expressed how they saw the role of the school in terms of what they wanted for their children. Many parents expressed expectations that the school should be addressing general academic needs:

“To give him a good education.” (Yr.7.)

“Get him back to working and learning.” (Yr.8.)

“A good education, which he’s had since he’s been here.” (Yr.8.)

“I want him pushed academically and worked to his ability, and not below it...he needs motivating and pushing.” (Yr.9.)

“To bring homework home, and school to chase him up to do it.” (Yr.9.)

“If reintegration is not possible, then good exams.” (Yr.9.)

For many parents, a ‘good’ education includes preparing pupils effectively for transition to the post-16 world outside of Line End:

“Basically, to get a decent education, and equip him for life in the real world.” (Yr.10.)

“To get somewhere in life...not to be a bum like I have...not to leave school and have no job...I don’t want him to have a life like

I've had...I want him going somewhere in life, a few exams behind him, a future..." (Yr.11.)

"He's only got a year to go - get him prepared for when he leaves... keep him in school." (Yr.10.)

"He hasn't got all that long left now, so if he gets some qualifications and a job when he leaves, I'll be happy." (Yr.10.)

Parents also defined their expectations of the school in terms of the way in which specific behaviours should be addressed:

"Keep him in school, especially when he comes back after running out." (Yr.7.)

"Teach him to ignore wind-ups." (Yr.9.)

"To calm him down." (Yr.9.)

"I want him to stop in school and stay out of trouble." (Yr.9.)

"Teach him to get attention in the right way - he tries to get attention by being naughty, but getting him to get attention by doing good work." (Yr.7.)

"Need him back into a good attendance routine - learn to control himself, not get into fights and control his temper." (Yr.10.)

"Although education is important, I think socialising skills are as important, and I would like 'R' to learn how to behave in society so he doesn't stand out and get picked on or become aggressive." (Yr.10.)

One parent suggested the behaviour management approach that should be exercised in relation to her son:

"I want proper discipline for this child; I want a real tough line taken with him - softly, softly doesn't work. I want everything the school can do to put him back on the rails - if you have to give him a slap to put him in line, you give him a slap...jump on his head if you have to."

Both the natural parents (though separated) of this child were interviewed together, and after the mother had made this comment, the father said:

"Basic literacy, numeracy, minimum - some GCSE's; my expectations are a little higher." (Yr.7),

which reveals how the perspectives and expectations of the different stakeholders may differ significantly.

There is, however, a vagueness with some parents as to how they perceive the role of the school:

“Give him a good education. I don’t really think I’ve got any expectations for the school, despite good exams. You’re dealing with problem kids - they need to be able to cope with the outside world. Give him responsibility and he thrives; if school does it, it might help. School should make D. feel special... does that sound right? Give him the attention he needs.” (Yr. 9.)

“To calm him down, but that’s not your problem...I think he needs psychiatric help.” (Yr. 8.)

“Should be able to cope ‘cos you’re a special school; you should keep them in... it’s difficult ‘cos of the pupils. Should be more trained to deal with their problems. Should be one step ahead and anticipate problems. You should jump on the important issues and leave minor ones to sort themselves out. I don’t know what you should be doing.” (Yr. 10.)

DfEE.

As outlined in Circular 9/94, and supported by other government documentation (Ofsted/DfEE, 1995; 1996; 1998), the role of the EBD Special School is to address pupils’ ‘educational, emotional and care needs through appropriate curricular planning, sound organisational arrangements and effective teaching and care.’ (para 62) The circular points out that it is the responsibility of the school to develop a school ethos within which pupils may develop emotionally, academically, and within which their self-esteem may be enhanced, and to provide opportunities to develop positive relationships with both adults and peers.

Local Education Authority/Local Authority.

From the perspective of the LEA - elicited from the two LEA advisers who conducted the pre-Ofsted mini-inspection of the school - the role of Line End reflects that of the DfEE/Ofsted as outlined above. The perspective of the Local Authority, however, focuses more on the provision for a specific group of children who fall within the ‘EBD’ descriptor –

those who are in the care of the local authority. The perception of the local authority's representative – the team with the responsibility for the oversight of educational provision for 'looked after' children – is that not only should Line End be providing an appropriate education for 'EBD' pupils, but should also be acting as a 'service' in offering a 'support/reintegration programme with a rolling population.'

Criteria for Effectiveness.

Staff.

The data regarding staff's perceptions of 'effectiveness' criteria were generated not only from direct questions to the 5 interviewed staff, but also from other prompts which informed brainstorming exercises with the whole staff group of 13 in an in-service training session: - what constitutes quality at Line End; what do you want for the school? The factors associated with the 'ideal' school, and therefore appropriate 'desirables' for Line End, tend to be more qualitative than quantitative in nature, and reflect more the aims and objectives of the school, and the operational and organisational factors that are perceived to be appropriate in translating the rhetoric of policy into the reality of practice. These factors - strong leadership, support for all, strategic planning, quality management, equality for all - though open to critical evaluation, are not necessarily easily measurable in quantitative terms, though there are other factors which are more quantitative in nature: attendance, opportunities for and rates of reintegration, exam results, exclusion figures.

The criteria intimated by staff lent themselves to division into a number of discrete areas (Appendices D, E, F, G). The extent to which the academic potential of pupils is maximised is seen as an important criterion for effectiveness, based on the provision of a stimulating and relevant curriculum, appropriately differentiated, opportunities for external accreditation at Key Stage 4, and the appropriate preparation of pupils for the post 16 world outside Line End. A further criterion for evaluating effectiveness related to provision for the perceived emotional/behavioural needs of pupils, and centred on the perceived integrity and appropriateness of behaviour management systems within the school, the level of consistency with which they are implemented – and the extent to which they are seen to be either pro-active or reactive - and the extent to which pupils are seen to manage and modify their own behaviour. A further evaluation of the effectiveness of provision centred on the school's ethos and environment based on the quality of peer relationships, and the extent to which they

promote/impede the learning process, the extent to which the school environment is felt to be supportive, safe and secure for both pupils and staff, and the extent to which pupils are given a part in the decision-making process within school. Other factors cited by staff as constituting appropriate effectiveness criteria included the opportunities for reintegration to mainstream, the quality of home/school relationships, and the quality of the management of provision, and the management of change.

The following perspectives relating to effectiveness criteria were elicited from five of the nine teaching staff at Line End, through individual tape-recorded interviews. One member of staff suggested that the school can be seen to be effective if it fulfils its perceived role:

“We are effective if we achieve what we set out to do; the issue is to look again at what we’re setting out to do,” (Teacher C.)

though another acknowledged that it was:

“difficult to work out what a good ‘EBD’ school should be.” (Teacher D.)

Teacher A. suggested that:

“ we should be aiming to maximise their academic potential, and if we get that right, then I suppose we are being effective.”

There were two other criteria by which staff evaluated the effectiveness of Line End’s provision: the quality of home/school relationships, and the extent to which the planning process was strategically managed, as opposed to situations developing and being addressed at a ‘crisis’ level. Staff stated clearly in response to the question: ‘What do we want for our school?’ during an Inset session: ‘Good relationships with parents.’ (Appendix E,) whilst in response to the question: ‘What would make Line End the ideal school?’ one of the factors forwarded by staff was ‘strategic planning as opposed to crisis management from the leadership.’

Pupils.

Based on the question: if I could set up my own school, what would it be like - what sort of things would you be able to do; what would you like to get out of being there; what sort of things would make it a good place to be? responses represent those factors that the 34 pupils surveyed perceive as reflecting quality, and those which they feel contribute to the perception

of the school as being successful. (Appendices N, O). As data were generated through whole group brain-storming sessions rather than individual response sheets, findings represent an amalgam of pupil responses for each year group.

Most pupils felt that the provision of help in academic subjects – especially reading (from pupils in all year groups) - opportunities for external exams (from pupils in Years 8, 10, 11) and rewards for good work in lessons (from pupils in all year groups,) all constituted appropriate effectiveness criteria for pupils. When considering the best help and support for behaviour difficulties, pupils felt that having sanctions that are fair (all year groups) and applied consistently by staff (Years 8,9,10, and 11), and addressing the causes of misbehaviour, rather than simply resorting to punishment (Years 9, 10 and 11) were important criteria in their evaluations of the school’s effectiveness. As regards the ethos and environment of Line End, the quality of relationships within school (Years 7,8 and 10), the extent to which the environment can be considered safe, secure and supportive (all year groups), and the level of aggression and bullying (Years 7, 8, 9 and 10), were considered important factors in evaluating the effectiveness of provision. Of other factors intimated by pupils, opportunities for reintegration to mainstream (Years 7, 8 and 9), the involvement of pupils in consultation as part of the decision-making process (Years 9,10 and 11), and more privileges/independence given to pupils as they get older (Years 10 and 11), were all seen as appropriate effectiveness criteria .

Parents.

Taken from both the Annual Review documentation and the parental interviews, effectiveness criteria for parents might be seen as the extent to which it is perceived that the school fulfils its role according to their expectations. Responses from the 25 parents interviewed included the following factors:

- A good ‘academic’ education, including a chance to sit external exams, and effective preparation for life post -16.
- Dealing with pupils’ emotional and behavioural needs, including keeping pupils on the premises (short-term), keeping pupils attending regularly (longer-term), firm discipline, and Staff appropriately trained in the understanding of ADHD, and strategies for dealing with it.

- The extent to which pupils are happy, and their enjoyment of school, including safety, security and support for pupils within the school environment, and pupils not feeling ‘different’ because they go to a special school.
- Opportunities for reintegration to mainstream.
- The relationship between school and home, and the quality of communications between the two.

A significant criterion by which parents judged the effectiveness of the school was the extent to which pupils felt safe in school, and the extent to which the school worked to create an environment within which the safety and security of pupils could be ensured. After one particular bullying incident, the father of a Year 8 pupil said:

“I know he’s a wind-up merchant, but I want him to be safe in school. If someone belts him for opening his mouth, I can understand that, but throwing his bag out of the taxi, and three of them jumping him is well over the top.”

Both parents and pupils want, and need, to feel that bullying is taken very seriously by the school, and dealt with firmly, and perceptions of the extent to which this is successfully addressed will inform perceptions of how effective the school is at realising its own espoused aim of creating a safe, stable and secure environment for pupils.

Where reintegration is not a significant factor for parents, the way in which the school prepares pupils for life, post 16, in the ‘real world’ is an important indicator of the school’s effectiveness:

“If he gets a job when he leaves, then that’s great. He’s never gonna be a brain surgeon.”

As noted earlier, the impression is that, after so many traumatic and painful experiences of education, these parents are grateful if their children stay the course, and emerge as relatively unscathed as is practicable. This was inferred from the accounts of 5 parents’ dealings with mainstream schools in tape-recorded interviews, who recounted their experiences of numerous telephone calls from school, sessions in the headteacher’s office, frequent exclusions and the consequent tensions in parent/child relationships within the home. There

was also the hope that their children would be able to leave Line End with something to show for it - qualifications, or a college or work placement.

“I want him to come out the other end with something.”

DFE/DfEE.

The criteria which the DfEE feel appropriate as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of EBD special schools - and therefore Line End School - are taken from a range of DFE/DfEE documentation (DfE, 1994; DfEE, 1996; Dfee/Ofsted, 1998) and include:

- * Appropriate planning and provision of a curriculum that is that is broad, balanced, relevant and stimulating,
- * Sound organisational planning.
- * Effective teaching.
- * A positive school ethos based on:
 - positive self-regard by pupils
 - a secure environment
 - positive relationships with adults and peers
 - pupil involvement in the processes of target-setting for both work and behaviour
- * Appropriate preparation for transition into mainstream society.
- * Behaviour management policies aimed at improving behaviour, not simply containing difficult pupils.
- * Clear and firm boundaries of behaviour for all pupils.
- * High expectations for both work and behaviour.

Ofsted.

The headings under which Ofsted were required to report on the effectiveness of schools have been clearly laid out under three main headings:

1. Educational Standards achieved by pupils, incorporating attainment and progress, attitudes, behaviour and personal development, and attendance.
2. Quality of education provided, incorporating teaching, curriculum and assessment, pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, support, guidance and pupils' welfare, and partnership with parents and the community.

3. Management and efficiency of the school, incorporating leadership and management, staffing, accommodation and learning resources, and efficiency of the school.

Local Education Authority/Local Authority.

As mentioned unequivocally by the Farside LEA Inspectors who conducted a pre-Ofsted inspection of the school, the criteria by which the LEA would evaluate Line End's effectiveness would mirror exactly those used by Ofsted in its Framework for the Inspection of Schools. The education team for 'looked after' children – the representative of the Local Authority - focused on the extent to which Line End facilitated the successful reintegration of children into mainstream as an important criterion when evaluating the effectiveness of the school's provision, and talked about the percentage of pupils returning to mainstream as a quantitative indicator of the school's success in this area.

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

OF PHASE I FINDINGS.

Introduction.

If there are conflicting criteria by which the effectiveness of Line End will be evaluated by its stakeholders, then there will also be differences of perspective amongst stakeholders as to the various areas in which the school is being effective. Consequently, there will be tensions and the potential for conflict in the light of competing perspectives as to what constitutes effective provision, with implications for practice and the relationships between and amongst stakeholders. From the findings (Ch.4) it is clear that there is some agreement amongst stakeholders about the role of Line End in terms of what it should be aiming to do for its pupils, a reflection of the school's institutional aims: the provision for pupils' academic and emotional/behavioural needs within a safe, supportive environment, and the opportunity for pupils to be considered for reintegration into mainstream education. Divergence occurs when the values and expectations of stakeholders inform differing attitudes about how such provision should be made, which may create tensions within the school, making overall provision susceptible to inconsistency, and a lack of coherence and clarity.

There is also a potential tension between the values that Line End pupils are exposed to outside of the school environment - both familial and environmental - and the values and expectations of staff within school. These tensions might well be exacerbated, however, if staff themselves are divided about what constitutes the main focus of their work, and if pupils are exposed to differing value systems within the classroom, where priorities may change from teacher to teacher, and where needs - both academic and behavioural - may be addressed in differing ways. It is not uniformity of approach that is important, as this might engender thoughtless regimentation at the expense of individual creativity based on the dynamic nature of staff practice; what is important, rather, is a unity of purpose - a consensual value system - that provides a framework within which individual approaches can be exercised.

The aim of the analysis of Phase I. Findings, therefore, is to examine the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the construction of 'EBD' and causality, the role of Line End, and

effectiveness criteria - and the tensions that might result as a consequence of the conflicting perspectives of stakeholders. [Research Questions 1- 5]

Causality.

A feature of much educational research is a concern with identifying causal patterns (Barton and Meighan, 1979; Ackland, 1981; Galloway et al, 1982). Some staff at Line End argued, however, that an understanding of causality in relation to challenging behaviour is not necessarily helpful in informing practice, as many perceived causal factors cannot be controlled for by the school, though my own belief is that there is a danger that such an attitude may sometimes serve to stifle the opportunity for creative thinking through which the diverse needs of a homogeneously labelled group of pupils may be effectively and differentially addressed. Laslett (1977, p.24) suggests that:

“It is essential for staff to understand the varied aetiology of behaviour and to appreciate the complicated interactions between different aspects of a child’s eco-system if proficient and individualised education and care programming is to be offered”,

whilst others argue that an understanding amongst staff of the range of theoretical and practical perspectives informing responses to the differing needs of ‘EBD’ pupils - and an understanding of the theories of causality - provide a valuable framework within which to work. (Cole et al,1999; Wilkins,1999). Interestingly, an in-service training session was based around theories of causality, after a prior session during which staff perceptions relating to causality were elicited. After the session when causality theories were disseminated and discussed, the Headteacher commented:

“That was very interesting, but in all honesty I think it would have been more appropriate for a University or Teacher Training Course. What we need here is to share good practice for classroom management strategies.”

Although, however, the Headteacher has ultimate responsibility for ensuring good order within the school, it raises for me the question of how it is supposed that needs can appropriately be addressed if there is no theoretical framework within which to locate and understand the root of those needs.

When asked to consider causality, however, staff tended to assume ‘single cause’ factors for pupil deviance - poor parenting, learning difficulties leading to task frustration, ineffective

support in mainstream school - rather than considering the eco-systemic nature of children's difficulties, and the inter-relatedness of the variables in their lives (Von Bertalanffy, 1968; Bateson, 1979; Dowling and Osborne, 1985). There is also a consideration that pupils may become 'EBD' by default, by being taken out of a mainstream setting, and then being denied the right to return, or as the outreach teacher observed: "once they get into special, there is no flowback," an observation supported by research findings, which suggest that pupil traffic is more often than not, one-way (Ainscow et al, 1999; Booth & Ainscow, 1998; Daniels et al, 1998). Indeed Cole et al (1998, p.15) argue that:

'the usual pattern is that once labelled EBD as in segregated provision, the pupil will see out their time in special schooling',

suggesting that one of the properties of such labels is 'stickiness,' and that once a label is conferred, it is very difficult to shake off (Tomlinson,1982; Furlong,1985; Lloyd-Smith,1987). There was a suggestion from one group of staff during the Inset session, however, that some children disrupt lessons simply because it is fun to do so. Disorder, it is true, can be recreational, and bad behaviour is often its own explanation and its own reward. Just as eating is a natural response to the human appetite for food, so disruptive behaviour can be the natural response, for some, to the human appetite for rebellion and the need to release adrenalin. A feature of successful cultures is that they find ways of channelling aggression away from overtly disruptive and anti-social behaviour, and successful individuals are able to do the same. Most schools, however, are likely to contain small numbers of pupils who have not found appropriate ways of burning off adrenalin, or developing and maintaining effective interpersonal relationships within acceptable social parameters. Unless contained by external discipline – that of the school – or strong cultural restraints on inappropriate behaviour, such pupils will often look for opportunities to disrupt, and find an outlet for their aggression and 'laddishness' inappropriately, which in the context of the school environment provides fun for them and entertainment for those around them.

Pupils, on the other hand, see themselves as being at Line End predominantly because of difficulties in their previous schools, with many of the perceived problems revolving around the work in class - learning difficulties, task frustration, ineffective teacher support. The experience of outreach teachers in schools, moreover, validates the claims of some of the pupils that inappropriate behaviour is a response to the frustration of not being able to cope with work, whilst the findings of Cole et al (1999) support the contention that inappropriate responses to pupil needs - whether curricular or affective - disadvantage 'EBD' pupils. In the

eyes of pupils, moreover - the response of mainstream schools were not unconnected to the labels that had been bestowed upon them, and, as is suggested in the literature (Furlong, 1985; Tattum, 1982; Tomlinson, 1982) some pupils perceive that the labelling process is simply a means of ejecting them from the mainstream system. As seen in the perceptions of the Year 10 pupils, the labels are very adhesive, and travel with them through their educational lives - often at great cost - separating, isolating and stigmatising, a perspective supported by the outreach teachers, validating the assertions of the pupils that, once they had been labelled, it was unlikely that schools would expend too much energy in trying to keep them.

The responses of parents to considerations of causality suggest, for some, a construction of 'EBD' based on a medical model, and in particular, ADHD. A medical construction of 'deviance,' however, can provide a convenient peg on which to hang the reasons for pupil behaviour (Box 1981; Booth and Coulby 1987), parents perceiving that it releases them from any guilt or blame. Once convinced of the causality, therefore, parents can go on the offensive; seen as a medical condition, it was unfair, argued one parent, that her child was punished within school for inappropriate behaviour and makes the point in a written response for the annual review of her child's statement:

"A child with epilepsy is not punished for having a fit, but a child with ADHD is punished for their symptoms."

Another parent wanted her son diagnosed as having Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD.) so that he could be prescribed Ritalin.

"He was tested years ago for that Ritalin, but they wouldn't give it him. There's a boy down our road, Billy. He's ten and he's on Ritalin, and he's in normal school. I'm going to the clinic to see if I can get him on it. I think it'll settle him down."

whilst another commented:

"I'm taking him to the doctors. He's being bloody awful at home. I think he's got that attention thing, and they can give him tablets for it."

Clearly, therefore, there are some parents who see Ritalin as the 'magic bullet' that will not only address the behavioural difficulties of their children, but will also absolve them from any of the vicarious guilt they may have felt for that behaviour, as once ADHD is diagnosed,

causality can be swiftly relocated into the medical camp (Roe, 1978). Armstrong (1995) further argues that implicit in parents' suggestion that there is a medical or pseudo-medical explanation for children's behaviour is that any provision will incorporate 'treatment' for the children's difficulties - hence the perspective of some parents that the role of the school is to 'fix' the problem.

Most parents, however, feel that it is the inability or unwillingness of their children to adjust to the demands of mainstream life – both academically and behaviourally - that leads to the labelling of their children. The effect of inappropriate behaviour on other pupils, moreover, is mentioned by several parents - and by some Line End staff - suggesting that provision for 'EBD' pupils need not necessarily be informed primarily by the needs of the pupil, but by the interests of others, the labelling of pupils being the first step in the process of removal from mainstream, so that the conforming majority can continue to learn, and teachers can continue to teach (Galloway et al, 1994; Barton and Tomlinson, 1984).

It is clear, however, that some parents experience the confusion and frustration of not knowing 'why', and the frustration of the on-going behavioural problems presented by the child, despite the intervention of significant others in the child's life. When things are perceived to go wrong, it is an integral part of human nature to want to find somewhere to fix the blame, to find a 'peg' on which to hang the underlying reasons for the problem; and frustration is not only the result of having to cope with the problem, but also of not being able to locate an appropriate peg upon which to hang the causes of that problem.

The role of Line End.

Whereas some staff felt that the school's role was to change pupil behaviour, others felt that the role of the school was not to 'fix,' but to work with children to develop strategies that will help them to cope more effectively. Accepting that these children have experienced failure and rejection in mainstream, this approach seems to be informed by what Skrtic (1991) terms 'critical pragmatism' - a means of strategic thinking based on the acknowledgement that the grounding assumptions of social practices – in this case those of some mainstream schools - are to be seen as problematic: the relocation model approach to pupil disaffection/deviance as exercised by such schools is seen, in effect, to devalue pupils, to corrode self-image and self-worth; the role of Line End is seen, therefore, as being to accept and value pupils for who

they are, aiming to re-build self-worth through, as one teacher suggested, engaging in practices which aim 'to provide a fresh start,' within a 'calm, caring, consistent and positive atmosphere where children are supported, valued and given the opportunity to succeed.' In accepting that it is unlikely that mainstream schools will adapt their practices to address their individual needs, Line End must somehow equip pupils with the requisite coping strategies for surviving in what can be an institutionally hostile environment, if reintegration is to be a realistic and viable option. To this end, it was felt important that pupils took ownership of their own behaviour, any change coming ultimately from within, though it was accepted that it was the role of the school to create the conditions, and provide the appropriate support mechanisms within which this could be facilitated.

With some staff feeling that the effectiveness of teaching and learning opportunities was being compromised by inappropriate pupil behaviour, making it therefore inappropriate to focus on curricular issues until the problems of pupil behaviour had been addressed, there is clearly the potential for tensions within the operational framework of the school when these perspectives are balanced against the perspectives of those who feel that the curriculum and classroom practice should be the main focus of the school's provision (Kennard, 1988; Lund, 1990; Bull, 1995; Orr, 1995). If the effective implementation of policy depends on consistency of practice across the school, then multiple perspectives informing classroom practice in relation to the addressing of pupils' needs, can only serve to compromise any whole-school planning for development and improvement.

There are implications, too, for the process of reintegration, and pupils' exposure to the culture of high academic expectations that obtain in mainstream, where pupils might find it difficult adjusting to an environment where the emphasis is on increasing levels of independent study skills, more tightly structured and less flexible pedagogic approaches to teaching and learning, and lower tolerance thresholds towards those whose behaviour might compromise the learning opportunities of others within the classroom, especially if they have experienced failure and rejection within such an environment previously (Skrtic, 1991; McManus, 1995).

For many pupils, however, the role of Line End is perceived in terms of the provision it should be making for them - a wider range of facilities, and a physical environment which mirrors that of mainstream, reflecting the perceived constraints that are a natural consequence

of being a small school. There is, however, a shift in attitude amongst pupils in relation to their feelings about mainstream as they progress through the school: in Years 7 and 8, there is a clear expectation that the role of the school is to facilitate for them a return to mainstream; by Year 9, there is no such expectation, possibly because pupils feel there is no realistic prospect - or desire - for reintegration. It could be argued that by the time pupils have reached the end of Key Stage 3, they have become institutionalised into the culture of Line End. As realistic prospects for returning to mainstream have diminished, there is a sense of being in the 'comfort zone,' based on an amalgamation of higher tolerance thresholds than those they have experienced or might expect in mainstream and the security of the small-school environment. To move from being a big fish in a big pond to a minnow in the comparative ocean of mainstream is, understandably, a daunting prospect, and staying in the frying pan may seem a preferable option to being launched into the fire. For those pupils who still entertain a desire to return to mainstream, there is a certain perspicacity of thought from some who recognise the need for support once in the mainstream system. Indeed, the perspective of one Year 9 pupil who was reintegrated into a mainstream school from Line End, was that it broke down because he was simply left to sink or swim, with no policy or practice of differentiated support for him in his new environment.

For some parents, finally - particularly those of lower school pupils - the role of Line End was seen as being to prepare pupils for reintegration into mainstream, through the remediation of inappropriate behaviours, a perception that would see Line End as the equivalent to the service department of a garage - a place where dysfunctional vehicles are taken to be repaired and serviced, given a certification of roadworthiness, and returned to the mainstream of highway life. Although a desire for reintegration reflects the schools' self-perceived role, however, this 'fix-em-and-send-'em-back' interpretation is naïve and oversimplistic - not to say unrealistic and impracticable. There were other parents, however, who, although recognising the schools' role in facilitating the reintegration of pupils, also recognised the dividing line between hope and reality:

"We were hoping that he would be able to go to mainstream, but we feel his behaviour is too unpredictable, and he is too immature, and hasn't developed educationally enough to keep up with others."

For those parents who see attendance at school as being an end in itself, their expectations reflect their perceived struggle over time to keep their children - often unsuccessfully - in

school. One parent suggested that this lowered the expectations of many parents, who were simply happy that their children were getting a full time education:

“Most parents are grateful their kids are in school and don’t want to upset the apple cart. They’re thankful that the school will take their children, especially when the kids are out of school a long time.”

Once in, however, it is important that pupils stay in, as the experience of many parents is of their children running out of school, or being sent from school, and the downward spiral that leads to exclusion and long periods of time outside of school, and therefore for these parents, continuous attendance can simply become an end in itself. For some, however, once their children are seen to be fairly settled in school, thoughts often turn to educational issues, and parents’ expectations are raised beyond simple attendance on a regular basis, to improvements in performance in literacy and numeracy, and other areas of the curriculum. They also have to contend with the reality that inappropriate behaviours often remain - they are not suddenly ‘magicked’ away by dint of attendance at a ‘special’ school. But whereas some parents may have been content in the past for schools to simply contain these behaviours, there is now an expectation that the school will ‘fix’ the problem for them. The reality, though, is that parents may have multiple expectations of the school, but may be unclear as to which, if any, should take precedence, reflecting an ambivalence, on the part of some, as to their children’s principal needs.

Criteria for effectiveness.

Addressing pupils’ needs – academic and behavioural.

The criteria by which staff at Line End would judge the school to be effective generally reflect the ‘effectiveness factors’ outlined in the research literature as they pertain to mainstream education generally (Mortimore et al, 1988; Tizard et al, 1988; Reynolds, 1991; Cuttance, 1992; Silver, 1994; Sammons et al, 1995; Stoll and Fink, 1996; White, 1997), and in EBD provision specifically (Cole et al, 1998; Ofsted, 1999; Cole & Visser, 1998). Criteria for the extent to which pupils’ emotional/behavioural needs are effectively addressed, however, suggest an ambivalence in staff perceptions; for some staff, the school is effective if it manages and contains the inappropriate behaviour of pupils; for others, however, the effectiveness of the school’s approaches to pupils’ behavioural needs is the extent to which pupils are empowered to take ownership of, and subsequently modify their own behaviour, a

policy, primarily of empowerment rather than containment, though there is an acknowledgement that the containment of challenging behaviour is a necessary aspect - though not the prime one - of an effective behaviour policy.

Teachers themselves are able to recognise the tensions that arise from competing values and expectations:

“I am told that I am doing well if I contain the kids; if I haven't sent anyone to withdrawal, I've been told that's been good. It doesn't actually do a lot for me, as it's not what I believe I'm here to do, and I think that other staff feel they've done a good job if they've contained the kids within the classroom. I feel people would think I was doing my job well if that's what happened.” (Teacher E.)

From the perspective of Teacher E, the effectiveness of individual teachers will be judged, by some, by the number of pupils being sent out of lessons. Challenging work for pupils based on high expectations of work and performance, however, may be compromised for the sake of control and containment, and the management of pupil behaviour thus becomes more important than the extent to which they progress in their learning. By concentrating on the 'difficulty,' it may become easier to avoid risk-taking with pupils, and to structure teaching and learning so as to minimise the risk of disruption within the classroom - pedagogy informed by the perceived need for containment and control. The danger is, however, that although disruption might be contained, the classroom may well become a breeding ground for disaffection, where pupils see little value in what they are being 'fed.' It also creates the potential for frustration for those staff who see teaching and learning as being the primary concern of the school, and a more appropriate means by which the emotional and behavioural needs of pupils might be addressed - and who are willing to take risks within the classroom to achieve this.

In defence of a 'containment' approach, one member of staff commented that “control's better than no control,” but this would seem to assume that the alternative to exercising control is having no control at all, whereas in reality, the corollary of a culture of containment and control - what Hargreaves et al (1975) term as one that is 'deviance-provocative' - is one of empowerment and giving pupils greater control of their own lives' a culture described by Hargreaves (1975) as being 'deviance-insulative.' Whereas the 'deviance-provocative' culture is exemplified by behaviour management strategies that are confrontational and

punitive, based on the expectation of troublesome and offending behaviour, the 'deviance-insulative' culture is aimed at de-escalation of conflict and avoiding confrontation, and allows opportunities for pupils to save face - offering a way out of a potential impasse with dignity intact or restored. Within such a culture, there is a belief that pupils want to work and improve, relationships being based on respect for pupils, empathy and humour. Similarly, Reynolds (1985) differentiated between a school culture reflecting an 'incorporative ethos' - based on minimum institutional control, participation in the life of the school by both pupils and parents, and high expectations of pupils' abilities - and a 'coercive ethos,' exemplified by high levels of control and punishment, low pupil and parent participation, and an under-estimation of pupils' abilities.

The danger of exercising two approaches within the one environment is the creation of what Teacher A. refers to as a 'two-tier system' of behaviour management, informed by separate and conflicting value systems. Children are quick to spot inconsistencies of approach amongst staff, and are often all too willing to exploit such situations in playing staff off against each other. There are also implications for the culture of the school in terms of its ethos and environment, as if pupils feel themselves subject to 'deviance-provocative' mechanisms of control, then there is a potential for this to impact upon peer relationships, and the reinforcement of 'macho' values within the school environment. Gretton (1996), quoting the head of an inner-city school, argued that:

"We have to create a counter-culture of learning with these youngsters, instead of strength being solely associated with the purely physical ability to survive in the urban jungle."

There is also the possibility that dual approaches to behaviour management might lead to resentment, and possibly conflict amongst stakeholders. If there is a 'coercive' ethos created by high levels of control and punitive responses to inappropriate behaviour, it is not only pupils and parents who may come to resent such approaches, but also those staff whose practices are informed by the perceived need for more 'incorporative' approaches, and who may feel disempowered or disenfranchised if such approaches are perceived by some pupils - and maybe some colleagues - as being weak or ineffectual, within a culture where 'macho' values dictate that might is right, and only the toughest survive.

The findings suggest that for pupils, moreover, there is a relationship between the perceived effectiveness of teachers and the perceived effectiveness of the provision made for them, reflecting the assertion of Wilson and Evans (1980, page 80) that: 'the quality of any provision for children will depend on the quality of the people who run it.' In indicating the type of teacher they wanted - strict but fair, with a good sense of humour, someone who did not shout, and was able to have a laugh - there is an inference that some of these pupils had come up against authority figures in their previous existences in mainstream, whose characteristics were antithetical to those of the perceived ideal teacher: i.e. staff who appeared strict and unfair, humourless (with them, anyway,) shouted a lot, did not seem to be able to have a laugh. Redl (1996) noted that in dealing with children's inappropriate behaviour, a sense of humour was the most vital characteristic of the adult involved. Pupils also sense, he argued, the hidden messages behind the overt words and actions of adults, and can sense if they are liked or cared about:

"The fact is that the youngsters not only respond to what we say - they also smell our value feelings, even when we don't notice our own body odour any more." (P83)

Parents, too, wanted the best provision that could practicably be made for their children's academic and emotional/behavioural needs, though the value put on the processes of learning and academic progress by parents may differ significantly from those of staff, and may be reflected in their children's own attitudes to learning, manifest within the classroom. Where pupils' lack of engagement with the learning process is addressed through the school's sanctions system, the response of more than one parent is that because Line End is a special school, it is our job to sort the problem out, and using sanctions to address pupils' inappropriate attitudes and behaviour within the classroom is akin to punishing people for being ill. Hence, parents may be seen, by staff, as being part of the problem (Wood, 1988; Barton, 1988), and tensions will increase if parents perceive - as some do - that they are seen as part of the problem by the school. The danger, therefore, is that a negative circle is created, and fuelled by these tensions, where parents blame the school for pupil problems, and the school blames parents and the home environment. There is also a potential conflict arising from the differing perspectives of stakeholders regarding the means by which the emotional/behavioural needs of pupils should be addressed. Whereas most staff see themselves as facilitators in the behaviour change process - rather than actual agents of change - parents (and sometimes pupils) often see it as the school's role - and therefore the

teachers' – to 'fix' problem behaviours. If it is perceived that there is no discernible improvement in pupil behaviour, then blame might be attached to the school, which might then be perceived as being ineffective in this area of provision.

For one parent, however, there was a sense of resignation rather than anticipation for her son's educational future. Recognising that any realistic chance for reintegration had come and gone, she simply felt that Line End's effectiveness could be measured by the extent to which her son was prepared for life in the real world, post 16, hopefully with some recognised qualifications and a place at college. Her resignation lay in her perception that her son's educational needs had become secondary to LEA expediency, and the tool used by the LEA to address and fulfil its own short-term goals was seen to be the statement of special educational needs. This mother felt 'conned' (her word) by the LEA into agreeing to a statement for her son, as the extra support she felt he needed was dependent on it. She felt that this was particularly unjust, since there were many pupils in mainstream she felt were as bad as, or worse than her son; yet because he was statemented, she felt that he was open to manipulation by the LEA, and as a result provision was seen as resource-based rather than needs-based, partly because "there are a lot of female parents who are less challenging to professionals," and therefore LEAs are seen to take decisions about provision for individual pupils that take little account of parental views, though ostensibly parents are 'involved' in the decision making process during the special needs assessment procedure. This is reflected in the research literature (Booth & Statham, 1982; Tomlinson, 1981; 1982; Armstrong, 1995), which suggests that LEAs are perceived by many parents to define the needs of, and specify appropriate provision for others, which leaves many parents feeling both dissatisfied and powerless. The result, as far as this parent was concerned, was that the statement had 'become a label that is a millstone round his neck;' and whatever Line End does that enhances her son's prospects when he leaves will be seen as a bonus, when put within the context of this parent's perception of how she and her son have been let down by and within the educational system.

Not unconnected to this, moreover, is the perception of parents that Line End is effective if pupils attend regularly, as experiences of mainstream have often involved non-attendance, either through pupils absenting themselves from school, or pupils being excluded from school. If it is seen that pupils actually want to attend Line End - or are at least willing to - then the school must be doing something right. Realistically, however, there is a greater

chance of pupils turning up regularly, as the majority of pupils are collected in the morning from their homes by taxi, an obligation on the part of the LEA in fulfilling its duty vis-a-vis the statement of Educational Need. For a small number of parents, keeping pupils on the premises until the end of the school day is an important factor, especially where their children have a history of turning up at school and then walking out. For the parents of pupils who have been regular 'absconders', success for them is measured in terms of frequency: if the frequency at which pupils run off lessens over time, then the school is seen to be instrumental in facilitating this improvement, and can therefore be considered as effective in this particular area. Conversely, if pupils walk out of school, the school is often blamed by parents for not keeping them in, and in this respect, the school can be perceived to be ineffective by some parents when this happens, as seen in the comments of two parents in interviews, who suggested that the school might be doing more to ensure that their children stayed in school rather than running off.

Hiding behind the rhetoric of the LEA policy statement – outlined in the Behaviour Support Plan – lies the answer to the question: 'What do the people who place pupils at Line End actually want of the school?' The LEA clearly has its own agenda – meeting statutory obligations to provide full-time education for all pupils within the authority – and the extent to which the educational, social and emotional needs of children are appropriately met might be less important than ensuring that as many pupils as possible receive this entitlement. Pupils who have been permanently excluded from mainstream schools invariably end up on the LEA's waiting list for school placement, the existence of which reflects the LEA's inability to meet its statutory obligations at any one time. Placement, therefore, becomes paramount, and if Line End can accommodate as many pupils as is practicable, then short-term political expediency might realistically inform the referral process, rather than a measured response to pupils' actual needs; and thus Line End may simply be perceived by the LEA as being effective if it can readily accommodate pupils on the authority's waiting list – an ill-sorted and often incompatible group of the authority's most intractable or troubled youngsters – who have become the 'untouchables' of the mainstream system, echoing the view of Tomlinson (1982) that the LEA, in its role of referring agent, simply becomes an instrument of relatively cheap social control, when compared with the costs of social service/health service provision, or educating the young person outside of the local authority. No-one within the LEA would, I imagine, ever go on record in support of this hypothesis, but then maybe that is why the LEA officer responsible for SEN provision refused to take part in

the study – for fear of being put in the position of having to justify the rhetoric of the LEA policy, whilst knowing the reality to be somewhat different.

With the refusal of the LEA officer to participate in the study, therefore, the perspectives of the advisory team became the main source of data. It was made clear, however, that there would be no stepping outside of the Ofsted structure to offer more personal insights into the perceived role of Line End, and the criteria by which its effectiveness might appropriately be evaluated. From the adviser's point of view, it may well have been an acknowledgement of, and response to, the current realities within the educational system. Line End's effectiveness will be judged externally by the DfEE through Ofsted, and since Line End represents part of the LEA's budget that is non-delegated, then any evaluation of the school's provision will be seen to reflect upon the management of SEN provision by the LEA. Structures, moreover, provide security, and the Ofsted Framework for the Inspection of Schools is accepted as the standard by which school effectiveness is currently evaluated, offering consistency and stability of implementation, whether real or illusory. In practice, this may lead to a conflict between what the LEA – and Ofsted – value, and that which is valued by other stakeholders – pupils, parents and staff. The criteria by which Ofsted has evaluated the effectiveness of schools have focused upon schools' academic attainments (Slee and Weiner, 1998; Lingard et al, 1998), the central criterion being the comparative attainment of pupils as assessed by Standard Attainment Tests (SATs) and external examinations - mainly GCSEs, a reflection of the government perspective which is based on a consumerist approach to the evaluation of effectiveness – the quantifiable assessment of performance based upon GCSE A-C percentages, SATs results, league tables, exclusion and attendance rates. Many have argued against too narrow an interpretation of achievement when assessing the effectiveness of a school (Blakey and Heath, 1992; Macbeath, 1992; Perkins, 1995; Creemers, 1996; MacGilchrist, 1997), with Wilkins (1999) suggesting that the meaning of quality and effective practice in education has to be sought beyond the statistical domain.

If, therefore, the predominant Ofsted criterion for the evaluation of the school's effectiveness is pupil outcomes in KS3 SATs and GCSEs at KS4, then there are other factors, as seen in the Phase I findings, that do not come within the Ofsted Framework for Inspections which will be highly valued by parents, pupils and staff, not least pupil achievement - the actual progress that children make over time – which would appear to be a more equitable way of evaluating a school's effectiveness. This might also include areas of practice such as the quality of

relationships, higher tolerance thresholds – indicators of effectiveness that are more qualitative than quantitative, but those which, nonetheless, are meaningful to the stakeholders who value them. In the case of Line End, the criteria of effectiveness used by Ofsted may in themselves be inappropriate for making safe evaluations on the effectiveness of provision and practice within the school. The statutory framework which informs the inspection of schools applies to all phases of education - primary, secondary and special - with little variation in the tests for the quality of provision within schools, despite separate handbooks for each separate phase. It has been argued, furthermore, that this model of evaluation particularly disadvantages many pupils in EBD settings, who have often experienced rejection from mainstream schools due to their inability/unwillingness to cope with the inflexibility of a curriculum which measures and values success in predominantly quantifiable pupil outcomes (Marchant,1995; Peagam,1995; Laslett,1995).

What is needed therefore, when assessing the effectiveness of Line End, is the recognition of a wider range of outcome measures than those used by Ofsted, a perspective supported variously by Cuttance, (1992), Mortimore (1992), Gray (1995), Goleman (1996). What is particularly inappropriate, moreover, is the use of comparative data that takes no account of different school circumstances, which assumes the homogeneity of all provision. Attainment is measured against age-related national expectations or averages, and although this can be disapplied in the case of special schools, there is no mechanism for measuring the progress of pupils within the National Curriculum framework, nor at GCSE level, that serves as an effective indicator of pupil progress in relation to prior attainment. Consequently, the extent to which the school may be making provision appropriate to the needs of a diverse school population - an important criterion, I would suggest, by which the effectiveness of the school might usefully be evaluated - goes largely unrecognised, as the inflexibility of the Ofsted framework and schedule for the inspection of schools does not easily accommodate such evaluations.

In terms of addressing both the academic and emotional/behavioural needs of pupils, finally, Rayner (1998) suggests that a re-conceptualisation of 'EBD' is called for in terms of an appropriate pedagogy aimed at providing the key which will open up the learning process, based on the recognition of the relationship between behaviour, leaning and teaching – a reconceptualisation of what it is that creates barriers to pupils' learning. Rather than focusing upon 'misbehaviour,' based as it is on a within child deficit model of pupil need, the focus

should be on 'teaching behaviour' and 'learning behaviour' as pivotal to both success and failure in learning. This represents an approach based on prevention rather than cure, a proactive rather than a reactive response to pupils' perceived needs, a by-product, suggest Galloway and Goodwin (1987) of processes aimed at raising the quality of education for all pupils.

Providing a safe, secure and positive environment.

As discussed earlier, Ofsted's criteria for effectiveness are outlined predominantly in quantifiable terms, whereas the effectiveness factors for other stakeholders are broadly qualitative; and although some of these effectiveness criteria might be agreed upon by stakeholders, the perspectives which have informed them may differ significantly. All stakeholders, for example, agree that the quality of peer relationships is an appropriate indicator of the schools effectiveness; for parents, this may be validated by an absence of bullying, and for pupils the absence of bullying and an absence of name-calling or 'winding-up.' Teachers, however, may feel that a realistic indicator of good peer relationships is not only a low incidence of bullying and name-calling, but also a positive learning environment, where positive peer relationships lead naturally to enhanced teaching and learning opportunities for pupils. This has the potential for leading to conflict between home and school, reflecting the tensions between the differing values and expectations of staff and parents. For parents, consistent attendance and children who want to go to school suggests that they are happy, and for many parents that may be enough, especially in the light of past experiences in mainstream education.

Pupils' perceptions are clearly important in evaluating the effectiveness of Line End's provision in this area, as it is primarily for them that the school should be a safe, secure and positive environment. When pupils were asked about the things that would make Line End the ideal school, part of the list of responses (Appendix M.) comprised a number of desired facilities which ranged from the fantastic and idealistic to the sensible and mainly practical. It could reasonably be argued, I feel, that the physical environment of the school, and the range and quality of the facilities on offer, reflect, in the perceptions of pupils, the value placed on them by the school; and in view of pupils' experiences in mainstream - and the ways in which they have come to feel devalued through these experiences - the extent to which they perceive Line End to value them may be an important criterion in their evaluation of the school's perceived effectiveness. Of the other factors perceived as important for pupils,

school uniform, good friends and the opportunity to play in school sports teams suggest a desire for some form of group identity, which the pupils of EBD schools tend to miss out on. Whereas in mainstream schools, pupils move from primary to secondary with at least some friends, pupils who come to Line End come, more often than not, not knowing anybody else; they also come to the school as 'individuals' - individuals with needs, with 'problems', with labels - reflected, to some extent, in the language of special educational needs (Corbett, 1996). Hargreaves (1982) suggests that this search for group identity is often the beginning of the process that leads to certain pupils being displaced from mainstream: in arguing that the secondary school system is failing a large minority of its pupils, he cites the 'cult of individualism', in that integration into the society of the school and the consequent establishing of institutional identity and belonging, has been eclipsed by an emphasis on individual needs and welfare. Pupils, therefore, may find group identity through the appropriate peer group sub-culture - in many cases disaffected, disruptive or low/under achieving groups - often seen in Years 10/11 - from which some pupils are ultimately separated, excluded, and directed to 'special,' off-site provision as isolated individuals.

There is also a sense that pupils evaluate the effectiveness of Line End in terms of relationships within the school, and how they feel they are treated, both by staff and by peers. There is a clear recognition that the school is a society, and within that society they feel that they have a number of rights - rights which relate to how they are treated when they infringe the rules, how they are treated by their peers, how their perceived needs are addressed, the extent to which their voices are heard. It is clear that many pupils feel a sense of powerlessness from having had decisions made for them by professionals throughout their educational lives, and it is therefore important - noticeably so for the older pupils - that they are given the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process within school, as a means of taking back some control of their lives, as clearly articulated by Leah (Year 11) in her interview.

Reintegration into mainstream.

The reintegration of pupils to mainstream is cited as an effectiveness factor by Line End's stakeholders, but it is addressed from two separate perspectives: the opportunities for the reintegration of pupils, and the extent to which pupils are successfully reintegrated. This, I would suggest, constitutes two discrete criteria for effectiveness, one of which is broadly appropriate - reflecting one of the espoused aims of the school, the other not necessarily as

appropriate. If the school recognises the potential for a pupil to be reintegrated into mainstream school, then, in fulfilling its own perceived role, the school can be considered effective if it makes every effort to prepare the pupil appropriately for this transition - involving parents, the 'receiving school', the Farside EBD outreach team, the LEA - establishing networks of support to ensure that the chances of a successful reintegration are fully maximised. If, however, after the school has done all in its power to facilitate such a transition, the placement breaks down, then it is not necessarily an indictment of the school's effectiveness, as it may have been variables beyond the control of the school that have contributed to the lack of success. Given, moreover, that there will be two separate institutions involved in the reintegration process, to use the number of successfully reintegrated pupils as an effectiveness criterion for Line End - as the Local Authority suggests would be fair and appropriate - would be to deny the role of the other institution, and trivialise important contextual factors. It might be argued, furthermore, that the school can become a victim of its own success: if Line End fulfils another of its own criteria for effectiveness - the provision of a 'structured, stable and positive environment' - then the transition from such an environment to one that is perceived as less positive and less stable - as the experiences of one Year 9 pupil suggested - may precipitate the 'failure' of a pupil to adjust to the mainstream setting. Some staff at Line End feel that once pupils arrive at Line End, they may become 'institutionalised' into the culture of the school, making successful reintegration to mainstream less likely.

Herein, therefore, lies the dilemma for Line End: to what extent does the school replicate the practices of mainstream - the arena in which most of the pupils have experienced failure and rejection - for the sake of enhancing the chances of successful reintegration as a means of reducing as far as is possible the culture shock of moving from one environment to the other? By being perceived to be effective in one area - the identifying and addressing of pupils' academic and affective needs - the school may be perceived by some to be ineffective in another, by virtue of the small number of pupils successfully reintegrated into mainstream.

Parents offer a somewhat mixed response to perceptions of criteria pertaining to the effectiveness/success of Line End. The 'reintegration factor' figured significantly in parents' responses, predominantly in the lower school. Interestingly, it was not a successful reintegration that was important for parents, but rather pupils being given a chance to be considered for reintegration. As with pupils, parents often referred to mainstream as 'normal'

school, reflecting the perception that mainstream offered a more traditional, structured and disciplined – and therefore better – education, simply because it was where the majority of children - ‘normal’ children - were educated, and the perceived stigma that came from attendance at a special school. For other parents, however, reintegration did not figure as an indicator of the school’s effectiveness; rather, it was more important that their children were happy wherever they were, and if they were happy at Line End, then the school could be perceived as being effective. So much of children’s experiences of mainstream school, moreover, has involved unhappiness, anxiety, frustration, inconvenience, a direct result of conflict, fractured relationships with both peers and adults, and unresolved tensions within the mainstream setting. Undoubtedly this has impacted upon the home environment, and as a consequence, the unhappiness felt by the child has spread itself into the lives of others, and affected detrimentally relationships at home. It is in parents’ best interests, therefore, if their children can find a level of happiness and contentment within school, as it means better relationships at home, tension between home and school is alleviated, and greater peace of mind from the knowledge that their children are in school on a regular basis accessing the educational opportunities available, rather than languishing at home or on the streets. And if parents, therefore, feel that their children are happy at Line End, then this represents a new experience for them, and makes it a ‘good’ school for that reason, as testified by data from parental interviews outlined in the Main Findings.

In contrast, however, the Local Authority has clear expectations of the school’s role in relation to meeting the needs of those children for whom it has a legal responsibility – those who are ‘looked after’ under the requirements of the 1989 Children Act. The expectation that the reintegration of children into mainstream should be one of Line End’s major roles suggests that the Local Authority sees the most effective provision for the needs of ‘looked after’ children being addressed in mainstream; the extent to which this happens being used as a criterion by which the effectiveness of Line End will be evaluated suggests, however, that this may represent an over-simplistic view of the processes of reintegration, and that the role of the ‘receiving’ school within that process has not been clearly considered or understood. This can lead to tensions between the Local Authority and the school, an area developed later in the chapter.

Clearly there is agreement amongst many of Line End’s stakeholders on the importance of providing opportunities for the reintegration of pupils into mainstream, though for some it

was neither practicable nor desirable. There is a potential for conflict amongst stakeholders, however, in terms of the implementation of policy into practice. The 'now's as good a time as any' attitude of some parents and pupils, may well conflict with the more conservative and cautious approach of staff, who do not want to consider reintegration for a pupil prematurely, for fear of subjecting the pupil to more potential failure, and also jeopardising future placements at mainstream schools if it is perceived that Line End sends across pupils who simply cannot cope in mainstream. The consequence of 'over-caution' moreover, is that pupils may lose heart, and resign themselves to staying at Line End, completing their institutionalisation into a culture that may be antithetical to that which may obtain in mainstream, in terms of progression to more independent learning and self-management of behaviour.

Although, moreover, reintegration is seen as a laudable goal by staff at Line End, the ideal is tempered by pragmatism, and an appreciation of the realities of mainstream life; and although there may be an extent to which parents' and pupils' past recollections of mainstream are 'sanitised' by the filtering out of negative experiences, there is consensus amongst Line End staff, parents and pupils, that problems may be caused and/or exacerbated by the inability/unwillingness of mainstream schools to make effective provision for pupils' individual needs, or to accommodate those who are perceived to be less conforming to institutional expectations than the conforming majority. Instances of this are confirmed by members of the EBD outreach team, who validate the claims by both parents and pupils that the inflexibility of mainstream schools has sometimes led to the marginalising and ultimate exclusion of children. Ironically, it was the addressing of another of the school's aims - the development and maintenance of a safe and secure environment for pupils - that created a real dilemma: having been rejected and excluded from a mainstream environment, pupils at Line End often bring with them the baggage of failure, low self-esteem and insecurity. In providing opportunities at Line End for pupils to achieve and experience success, self-esteem is raised, motivation is enhanced, and achievement begins to feed upon itself. Within the intimate environment of a small school, pupils begin to experience a sense of safety and security where not only their successes are recognised and celebrated, but their inappropriate behaviours are confronted, but within a culture that does not seek to devalue or reject them. Hence the danger is that the environment may become so secure for them that they do not want to leave, and for some pupils, the anticipated fear of becoming anonymous within the

comparative vastness of mainstream might be enough to frustrate any thoughts of reintegration.

What is less clear, however, is how realistic or fair it is to evaluate the effectiveness of Line End in terms of its reintegration record, when there are seen to be so many variables that are beyond the control of the school. Recognising the current constraints and barriers to successful reintegration, therefore, it might justifiably be argued that a fairer measure of the school's effectiveness would be the extent to which its strategic planning takes account of the real and potential difficulties, and the ways these are addressed as a means of making reintegration a more realistic and practicable exercise. This might include the extent to which Line End engages mainstream schools in purposeful dialogue, regarding issues of preparation, transition, appropriate and effective support, roles and responsibilities of both schools, and procedures for the evaluation and review of the placement.

There is agreement amongst stakeholders, finally, that where reintegration is not appropriate, desirable or practicable, then preparation for the world of work, and life post-16 in the outside world, is pivotal to the role of the school. In this, the aspirations of Line End's stakeholders for pupils are no different from those of stakeholders in mainstream schools for their particular pupils; and in aiming to translate these aims into practice, the role of Line End is seen by many of its stakeholders as being to mirror the best practices of mainstream schools, what Maier (1981) has termed the principle of 'normalisation' - a term that reflects both parental and pupil attitudes to the implicit stigma associated with attendance at Line End. This is illustrated by the repeated use of the descriptor 'normal' to refer to mainstream, and by inference, a perception that Line End is 'less than normal' - and by association, the pupils for whom it caters. Neither pupils nor their parents wish to be perceived, as Cole et al (1998, p.96) describe it, as 'a breed apart, unworthy of the full curriculum entitlement as mandated by law.' From the school's perspective, the aim is to replicate the curricular opportunities that obtain in mainstream as far as is practicable, within a behaviour management structure that, though more flexible than mainstream schools are possibly prepared to be, aims to create and maintain high expectations of pupil behaviour. As the research of Cole et al (1998) has shown, this approach is based on the recognition of the danger of the institutionalisation of pupils into the artificial world of the EBD special school, and the need to prepare pupils appropriately for the possibility of a return to a mainstream setting.

Conclusion.

Whether the 'relocation' model of addressing school deviance is informed by interests or needs - or both - young people have to be displaced 'to' somewhere, and although some may end up with no educational provision, or with a few hours home-tuition a week, large numbers find themselves in some form of off-site provision, whether a pupil referral unit, or a school such as Line End. The wide-ranging perspectives on the role and function of Line End often highlight perspectives on other associated areas - albeit implicitly - such as the individual constructs of disaffection/deviance, the role of mainstream schools, issues relating to special educational needs and integration/inclusion, theoretical frameworks within which individuals construct their own educational philosophies. It can be seen that there is broad agreement amongst stakeholders regarding what they want for Line End pupils - for the school to address pupils' needs within a positive and supportive environment - neatly encapsulated within the first two of Line End's three main institutional aims. (A more obvious divergence in perspective relates to the third institutional aim of the school, and its role in facilitating the reintegration of pupils to mainstream.) In this respect, these first two aims are no different from those which obtain in mainstream, and the evaluation of Line End's effectiveness by stakeholders - and, arguably, that of any other school - will be based, to a large extent, on the extent to which it is perceived that the school's aims are being successfully addressed. With such a high degree of agreement amongst Line End's stakeholders regarding the role of the school and the aims of its provision, it might be assumed that there would be few tensions resulting from the range of stakeholder perspectives; this would be based on a prior assumption, however, that stakeholders will evaluate the effectiveness of the school's provision solely on the extent to which it is felt that the aims of the school are being successfully addressed. In reality, however, tensions are seen to arise, not from conflicting perspectives as to the school's role and aims, but from differing interpretations of the ways and means whereby the rhetoric of the school's aims should be translated into day to day practice, and differing perspectives regarding the emphases placed on the various aspects of provision that should be made in addressing pupils' perceived needs.

The main aim of Phase 1 of the research study has been to elicit from the school's various stakeholders, therefore, the criteria by which they would evaluate Line End to be effective. What has emerged is that there is a range of criteria, which are felt to be pertinent in

informing such judgements. The school is not necessarily perceived to be ineffective, however, if all the criteria are not seen to be met; rather, there is an acceptance that Line End might be less effective in some areas than in others. Overall evaluation, therefore, is based on what is felt to be the most important criteria by stakeholders, though within the discrete stakeholder groups, there is evidence of a diversity of perspective as to what the most important criteria for effectiveness are.

CHAPTER 6: PHASE II. MAIN FINDINGS.

Introduction.

The second phase of the study was concerned with establishing the extent to which stakeholders perceive Line End to be effective – based on stakeholders’ criteria as outlined in Phase I. After collating and analysing views from all stakeholder responses from this first phase of the research, it became clear that there were a number of broad areas into which effectiveness criteria could be located. These were informed by stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations of the school’s role, which embraced:

- Addressing pupils’ academic needs, including preparation for the world of work/post-16 education.
- Addressing pupils’ emotional/behavioural needs.
- Providing a safe, secure and positive environment for pupils.
- Providing opportunities for reintegration into mainstream.
- Other factors, included the development of an effective relationship between school and home, and establishing an organisational framework within which pupils needs could be addressed, based on the strategic planning and management of provision.

And although there is broad stakeholder agreement on the role of Line End, it is the extent to which the school is perceived to fulfil the various elements of its role – and the means by which this is done – that determines how effective the school is perceived to be by its various stakeholders.

Summary of main findings.

Addressing pupils’ academic needs.

Staff felt that the curriculum was a strength of the school - as was the way pupils were prepared for transition into the world of work or further education at Key Stage 4 – although it was acknowledged by some that the school was not always effective in engaging pupils fully in the learning process. Pupils felt that the smallness of the school contributed to the effectiveness of curricular provision in terms of support for their academic and learning needs, especially when balanced against previous experiences in mainstream. Some of the older pupils felt that the school should be providing more curricular experiences that were directly related to the world of work, whilst some of the younger pupils expressed the opinion

that mainstream schools provided a better education generally. Parents of pupils at Key stage 4 were pleased with the provision the school had made for their children, whilst parents generally were pleased with the progress being made by their children, especially when reviewed against previous experiences in mainstream. Based on Ofsted criteria, Farside inspectors felt that Line End was less than effective in the areas of academic target-setting and the monitoring of pupil progress, whilst Ofsted itself highlighted the effectiveness of curriculum provision and teaching and learning across school, though it was felt that inappropriate behaviour management within class rendered some provision ineffective.

Addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs.

It was felt by some staff that, despite a whole-school framework for such provision, there were inconsistencies in its interpretation and translation into practice. For some this led to a culture of containment and crisis management, whilst others felt that it disempowered some staff. It was also felt that inappropriate behaviour sometimes had a negative effect on the processes of teaching and learning. Pupils felt that there was a lot of bad behaviour in school, and that staff spent a lot of time telling pupils off. Higher tolerance thresholds – when compared with those of mainstream – were seen as positive, though older pupils felt conscious of a culture of containment and control. Perspectives from parents were varied: some were pleased that their children's behavioural needs were being effectively addressed within school, though others felt that the school's responses to the inappropriate behaviour of pupils were sometimes too punitive. Others felt that there did not seem to be too much improvement in their children's behaviour. Ofsted, finally, felt that there were good systems in place for addressing the behavioural/emotional needs of pupils, but that there was inconsistent and inappropriate management of pupil behaviour by some staff. It was also felt that the rationale for the withdrawal room was unclear, and that it was being ineffectively used.

Providing a safe, secure and positive environment for pupils.

Staff felt that the school was effective in celebrating pupil achievement. Concerns were expressed by some, however, about a perceived culture of aggression and bullying, and that the school did not provide a safe, secure environment for all its pupils. It was nonetheless felt by others that there was a positive ethos within the school, and that concerns could be addressed more effectively because of the smallness of the school. For pupils, the smallness of the school – especially class sizes – the availability of support, and the sense of being

'known' by staff all contributed to the school's effectiveness. Not all pupils, however, felt safe in school, and poor peer relationships, bullying and name-calling were seen as problems. Some parents were pleased that their children were happy at Line End, evidenced by their desire/willingness to attend regularly. The policy and practice of regular rewards for pupil achievement was perceived to be effective in motivating pupils and helping them to achieve. Concerns were expressed by some parents that the school was not being effective in keeping their children on the premises, that bullying took place, and that the mix of children within the school created a negative environment. Ofsted commented on good relationships across the school between and amongst staff and pupils, whilst Farside LEA commented, through its two inspectors, on the positive ethos within school, and the positive relationships between staff and pupils. It was felt by the LEA, however, that the school might be more effective in promoting more positive peer relationships, especially through more appropriate teaching styles.

Providing opportunities for reintegration into mainstream.

Staff felt that the school was not effective in facilitating this. Although some of the younger pupils expressed a desire to return to mainstream, none had been considered for reintegration during the research study. One pupil at Key Stage 4 had returned to mainstream at the beginning of Year 9, and the placement had lasted nearly a year before it broke down. He felt that he had not been appropriately prepared for his return to mainstream, nor effectively supported once he was there. Parents were divided upon the issue of reintegration: some parents – particularly those of lower school pupils – felt that the school should be doing more to get their children back to mainstream, whilst others – notably those of pupils at Key Stage 4 – felt that it was neither practicable nor desirable for their children to return to mainstream. Ofsted noted that although the school was not effective in reintegrating pupils into mainstream, the responsibility for this lay with mainstream schools rather than with Line End.

Other factors.

Concerns were expressed by a number of stakeholders – staff, parents, the LEA and Ofsted – about the quality and effectiveness of home/school relationships, whilst in the area of school organisation and management, some staff felt that the efforts of the school to make appropriate provision for pupils were at times rendered ineffective due to a tendency towards crisis- rather than strategic-management.

Conclusion.

What emerges from these findings, therefore, is that the differing evaluations of Line End's effectiveness clearly reflect the differing criteria of its various stakeholders about what constitutes effectiveness. There is a recognition by some stakeholders, however, that in making evaluations of effectiveness, it is important first to separate out those variables that fall within the power of the school to control or change, and those over which the school has little or no control. In this respect, the school is expected to be an agent of change by its stakeholders; how this is interpreted differs, however, according to the perspectives of the particular stakeholders. Some – mostly parents – expect the school to change children's behaviour, to 'fix' the perceived problems, and therefore if these problems are not seen to be fixed, then the school is perceived as being ineffective. For others, however, the school's role is seen as being to create the conditions within which change can be facilitated; and if change does not occur, it is not necessarily perceived that the school is being ineffective in fulfilling its role. The reality of differing perspectives on the school's effectiveness must therefore be recognised, and the issues of the compatibility and co-existence of these perspectives addressed. Tensions will certainly exist as a result of some of the differing and conflicting stakeholder perspectives; whether they can be resolved, or whether they will simply have to be managed, should inform the processes of planning for school development in the future.

Addressing pupils' academic needs.

Staff:

During an in-service training session, staff were asked to brainstorm ideas on what they perceived to be both the strengths and weaknesses of Line End. (Appendices H.) Staff felt that curriculum provision was a strength of the school, based as it was on full access to the National Curriculum, with opportunities for a range of externally accredited exams. It was appropriately differentiated for need and ability, and staff felt that pupils were set realistic yet challenging targets for improvement. Staff felt, however, that pupils needed to be involved more in their own learning, and that at times the low expectation of pupil performance meant that the targetting for improvement processes were not being used effectively.

From the 114 - statement survey (Appendix Ii.) and the follow-up questionnaire which asked staff to respond to the results of the survey (Appendix Iii.) provision for pupils' academic needs was generally seen to be a strength of the school, based on a classroom environment that is felt to be generally positive and purposeful, high expectations of pupil performance, and the involvement of pupils in setting measurable targets for academic improvement. Inappropriate behaviour in class is felt to be a major impediment to effective teaching and learning, and under-achievement is a problem for many pupils. There was, moreover, a significant divergence of perspectives on whether pupils are clear about the aims and objectives of lessons, whether they feel ownership of their own learning, and the emphasis that should be put on addressing pupils' academic needs - as opposed to their behavioural needs - which suggests that some staff feel that the school is effective in addressing these areas, whilst others clearly do not.

Individual contributions to the study revealed a range of perspectives from staff. The perspectives of the mature PGCE student (Appendix Jii.) can be considered as no more than a snapshot based on initial impressions gained over a two week period. In general terms, she felt the school to be effective in the provision it made in addressing both the academic and behavioural needs of the pupils, with teaching and learning being seen a strength of the school.

There was a clear perception from Teacher D, who had been at the school for a year, that provision for the academic needs of pupils was effective for some - those who were willing

and motivated to learn - though there is no blame attached to the school for not effectively addressing the academic needs of all pupils:

“Children learn academically in school- the ones who want to learn, but there are those who don’t want to learn, who are completely disaffected; that’s not a reflection on the school - it’s probably the fault of the wider education system, or society as a whole.”

Teacher E, who had been at the school for a term after working for several years in mainstream, suggested that in the area of curriculum organisation and delivery, the school was being less than effective, reflected in the attitude of many of the pupils to their own learning:

“I don’t consider that the pupils consider that they are here to learn; from their point of view, these kids see they’re here to be controlled, and not to learn. And I look at it from the other aspect; I’ve come in thinking that I’m here to help these children to learn, and this causes me enormous frustration at the moment, because we’re coming at it from two totally different angles; I find an enormous sense of frustration when the kids leave my room, and I feel that they haven’t learned anything, and I feel that I have wasted my time just by having to focus on their behaviour.”

In this respect, it is felt that the school is not being effective in developing a culture of learning within the school, nor encouraging and motivating pupils to engage effectively with their own learning:

“I do feel there has to be more emphasis placed on learning, and the fact that they are here to learn, and they see the value in learning and the academic process. I spent fifteen minutes talking to “H” and “S” yesterday trying to explain to them (the relevance/importance of the exam they were preparing for) and they didn’t seem to understand; they didn’t seem to think it would have any value for them - now that’s got to be a reflection of the environment they’re in....”

There was also a suggestion that curriculum provision at Key Stage 4 was often inappropriate to pupils’ needs, and therefore ineffective in construction and execution, as it led - certainly in this teachers own subject - to apathy and disaffection:

“One of the most disheartening things for me is no matter how much I have

prepared a lesson, differentiated it, tried my best to make it interesting, tried to do a whole wide range of teaching approaches, the kids come in and say they're not going to do it - science is boring and all the rest of it. And then I do sometimes think to myself - well, should we be providing something else that they can see as more relevant, that for them might be more vocational, particularly when we get to the upper school."

In terms of the implementation of the curriculum, it is felt that there is no effective monitoring of pupil progress:

"There need to be systems for the monitoring of pupil progress, in a structured way, that everyone is doing the same thing - monitoring the academic progress of the kids....and target-setting as well; that is one thing that....I haven't seen any formalised target-setting for academic improvement."

This was felt to be particularly important if pupils were to be prepared effectively for a return to mainstream:

"I think you've got to make your mind up whether you're going to - when a child comes in - whether that child is likely to be staying here for the whole of their academic career, or whether they're likely to be going back to mainstream; and if they're going to go back to mainstream, they're going to have to follow the same curriculum, because otherwise you're making it harder for them to get back."

Amongst the three other teachers who had considerably more experience of working at Line End, there seemed to be an agreement that Line End was generally effective in addressing pupils' academic needs, and in the management, organisation and delivery of the curriculum:

"Academic issues seem to be largely safe ground." (Teacher C)

"I think we're fairly effective curriculum-wise up to a point." (Teacher A)

"I think we're being effective in pushing kids towards some kind of academic attainment." (Teacher B)

There were, however, cautionary observations from two staff members, which suggests that there is a perception that provision for pupils' academic needs could be more effective in certain areas:

"A major cause of disruption in some cases is because lessons are not

as interesting or stimulating as they might be, and this is the teachers' recognised onus of responsibility." (Teacher A)

"There needs to be more encouragement and more flexibility in lessons: we also need to consider enrichment strategies for the curriculum." (Teacher B)

Although, moreover, it was accepted by Teacher C that the school was not always effective in encouraging and motivating all pupils to access the curriculum, she felt that it was less to do with the school's provision, and more to do with variables that were outside the control of the school:

"I think it's more to do with what goes on outside of school. I think staff are really keen to make work stimulating, to keep and hold their interest - I think staff work really hard to differentiate, to push them - I think staff work really hard to differentiate, to push them - I think staff see it very much as their responsibility, and I think it's to do with the pressures of the outside world, really."

Pupils:

Pupils' responses to the things they liked and disliked about Line End were collated and content-analysed (Appendix P). The positives that related to academic provision reflected pupils feelings about the smallness of the school, and its difference from mainstream: small classes, shorter hours, no homework, and the school supplying all equipment. What some pupils felt less positive about were text books that were accessible to pupils of a secondary age who had difficulties with reading, but whose content and style were aimed more at primary aged children. From responses to the 60 – statement survey (Appendix Q.) just under half of the 34 pupil surveyed (44%) felt that they got sent out of class more often than they should, whilst just over one third (35%) felt that they walked out of class more than they should, which suggests an implicit suggestion on the part of these pupils that the school is being less than effective in engaging them in the learning process. Three quarters of pupils said they were aware of what their learning difficulties were, whilst the same number felt that staff were supportive in helping pupils to overcome them.

Findings from pupil responses to individual lessons (Appendix R) showed that pupils respond in different ways to different lessons and teaching approaches. In the follow-up survey, pupils

elaborated on their responses given in the earlier survey, and in a whole group discussion session, offered reasons for the answers they had given (Appendix S.) The things pupils said they liked and found interesting in lessons were split between what teachers did – presenting work that was stimulating and which engaged pupils’ interest – and what pupils themselves did – avoiding work and behaving inappropriately in a number of cases. When asked why they ‘mucked around’ in lessons, pupils cited a lack of interest in and engagement with lesson content, work that is too hard or too easy, and confrontational attitudes towards teachers. In this respect, some pupils felt antagonism towards teachers who were felt to be punitive in their dealings with pupils, whereas they spoke positively about teachers who gave rewards, did not shout, and treated pupils with respect. In terms of target-setting, it was felt by pupils that they were not realistically involved in the process, and that the targets that were set were predominantly behavioural rather than academic.

Findings from the data generated through interviews suggested that pupils felt that Line End was generally effective in meeting their academic needs, with some commenting positively on the way that their reading needs had been addressed, and the progress they had made since they’d been at Line End:

“I’ve improved - I don’t even need to do a reading test now. I can read any book in the library. Me writing has got better - all my education has got better.” (Paul: Year 11)

“Me reading’s come on in leaps and bounds - I’ve gone up two years in six months.” (Mark: Year 9)

“You get more help with your work here - they just ignored you in normal school. That’s why I got into trouble-I just kicked off.” (Martin: Year 7)

There were, however, some implicit criticisms of curricular provision, particularly at Key Stage 4:

“There was this thing at Normal High School, these kitchen designs you used to do on the computer - I got full marks for that. Like building a kitchen with a window and a door. We should have some learning processes like that...do something practical like that on the computers.” (David: Year 11)

“I think it would be nice if we’d had more IT studies, because everything is changing now, all the future is going to be computers and stuff.”

(Peter: Year 11)

Leah (Year 11) felt that the school should be doing more to ‘convince’ pupils of the relevance of learning, and the importance of accessing the teaching and learning opportunities available:

“I think you need to talk to them about the importance of the lessons, and everything, because if someone had spoke to me a couple of years ago and said: ‘Look, you need so much...your work, your lessons. It’ll help you when you leave.’ I think you need to talk to them about that.”

Parents.

Of the parents who commented specifically on how they felt their children’s academic needs were being addressed at Line End – as opposed to those who made more general comments about how they felt their children were progressing – five made positive comments about the school’s provision, of which the following three are examples:

“Mr B said that he feels W is happy at Line End, and that educationally he is improving slowly but steadily, although he is concerned about Wayne’s immature behaviour.” (P11: Year 9 pupil – from Annual Review.)

“His reading’s got really good now. He reads my magazines at home which is a pain, ‘cos I can never find them...His writing still looks like a spider, but I don’t think anyone can help him with that...” (P6: Year 9 pupil – from interview.)

“Mrs R said she is concerned about K’s literacy skills and tries to help him at home. She is pleased he is on the Reading Recovery Scheme.”

(P7: Year 8 pupil – from Annual Review.)

Another parent expressed the view in a written submission to the annual review, that the school had been effective in a number of areas of provision: the addressing of her sons needs, both academic and behavioural, his general progress, and communications between school and home:

“I believe P has settled down well at Line End. P’s behaviour has sometimes

caused slight disruption in class, but Line End has coped well with the situation it has been up against. The teachers and headmaster have all been well to speak with, and helpful when needed. P's work and ability has continued well, while being at Line End school. His marks for school work and effort have been above average. I believe P has not yet been held back in any way (because of Line End) to do with his school work." (P14: Year 9 pupil)

"I wasn't over happy about him coming here. I'm not sure he's going to reach his full potential educationally. If I'm honest, I'd still prefer him to be in mainstream, but I know that's not being realistic." (Year 8 pupil – from interview.)

Farside LEA.

The inspection of the school by the two LEA advisers was based on the Ofsted framework, and the criteria used to inform evaluations of effectiveness are those that were used by Ofsted the following year. In addressing pupils' academic needs, the Farside team felt that two specific areas where school practices were ineffective were academic target setting, both in its focus, and its impact upon the meaning of pupil progress, and in the monitoring of pupil progress through the assessment of measurable outcomes. (Appendix Xii.)

DfEE/Ofsted.

From the Ofsted Report (Appendix Xiii) it was felt that 'the curriculum is a strength of the school' and that overall, the quality of teaching and learning across the school is an indication of effective provision in this area. There were certain areas, however, where Ofsted felt practice was less effective – the process of target-setting for academic progress, and the inappropriate management of pupil behaviour within the classroom.

Addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs.

Staff.

Staff felt that although there were effective policies and systems in place within the school for addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs, the implementation of these policies into practice was less effective. Staff inconsistencies in the interpretation and implementation of policy, a tendency towards crisis management – reactive rather than proactive approaches –

and the perception of a punitive school culture, suggested that there was an implementation divide between the rhetoric of school policy, and the reality of practice.

From responses to the 114 - statement survey, it was perceived that the school has clear, consistent rules, and staff are generally felt to be effective at diffusing difficult situations, with pupils involved in target-setting for behavioural progress, and evaluating their own performance. It is felt, however, that the number of pupils ending up in the withdrawal room is unacceptably high, and that unruly behaviour often impedes the teaching and learning process. It is also strongly felt that inconsistent behaviour management practices may disempower some staff. There is a significant divergence of perspectives, however, on the extent to which teacher responses to pupil behaviour are reactive rather than proactive, and the extent to which this informs a culture of containment and control within the school.

There was a perception from Teacher D in relation to the management of pupil behaviour, that the school tolerates too much inappropriate behaviour, and is therefore being less than effective in addressing pupils' behavioural needs:

“The way some children talk to staff, sexual innuendo - it's insulting to professional people. I think if you raise thresholds, you raise standards.... It's not the norm, it's not the way it is in society, so why should we accept it here?”

Teacher E. felt that the school appears to be effective:

“ in providing a good structure for the kids; they are aware of what the structure is and they follow that structure, especially as regards their behaviour.”

The promotion of a culture that emphasises the management of pupil behaviour, however, is sometimes at the cost of addressing pupils' academic and learning needs effectively:

“It doesn't matter how well you prepare a lesson, no matter what the range of activities are, how you differentiated it, and all the rest of it, and I think to myself that is an absolutely brilliant lesson, and I come in and I find of my 35 minute lesson, I've spent 15 minutes trying to control the behaviour of the children - and I find that very frustrating.”

Teacher C felt that the school was effective in controlling behaviour, but not effective in facilitating changes in behaviour:

“We’re effective up to a point the way we control behaviour. If you’re talking about the big question in terms of how you change behaviour, then clearly we’re not that effective....we tend to find ourselves trying to control in the same way for say three, four years, which obviously if we were effective we wouldn’t really be doing. It’s got to be said that in radically changing the kids’ cycles of behaviour - solving their problems if you like - we’re not being effective, not that we can solve everybody’s problem.”

This point was also picked up by Teacher B:

“Pupils are aware of the school’s expectations, and some of them try and control their behaviour - when it suits, like when they’ve got a pool match or something. The main area where we’re not effective is in providing them with any counselling, if you like....after they’ve been sent out of class to withdrawal, or given lines, there’s very little time to talk with them, how can we help them...I really think we need to be providing more support for children to modify their behaviour...”

Teacher A felt that the school was ineffective in its approach to addressing pupils’ emotional/behavioural needs, and needed to address provision at both cultural and organisational levels. In terms of the culture of the school:

“I think we have an aggressive system of dealing with bullying behaviour, and I think the pupils learn their behaviour from that. Therefore I think we need to change our behaviour - we’ve got to try to be more caring and less aggressive, non-confrontational.”

She maintained that an aggressive behaviour management system created a dual system, whereby:

“those staff who aren’t aggressive, the pupils don’t respect them quite as much. I think they seek it as a sign of weakness when the other system (non-aggressive) is being used.”

It is further felt that this may put her and other teachers in a difficult position with pupils:

“I think the kids pick up on these things, because I’ll say...because I don’t do

it, can't do it, you know - kids come to me and say: 'He can't do that, can he?' and you have to be very professional and say, well, - you know - back the staff up."

To this end, it was felt that: "We tend to be more reactive than pro-active," the inference being that in its planning processes, the school is being less effective than it might, relying more on the crisis rather than the strategic management in addressing the emotional/behavioural needs of pupils.

At an organisational level, Teacher C felt that the withdrawal room - a facility for pupils who had been sent out of lessons, or had walked out - was not operating effectively:

"It's not working on several levels: What they do there is inappropriate.

It's also unmanageable - once they get to the point where they're defying you, giving out messages to others in there, you end up with a steadily deteriorating set of pupils...just copying out school rules makes them meaningless...pupils make a choice to go there - we've got to ask why that is. Some see it as an easy option."

The headteacher not only appeared to recognise and understand the perspectives of his own staff, moreover, but felt that an aggressive approach to behaviour management was what was needed sometimes as a means of maintaining good order within the school, even if some staff disagreed with the way things were done; and clearly, the head felt that a measure of the school's effectiveness was not only the extent to which good order was maintained, but the extent to which things were seen to have improved over time. There was an implicit acknowledgement, however, that what was needed was firmness rather than aggression, and that he himself was sometimes part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

(Appendix Wi.)

Pupils.

From analysis of pupils' perceptions of the good and bad things about Line End (Appendix P) pupils liked clear structures for behaviour management, and the fact that such structures were less rigid than in mainstream. Some of the concerns reflected dissatisfaction with what was perceived as the pettiness of some of the rules, and the inconsistency amongst some teachers in the implementation of behaviour management policies. A group of Year 10

pupils displayed a certain level of corporate disaffection when commenting on some of the school rules, and the way they were enforced by staff:

“You can’t do what you want.” (David: Year 10)

“You shouldn’t pressure us.” (Michael: Year 10)

“Teachers being lippy, pulling rank because they’re teachers.” (Stephen: Year 10)

“It’s a Special Needs School, but we get done for swearing...we can’t help it.”
(Lee: Year 10)

“Being shouted at by teachers for leaning back on chairs.” (Paul: Year 10)

“We want some respect. Teachers don’t respect us.” (Shaun: Year 10)

Responses to the 60-statement survey (appendix U) suggest that over three quarters of pupils (79%) feel that staff spend a lot of time telling pupils off, whilst less than one third (29%) feel that pupils are well behaved in school. Less than half the pupils (44%) said that they knew what their behaviour difficulties were, with only just over one third (35%) feeling that staff were supportive in helping them to overcome their problems, which suggests that a significant number of pupils did not feel that the school was addressing their emotional/behavioural needs effectively.

Some comments suggested a criticism of the culture that was being perpetuated by the school’s behaviour management strategies. A Year 11 pupil, ‘David’, felt that behaviour management within school was based upon response mechanisms aimed at containment and control:

“It’s like trying to keep you under control - they’re nervous that I might do something, that I might start taking liberties, something like that...I might start shouting out, swearing, stuff like that, like taking liberties, so they need to shout at me beforehand to keep my trouble at bay - with some I just get sent home...I think they’re too nervous...of people misbehaving - they’ve got to keep things under control before anything starts.”

The ‘withdrawal room’ - where pupils were sent if their continued presence in class was felt to be too disruptive, or where they went if they walked out of a lesson of their own accord - was felt to be ineffective by Leah (Year 11) who felt that the system was abused by pupils, and had little effect in reducing inappropriate behaviour within the classroom. (Appendix Tii)

Another pupil, Paul, suggested that isolation - being taken out of the classroom to continue with schoolwork at a desk in the school's conference room - was more effective a response to inappropriate behaviour within the classroom than was the withdrawal room, which was considered to be: 'just a laugh, 'cos you could mess around with everyone, and wind up the teachers, and it was better than being in class, but you never learnt anything.' Interestingly, when asked what lessons he didn't mess around in, he replied:

"Mr Z's, in 'xxxx' - he twatted you if you messed around."

which reveals another strategy for addressing the behavioural needs of pupils used within the school that was felt to be effective by at least one member of staff and one pupil. There was also a suggestion by another pupil that some staff responded aggressively to pupils at times, but he added:

"Well, sometimes they need a bit of...er...you know...to straighten them up a bit. Grabbing them like that (indicates) and putting 'em up against the wall's fair enough." (Peter: Year 11.)

Other pupils, however, commented on areas where provision for their emotional/behavioural needs was felt to be effective, when based upon understanding and support:

"That's the good thing about this school: you can talk about what you've been doing, how they can help you to calm down and stuff, and if it's getting off the handle, I can go off for a walk, calm down, come back go to lesson." (Peter: Year 11)

For the same pupil, the strength of the school lay in its structures, and the predictability of the responses to inappropriate behaviour:

"The teachers there (previous EBD school) were just too laid back; we got away with everything, but here you've got a certain set of rules, and if you break those rules you know what the consequences are, but they have no rules there, no detention system, no withdrawal system, no sending home system, nothing at all that just helps the system."

There was not a whole school policy, however, of taking a walk up the road to calm down; rather, this particular strategy had been negotiated between the headteacher and Peter. Other pupils felt that they should be given the same opportunities:

"Whenever P kicks off, he can walk out of school and come back..."

I mean, I can't do that - it's like people won't trust me, but they trust P, and he's always f...ing about in class. They should let me leave the lesson for ten minutes and take a chill pill, not send me to withdrawal straight away." (David: Year 11)

The theme of trust also figured in the comments of Year 10 pupils, who intimated a desire to be given more responsibility and trust, commensurate with their standing in the school:

"Our behaviour would change if we were given more responsibility."

(Stephen, Year 10)

"There's cameras and fences around school (part of the CCTV security system) ...it watches you all day."

(Michael, Year 10)

In the same group discussion with Year 10 pupils, Sally suggested to the group:

"If you want privileges and responsibility you have to earn it - if you give them too much, they can get away with too much,"

and then reminded the group of six boys that it was some of them who had engaged in some gratuitous vandalism, which, ironically, was picked up on one of the CCTV cameras:

"We only kicked in the annexe steps 'cos we were bored." (Michael, Year 10)

The concept of boredom came out in discussions with the same Year 10 group, who suggested that the school was ineffective in offering things that would engage them more, and consequently led to disaffection and erratic attendance, the pupils voting with their feet:

"It's boring." (Michael, Year 10)

"If I've had a late night, I can't be arsed getting to school." (David, Year 10)

"I'd come if school was more fun - more exciting lessons, shorter lessons and longer dinner hour, more time to have a fag." (Stephen, Year 10)

Not all pupils, however, blamed the school for their unwillingness to attend:

"There's nothing wrong with the school, I'm just not getting on with me mum at the moment. She depends on me too much. She sits there all day and says 'Sally do this, Sally get this for me.' She has her mates round in the evening, and I have to clear up the mess in the morning. That's part of the reason I haven't been coming in." (Sally, Year 10)

Parents.

As with many of the parents' perspectives on the effectiveness of Line End's academic provision, a range of perspectives on the school's provision for pupils' emotional/behavioural needs were inferred from more general comments from parents about how they felt their children were progressing. Some parents, however, made specific observations relating to provision for their children's behavioural needs, one parent praising the school for its part in his son's progress. (Appendix Ui.)

"The school's been brilliant with him. When he started he used to run away a lot, didn't he, but he hasn't run off for ages. He was never in school before he came here; I mean he ran away every day, and then he didn't even bother going."

(P12: Year 10 pupil – from interview.)

Another set of parents expressed pleasure at the stability of the placement, and the implicit observation that Line End was more effective at addressing the child's behavioural needs than mainstream had been:

"Mr and Mrs B are very positive about P's placement at Line End. They feel that if he had been placed in a mainstream school, he would have been excluded a long time ago. They said that this continues to be the longest educational placement that P has experienced. (P8: Year 8 pupil – from Annual Review.)

These views were echoed by other parents during interviews:

"He's in school most of the time, and he wasn't hardly ever before he came here, so you must be doing something right. I know he's not perfect, but I was always up at the school and taking him home. I was dreading the phone ringing, so I used to go to me mums or go shopping." (P4: Year 7 pupil.)

"I'm happy 'cos K's happy. He likes coming to school. He was a right little sod before he came here but I think you've done brilliant with him." (Year 10 pupil)

"He's had a good education since he's been here. When there's any trouble you don't fob it off. There's been more time to spend with pupils than bigger schools. Mainstream tends to suspend too early rather than dealing with it; Line End tries to look at why it's happening and dealing with the problem. I said: 'You'll never get back to mainstream' and he said: 'I don't want to - I'm

happy where I am.' He's been happy at Line End." (Year 11 pupil)

Another parent, however, felt quite strongly that the school was failing to address the perceived behavioural needs of her son effectively:

"This isn't the right school for D. He's got worse since he started here...it's not just the school - he's growing up, puberty...he wants to fit in to their ways, so he becomes naughty to fit in... You're not controlling him. You don't make him do what he should do, so he does what he likes." (P22: Year 7 – from interview.)

"I can't see what else the school can be doing for him - his Uncle said this place is getting like Line End Junior - every little think and he's getting sent home." (Year 9 pupil)

Other parents went as far as to suggest, in interviews, that it was the school's fault that the behaviour of their children had deteriorated since being at the school:

"He was never like this when he was at Line End Junior...he's got worse since he's been here." (Year 7 pupil)

"His attitude since he's walked into this school has gone right downhill."
(Year 8 pupil)

"He was never in any trouble until he started here." (Year 8 pupil)

"He never got into trouble (with the police) before coming to Line End."
(Year 10 pupil)

Farside LEA.

In addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs, it was perceived that support for pupils in managing their behaviour was effective, and that pupils generally behave well in lessons. It was felt, however, that pupils were not effectively involved in the target-setting process for improvement in those areas of behaviour outlined in their Statements.

DfEE/Ofsted.

The 1996 Report acknowledged that relationships across school were satisfactory, and that there were effective systems in place for promoting and rewarding good behaviour, for addressing the occasional instances of bullying, and for encouraging pupils to take responsibility for their own behaviour. The inconsistent and inappropriate management of pupil behaviour by staff, however, was cited as an area of ineffective practice, as was the use of the withdrawal room:

“it does not effectively support the improvement of behaviour, nor the promotion of learning.”

Providing a safe, secure and positive environment for pupils.

Staff.

Based on the findings from the staff survey on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the school, (Appendices H.) it was perceived that effective school systems for celebrating achievement, supporting pupils both academically and pastorally, and good relationships between pupils and staff, all contributed to a positive ethos and a positive environment within the school. It was felt, however, that this was compromised at times by a culture of aggression within the school that was often made manifest through incidences of bullying, and by a culture within which staff did not always feel as secure in being as open in professional relationships as they would like to be.

From the 114 - statement survey, it was felt that, despite there being a positive feeling evident in school, with a perceived emphasis on success rather than failure, verbal and physical aggression are commonplace in school, which perpetuates a culture of aggression which permeates the life of the school. Only 53% of staff felt that the school provides a safe and secure environment for pupils, with 73% acknowledging that bullying is a problem within school.

From the perspective of the PGCE student, a positive school ethos and environment was felt to be an important contributory factor in the quality of provision:

“the atmosphere is generally calm and conducive to learning.”

“Relationships between staff and pupils are good. There is a strong sense of team spirit amongst the whole staff. Staff are supportive and understanding of the pupils, their problems and needs. The majority of pupils seem to have regard and respect for the adults in the school.”

Teacher D. also felt that the ethos of the school was one of its strengths:

“From what I see at the moment, I see a great deal of effort being made by the staff, and very supportive...of the children and of each other, and it creates a positive ethos in the school.”

When considering how effective Line End was in providing a safe and secure environment for pupils, and the general ethos of the school, opinions amongst those staff who had been at Line End a considerable time were divided. In terms of providing an environment where pupils were able to fit in and feel accepted, Teacher C felt that:

“I think we’re effective in providing a quite positive environment as an EBD school in EBD terms, in providing an environment that is workable whereby you can get these kids into some sort of society - if you can call the school a society.”

Expanding on the extent to which she felt that Line End provided a safe and secure environment for its pupils, she added:

“On the whole, yes. In any school I think there’s a culture, an undercurrent of bullying, dog eat dog, but it’s often not picked up because of the bigness of the school. Because we’re a lot smaller, we pick up most things, and the problem is dealt with.”

Teacher A, however, sees things differently:

“There is a culture of aggression within the school. I don’t think the children care about each other too much - they just want to bully each other, you know, as they go further up the school.”

Pupils.

From pupils’ responses to those things they liked and disliked at Line End (Appendix P) positive aspects of the school’s ethos and environment centred on the perceived smallness and ‘intimacy’ of the school, and the academic and pastoral support available from staff. Things that were perceived as being less positive centred mainly on peer relationships within school, and included bullying, the inappropriate behaviour of others, and poor interpersonal relationships between pupils.

Findings from the 60-statement survey (Appendix Q) supported the view that poor peer relationships were a reality for many pupils in the life of the school, with a mere 9% agreeing that pupils were pleasant and polite to each other, whilst nearly all pupils (94%) agreed that there was a lot of bullying in school. There was a recognition by most pupils (88%) that there was a reward culture in school based on the recognition and celebration of achievement and success; balanced against this, though, was the fact that only half of the pupils said that they felt safe and secure in school, whilst only half admitted to being happy. Although, moreover, nearly two thirds of the pupils (65%) agreed that they were asked their opinion on various matters by staff, just under three quarters (74%) said that they would like more of a say in what happens in school. A subsequent survey on bullying revealed that only 9% of the 35 pupils questioned said that they had never been bullied in school, whilst only 9% claimed never to have been involved in bullying other pupils.

Data from interviews with 10 pupils suggested that there were a significant number of factors within this area that gave cause for concern; problems such as bullying, pupil behaviour, poor relationships, bad language, put-downs and name calling were highlighted as being things that were bad about the school. From the perspective of older pupils, there was an ongoing problem caused by the younger pupils calling them names and ‘winding up’. This would often result in the older pupils responding physically, running the risk of getting into trouble themselves and being labelled as bullies, whilst the younger pupils were seen to get away with the original offence:

“I think you need to be more stricter with the little kids, ’cos they can go up to the 5th years and call them knob-heads and the lot...I usually go and see a teacher, but a couple of weeks, a month back I used to take the law into me own hands.” (Paul, Year 11)

“Year 7 wind up, then Year 11 get into trouble by reacting physically...the school should be harder on the winders - punish them.” (David, Year 11)

Another Year 11 pupil accepted, however, that bullying was a problem within the school:

“there’s a big problem with bullying. I mean, all the Year 11’s bully now, but it’s only because they got bullied when they were younger. D’you understand? Because when I first come here, I got bullied all the time.”

(Leah, Year 11)

She also suggests that the culture of bullying was perpetuated because bullies got away with it.

“They get away with it most of the time, and that’s encouraging ‘em. ‘I didn’t get gripped for this, I’ll do it again.’”

From the perspective of pupils who had only been at Line End for a short time, first impressions suggested that there was a culture of bullying and aggression, and for some it impacts upon learning opportunities within the classroom.

“People are naughty in class and shouting out and winding up. It’s hard to listen to the teacher, but you’ve got to try and get on with your work and not listen to them. They don’t wind me up much, but they do sometimes... I just try and ignore it. L and K always wind R up and kick him when Miss isn’t looking.” (Micky: Year 7)

“You see a lot of fighting.” (Ryan: Year 7)

“It’s hard to learn when people are being noisy in class. It happens quite a lot in my group. It always happens in class. K called me mum and I told him to shut up you dickhead, so he twatted me and kicked me in the back and he got sent home for that.” (Chris: Year 7)

Another pupil felt he had learned what was required of him if he was to survive, and eventually return to mainstream:

“Just to be trying my best here, not to get into any trouble, and not to get on the wrong side of the other lads.” (Billy: Year 7)

Some of the pupils suggest reasons why bullying continues in the school. David, a Year 11 pupil, felt that some of the teachers didn’t take it seriously enough:

“Some of the teachers in the school just wanna, you know, like when someone complains to the teachers an’ that, they want to take more interest in what the pupil’s actually saying, about being bullied and that.”

Leah, from Year 11, described the detrimental effect she feels that bullying has on the School, and felt that part of the problem was that the pupils themselves weren’t really involved by the staff in addressing the issue, and weren’t consulted in the anti-bullying process. She further suggested that not enough effort was made to find out why bullying

behaviour took place, and punishment needed to be balanced with a counselling approach.

(Extract from interview transcript: Appendix Tii.)

Some pupils were able to articulate the perceived benefits of being at Line End when compared with mainstream. For some, the small school environment was a positive:

“It’s better at Line End, ’cos at mainstream there’s about 30-odd in a class.

There’s only 7 in a class here, so they can keep an eye on you.” (Kevin, Year 8)

“I was a lot worse at mainstream - I’ve been better here...smaller school, teachers help you through it.” (Alan, Year 8)

“Line End is like a little village - here you know everybody; you don’t in mainstream.” (Wayne, Year 9)

“There are too many lads in mainstream. I don’t like to mix. If I got sent back to mainstream, I’d do my best to get sent back here. I wouldn’t do any work, talk to people.” (Simon, Year 9)

Others, however, felt that the smallness of the school was a disadvantage, not least because it inhibited appropriate social interaction:

“There’s no girls at Line End - you haven’t got any mates.” (Lee, Year 10)

and when giving reasons for preferring to be in mainstream, the fact that their friends were there was invariably a significant consideration.

Parents.

For some parents, the fact that their children attended, and wanted to attend, was a sign that the school was being effective in providing a positive environment for them, and as a result it was felt that within such an environment their children were making progress. This was reflected in parental contributions to the Annual Reviews of their children’s statements of special educational needs, reported in the documentation by the SENCO.

“Mrs R says she is happy for L to be at Line End, and that he wants to come.

She has noticed a difference with him at home. He is more settled.”

(P1: Year 8 pupil)

“Mrs M says she is happy with M at Line End. She says that he has settled well considering the fact that he had twelve months out of school. She says that he must enjoy it because he comes in everyday.” (P2: Year 9 pupil)

“Mrs R feels that R is doing very well at Line End. He is more content and not as frustrated. He always wants to come to school.” (P3: Year 7 pupil)

“Mrs S is very pleased with the way B has settled since he came here. He loves coming to school.” (P4: Year 7 pupil)

“Mrs McG says she is very happy with L’s progress at Line End, and the way he has settled in.” (P5: Year 7 pupil)

“Miss R is very pleased with M’s progress at Line End. She feels he is much more settled and is much happier at school.” (P9: Year 8 pupil)

“Mrs W says that she feels D is progressing well at Line End; she feels he is improving in leaps and bounds.” (P10: Year 10 pupil)

“Mr and Mrs H feel that S is very happy at Line End. They are surprised at the fact that he appears to have settled in so well as he had been out of school for such a long time. He is doing a lot better than they had expected.” (P6: Year 9 pupil)

The same perspectives came out during parental interviews:

“We can see a change in him since he’s been here. He talks about his work; he’s dead interested in it and what he’s done. He couldn’t wait to come back to school after the holiday. He’s chuffed about what he does and all the certificates he brings home. I haven’t got any complaints - I think you’re doing a good job.”

(P1: Year 8 pupil.)

“The school’s doing alright. He wants to come in. I’m happy he’s starting to get into the routine. He gets himself out of bed, which he didn’t do before.”

(P2: Year 9 pupil.)

“I think you’re doing brilliant with him - you’re getting there with him.”

(P3: Year 7 pupil.)

Concerns about the ethos/environment of the school - including relationships with other pupils - were raised by some parents in Annual Reviews:

“Mr and Mrs S have reservations about some of the people P mixes with.”

(P21: Year 10 pupil.)

“Mrs S appreciates D’s problems, and is generally happy with his progress. She expressed some concern about incidents of bullying, both in school and in the taxi.” (P22: Year 7 pupil)

“Mrs C is happy with H’s progress educationally, but is very concerned that H is one of only 3 girls in the school.” (P23: Year 10 pupil)

In a subsequent interview, Mrs C said:

“I think she’s past it. I think she’s being abused...I mean one girl with forty lads. I’ve sent a letter to my M.P. It’s a form of abuse. There are only two other girls in the school - and none in her class, it’s detrimental to her maturity. She complained of tummy ache last week, and Mr X said: ‘You can’t have ‘cos you went and ate a full dinner.’ He just didn’t think.”

One parent, however, felt that, although the school was not necessarily being ineffective, there was a problem of institutionalisation:

“I don’t think as a school you’re doing anything wrong...under the circumstances...it’s the system. It’s all the problem kids in one place - they just sink to the lowest level.” (P22: Year 7 pupil)

Other parents shared concerns about differing aspects of the school’s provision:

“I know what he’s like, and he probably deserves half of what he gets, but on a couple of occasions he’s come home with bruises on his arms and legs where he’s been kicked and punched. I know there’s bullying in all schools, but W seems to come in for a fair share of it.” (Year 8 pupil)

Farside LEA.

The LEA’s Report said that the school had a positive ethos and environment, and that relationships between staff and pupils were good. It was felt, however, that relationships

between peers were less positive, and that the school might be more effective in addressing this issue, particularly through more appropriate teaching styles.

Reintegration into mainstream.

Staff.

There was no member of staff who considered that the school was effective in the reintegration of pupils into mainstream. One teacher felt that Line End didn't take the risk with pupils often enough:

“I don't think we're effective in linking that (the provision of a positive environment) with getting kids back into the mainstream, and stopping kids from being isolated in the EBD setting. It's obvious we're not effective 'cos we don't do it, or do it often enough...we probably don't try it often enough...” (Teacher C.)

Another teacher felt that, to a certain extent, the school was a victim of its own success:

“I don't think we do that (reintegration) effectively, and I think part of the reason is they don't want to go back because we are providing this very secure and consistent environment for them, which I think is a major purpose of the school, and yet reintegration into mainstream into a much larger environment is a bit frightening for them.” (Teacher B.)

Another teacher felt that there was a lack of commitment on the part of the school to establish an effective and practicable reintegration programme:

“I believe our role is to try to reintegrate pupils back into mainstream. When I came in I asked 'J' (the headteacher) how many kids are reintegrated into mainstream school, and he said to me not very many...he said they do want to get back into mainstream, and I thought if the kids want to get back into mainstream, shouldn't there be more kids actually going down that route - if we're not getting many back into mainstream, why aren't we? So maybe we need to be providing - I don't know - better structures for enabling these kids to get back into mainstream.” (Teacher E.)

Pupils.

From interviews with pupils, of the other factors that pupils felt to be significant in determining how effective the school was in its provision for pupils, reintegration - and the opportunities for reintegration - was something that very few pupils were able to comment on in terms of effectiveness, as few had first hand experience of it. One of the Year 11 pupils, however, had returned to a local mainstream school when in Year 9, but the placement had broken down within the year. When reviewing this experience, Paul felt that there were a number of significant factors associated with the breakdown: he had no real idea what to expect when he started his new school, the only preparation at Line End being a process of monitoring to ensure that he was able to behave appropriately over a number of weeks; there was little effective support, either from Line End, or the new school; the stigma of having attended Line End put him under a lot of pressure, not least from other pupils. Paul also felt that the receiving school did not appear sensitive to the situation, and did not seem to make allowances or differentiate for Paul's individual needs. Overall, Paul felt that given more support, the placement might have worked. He recognised that the receiving school had a responsibility to offer appropriate support, but also felt that Line End had a responsibility to prepare pupils as effectively as possible for reintegration:

“They should have given me some advice about some of the problems I was going to come up against in mainstream. Once I left, I thought it was up to me to make it work.” (Extract from interview: Appendix Ti.)

Parents.

Parents were clearly divided about how effective the school was in providing opportunities for reintegration, though it was clear from Phase I Findings that not all parents who felt that reintegration was appropriate for their children. There were criticisms from some parents felt that their children should either be considered for reintegration, or should be in a mainstream school – which could be considered as an implicit criticism of Line End's effectiveness in facilitating this, or in providing opportunities to at least consider it:

“Mrs G and her partner think that C is happy at Line End, but are concerned about his placement here. They do feel that he should not be here. They are likely to move out of the area in the near future, and will look for a mainstream school for him.” (P18: Year 7 pupil)

“Mrs P is not entirely happy with S’s placement at Line End. She had hoped he would be able to stay in mainstream education. She was surprised and pleased at the positive things said about S. He does seem to be getting on and improving.”
(P19: Year 8 pupil)

“Mrs B says she is very pleased with the way A has settled in at Line End. She feels he has a lot of potential and now has the chance to realise this. She was not happy with reintegration efforts, and felt that A should be given a chance to get back to mainstream.” (P20: Year 8 pupil)

Other parents, however, although feeling positive about certain aspects of the school’s provision, expressed some concern about other areas. Some parents expressed concern that, because of their children’s progress at Line End, they were being considered for reintegration to mainstream; and if one of the criteria of the school’s effectiveness for these parents is the provision of full-time and permanent placement at Line End, then the belief that this might be under threat might be considered as an implicit criticism of the school’s effectiveness by these parents:

“Mr and Mrs B are very pleased how M has settled at Line End. He is very happy and the most stable he has been for a long time. They feel that the attention he has received here has been most beneficial. For the time being they would like him to stay here because he is like a different person. Reintegration might be detrimental to his progress.” (P15: Year 7 pupil)

“Mrs H said that she was very happy with P’s progress at Line End. She said she would be very apprehensive about any possible reintegration.”
(P16: Year 9 pupil)

“Mr and Mrs W felt that D’s temperament both at home and at school had greatly improved during his time at Line End. They are very pleased with the recent involvement of the SPLD (Specific Learning Difficulties) team. They felt behaviour had deteriorated when D was on reintegration report, and wondered whether he was better staying at Line End as he was so settled.” (P17: Year 8 pupil)

DfEE/Ofsted.

Ofsted noted that opportunities for reintegrating pupils into local schools were unsatisfactory, though the blame for this was placed at the door of mainstream schools:

“...due to the paucity of opportunities currently made available to Line End in local mainstream schools. Local mainstream schools do not actively support the school’s aspiration for integration links.”

Farside LEA/Local Authority.

Farside Education Authority had no comment to make on the school’s reintegration policy and/or practice. The Local Authority, however, made its feelings known through its representative – the ‘looked after children’ team. The perception from Mr. V, the teacher with oversight responsibility for the education of ‘looked after children’ was that – although Line End was ‘effective as a school with excellent management and support structures in place’ – the number of pupils actually returning to mainstream suggested that Line End was not being effective in this area, based on the effectiveness criterion that ‘pupil turnover should be the key issue as to whether Line End can be considered effective.’

Other factors.

There were two other significant factors that emerged from the data when considering the criteria by which Line End’s stakeholders might judge its effectiveness: the quality of home/school relationships - seen as a significant effectiveness indicator for staff, parents, the LEA and Ofsted - and the dominant style of management and organisation – strategic or crisis-led - seen as an important indicator of effectiveness, particularly to staff, pupils and parents.

Home/school relationships.

The quality of home/school relationships was There was a general feeling – taken from staff perceptions elicited during Inset sessions - that relationships with parents were poor.

(Appendix H.) From the 114 - statement survey, perspectives on the relationship between home and school were significant. (Appendices Ii and Iii.) 13 out of 15 staff felt that the home/school relationship needed to be evaluated and addressed, with 14 out of 15 staff feeling that contact with parents is most often at times of crisis. 12 out of the 15 staff felt that

parents were not realistically involved in the decision-making process in school, whilst 9 out of 15 felt that parents needed to be more involved and supportive of the work of the school.

Four of the parents expressed concern about communications between school and home in written submissions for the Annual Review:

“I don’t really know what in advance I need to say as I do not know a lot about what is happening at school with him.” (P24: Year 10 pupil)

“The only moan I have is that I only find out he has been misbehaving when he brings a report home. I have mentioned this to one of the teachers who gave me a satisfactory answer, but although I haven’t asked for it, I would like to be kept more informed of his progress.” (P25: Year 9 pupil).

“I really do think that more should be done to involve parents with the school and children, therefore teaching the children that both parties are working together for the benefit of the child, and not just being called in to sort out problems which have escalated into something major and which could have been sorted when they were arising. Parents need to feel that they can enter the school whenever they need and be made to feel welcome and be able to air their views on any matters.”
(P26: Year 10 pupil)

“Teachers don’t listen...deal with the problem and I’ll have to deal with it later... I feel he’s being fobbed off, and have done in the past. I think I get fobbed off when I come, and nothing’s done. The school isn’t good at telling parents the good things that are happening. They only phone up when things go wrong. I don’t know what he’s doing in school. He can hardly read his sister’s school books, and she’s in juniors. At the last review meeting I was told that if he wasn’t working in class he’d have his work sent home with him and I’d make sure he did it. That was six months ago. I haven’t seen any work yet, absolutely nothing has been done about it...he needs to be doing his work if he’s going to get a good education...” (P25: Year 9 pupil)

From the perspective of external stakeholders, it was felt by the LEA inspectors that home/school liaison was poor, a perspective echoed by the Ofsted team in its Inspection Report:

“Overall the links the school has with parents is (sic) unsatisfactory. Despite its best efforts, only a small minority of parents are involved in the school.”

Management style.

When considering perceived areas of weakness in the school’s provision during a staff Inset session, it was felt by some staff that there was a tendency towards crisis management rather than strategic planning as a means of addressing issues within the school. (Appendix H.) This was elaborated upon by one of the members of the senior management team, who had first-hand experience of planning meetings at SMT level. He clearly felt that this was an area where the school was being particularly ineffective.

“ I might as well get myself a black uniform, yellow hat, and change my name to Fireman Sam, ‘cos that seems to be what I do - spend my time putting out fires.”

There was clearly a sense that this member of staff felt unsure of the direction the school was or should be going in, and felt no sense of guidance from the bridge:

“ I’ve come to realise that I just don’t know what his vision is, or even if he’s got one. I know it’s all jargon, but I don’t know anymore what he wants for the school. He says every now and again that we need to put time aside to plan, but we never do it.”

Certainly, no time was ever set aside after school for SMT strategic planning, except in times of crisis - notably an Ofsted inspection. Rather, there is a series of half-hour meetings three mornings a week before the start of school, the aim of which is to ‘wash-up’ any business from the previous day, and plan for the events of the immediate future - the day to day management, in essence, of routine and administrative business, a necessary aspect of the management process. The range of topics covered in these short meetings is often vast and diverse, incorporating day to day administration, ‘strategic thinking,’ anecdotal excursions, external phone calls (as people realise that it is a good time to catch the headteacher in.) The following are the topics covered in two actual meetings, during different terms:

Meeting 1.

Traffic on the way to school.	Election of teacher governor.
Supply budget.	KS4 Maths challenge.
Pupil referrals.	Pupils from other LEAs (current.)
Referrals from other LEAs.	Cover for maternity leave.
Push by LEA to admit more pupils.	Part-time provision for pupils.
Withdrawal of places of non-attenders.	Increased class sizes.
Year 11 PRU.	Management of EBD service.
Pupil groupings.	Links with mainstream.
Pupil exclusions.	Pupils causing concern.
Pupils causing concern.	Pupil groupings.
	The week ahead.

Meeting 2.

Telephone calls.	Business for the week.
Parents evening.	Directions to moderation meeting.
Pupils causing concern.	New referrals.
Secondary heads meeting.	Bench-marking.
NQTs.	Distribution of assorted literature. (DfEE etc.)
H.T. training courses.	National Grid for Learning.
Annual Report to parents.	KS3 SATs results.
Pupils causing concern.	Curriculum Development Plan.
Staff absence.	Calendar for next academic year.
Annual reviews.	Staffing.

After one such meeting, the same member of staff rolled his eyes heavenwards and said:

“ It’s a waste of f***ing time...I’m getting so disillusioned. I can’t be bothered anymore - I’ve given up trying. I’ll just take the money and go home.”

Stakeholders, finally, offered some general observations on their perceptions of the overall effectiveness of Line End’s provision, which reflect a generalised overview of whether it is felt that the school is doing a ‘good job,’ and whether the school is perceived generally to be fulfilling its role – a judgement on the whole rather than an evaluation its component parts.

Teacher D appeared to err on the side of caution when offering a general overview of the effectiveness of the school's provision:

“I don't really feel qualified to say whether it's effective or not. I can see it being effective with some of the children - in the time I've spent here I can see improvement in some of the children, and I don't feel my time's been wasted. With some children I feel I'm getting through, and it shows that they can do it...”

Teacher E felt generally that staff were focused upon translating the ideal of the school aims into the reality of practice,

“I had a brief look last night at what the aims and objectives of the school were. I do feel that's what people are trying to achieve; when you look at them down on paper, you can see how it translates to what is going on in school.”

Amongst the three other teachers who had considerably more experience of working at Line End, there was a range of perspectives on particular areas of school life, though there was a feeling that in general terms, the school was making effective provision for its pupils:

“We're not effective in all of these areas, but in most of them, yes.” (Teacher B)

“I think we're effective as an institution in ourselves in many ways, particularly in terms of providing a place for some kids who are going totally off the rails, and stopping them going totally off the rails.” (Teacher C)

“Compared to how the school used to be, then I'd say yes; we are a lot more effective now than we used to be. I mean, we're not perfect, but there's been a definite improvement over time.” (Teacher A)

Three parents expressed concern and frustration with their own children, despite the best efforts of the school:

“I think you're doing a good job, but it doesn't matter where he goes, he'll always be the same. He had this therapy, but the bloke at the clinic said he couldn't get through to him - he's like a block of ice.... There's no other school he could go to. I didn't want him to come here in the first place 'cos of what we'd heard - but we were told he'd only get 4 hours home tuition a week (D, the caretaker said it's OK, they're pretty strict with them. If I were you I'd try it)...I think it's alright for L - I was worried they'd be a bit backward,

but they look alright. There's about 12 lads in our street who go to H. High. L tells them he goes to a private school, but they found out and wind him up about it. His reading's got better. He was bringing stuff home, but he just wants to go out now." (P5: Year 7 pupil)

"You've done what you can - it's him abusing people....Yes, I do think you're being effective, but it's down to him....he doesn't care. Nothing's getting through. I can't see what else you can do....there's too many things happening outside.... He won't listen to no-one anymore." (P27: Year 10 pupil)

Two other parents, finally, gave the impression that they felt the school to be neither effective nor ineffective, the suggestion being that whilst there were no great educational fires being lit, neither was there any sense of crisis:

"Most things are OK - it's just D. I don't know what's going on in his head; he doesn't talk about things." (Year 9 pupil)

"I don't know if you're being effective - all I see is that A's in school, and I'm grateful for that. It gives him some normality, rather than being at home with me everyday." (Year 8 pupil.)

CHAPTER 7: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF PHASE II

FINDINGS.

INTRODUCTION.

Riddell and Brown (1991) suggest that schools may be differentially effective upon different areas of pupil development. It is clear from the Findings that there are certain areas where stakeholders agree that Line End is being effective in its provision. There are other areas, however, where there is divergence in perspectives between and amongst stakeholders, which raises the issue of the extent to which this may lead to tension and conflict - real and potential - within the school, and the implications for relationships between stakeholders, and practices at Line End.

Addressing pupils' academic needs.

Despite provision for pupils' academic needs being seen by some staff as a strength of the school, the findings suggest that it is seen as being effective for only some pupils, as reflected in the comments of Teacher D. Pupils who are motivated to learn are seen to be well served by the school's provision. This may well be a reflection of the divergence of staff opinion in relation to the primary role of the school - 'split right down the middle' as Teacher C. put it - with only just over half of the staff feeling that the main focus of the school should be on teaching and learning.

Some of the most explicit criticisms of Line End's provision come from Teacher E. who had been at Line End for a term. This is possibly a reflection of the fact that she had come to Line End after a considerable time in mainstream, where there would arguably be a more overt and explicit culture of learning, where measurable pupil outcomes were a highly visible mark of the school's perceived effectiveness, and an important contributory factor in the construction of its reputation within the educational and local community (Gray and Hannon, 1986; MacBeath et al, 1992; Gray, 1995). This raises the issue of cultures and sub-cultures within Line End, and the extent to which a culture of containment and control may be perceived to impact upon the provision for pupils' academic needs within the school. There was clearly divergence of opinion amongst staff regarding the extent to which pupils are encouraged to work independently, and whether they are encouraged to take some ownership of their own

learning, a prerequisite for effective learning (Gipps and Murphy, 1994; Cooper and McIntyre, 1996). Teaching strategies may well be constructed to incorporate behaviour management mechanisms, whereby pupils are 'contained' within the classroom through highly structured pedagogic approaches, a corollary to the development of independent learning and study skills. The importance of the learner being active, however, is seen as being a prerequisite to effective learning, and is best facilitated by high challenge and low stress (Smith, 1996). If it is felt by some staff at Line End, however, that there is not always appropriate academic challenge for pupils, then teaching can justifiably be perceived as being less than effective. Others argue, however, that even when the expectations of, and challenges for pupils are set realistically, many pupils still fail to engage with the learning process, which would seem to validate the assertion of some staff - supported by research findings (Mortimore et al., 1988; Tizard et al., 1988) - that there may be variables that are outside the control of the school which impact upon pupils lives, and upon their attitudes to and engagement with the learning process and the formal curriculum. Hence the attitude of some staff that it is these perceived emotional and behavioural issues that should be addressed before effective teaching and learning can take place.

For those staff who feel that the main role of the school is to address the perceived behavioural problems of pupils, the unwillingness or inability of pupils to engage fully with the curriculum may not necessarily be seen as the most vital problem - in fact, it may be expected. For those staff, however, who see teaching and learning as being the prime role of the school, a reluctance or inability to access the opportunities presented to them would suggest that Line End is failing to be effective in this area; for them, the effectiveness of Line End's provision might be better evaluated by the extent to which the school is committed and able to engage reluctant and disaffected learners. The difference between the two perspectives is that for one group of staff, the school is not necessarily seen as being ineffective in the area of teaching and learning, as this is not perceived to be its most important role; for the other group, however, Line End is perceived as being ineffective in its provision for teaching and learning, as it is failing to fulfil its primary role for many of its pupils.

Pupils responses to their learning reflect a range of perspectives, as seen in the findings from the survey of pupils regarding individual areas of the curriculum (Appendix R.) Not surprisingly, some pupils like some lessons more than others, which will undoubtedly be

reflected in varying levels of motivation, differing behaviours, and different pupil outcomes. In responding to the question: "Why do you muck around?" some pupils suggested that it was because they wanted a 'treat,' and this reality suggests an ongoing dilemma for the school. Having experienced failure and rejection in mainstream - often perceived by pupils to be linked with their inability to cope with the work - pupils' self-esteem is often very low, and consequently they may choose to 'play it safe' in the classroom, refusing to take risks with their own learning for fear of further failure. As a consequence, they are seen as being poorly motivated, and underachieve because of their unwillingness to engage fully with the learning process. Teachers, therefore, structure teaching approaches to incorporate opportunities for success, and build in rewards when short-term targets are reached. On the one hand, the negative cycle of failure and poor self-image can be broken, and success and enhanced self-esteem can lead to greater motivation and further success. On the other hand, however, pupils can become addicted to rewards, and may simply work to this end, rather than seeing the intrinsic value of the work itself, or the importance of their own active role in the learning process. It can also lead to conflict within the classroom, when pupils' first question when they enter the room is: "Can we have a treat lesson, miss?" and then down tools - or refuse to pick them up in the first place - when they are expected to work. The danger for staff is that sometimes it may be easier to take the line of least resistance, lowering expectation and challenge, by feeding pupils with a 'safe' diet of curricular fare aimed at minimising the potential for disruption. This approach reflects one of the criticisms of behaviour modification as a model for behaviour management, and the token economy system in particular, where the reward becomes an end in itself, more important than the behaviour which leads to the reward (Pring, 1981; Kohn, 1990; Sternberg, 1990). What is important, therefore, is that a balance is maintained, whereby appropriate and meaningful rewards are incorporated into teaching and learning strategies, based on high expectation and high challenge for pupils.

The fact that it was felt by Leah (Year 11) that pupils opted to be in the withdrawal room at times rather than in class (Appendix Tii.) could be considered to be an implicit criticism of the school's curriculum provision for pupils' academic needs. This is certainly reflected in some of the comments of Year 10 pupils (Appendix P), especially those who were irregular attenders, who suggested that school held no interest or relevance for them, and it might be seen that their truancy is a reflection of the internal disaffection that results in pupils voting with their feet by self-referral to the withdrawal room (Lemert, 1967; Bellaby, 1974; Cooper,

1993). This may also reflect the perceived gap between the rhetoric of policy and the reality of practice. Many pupils do not perceive that they are realistically involved in the target-setting process, certainly not in a way that fulfils the spirit of the espoused policy. This does not obviously lead to a tension between stakeholders, but rather a tension between what is supposedly done, and what actually happens, the result being that practice may be less effective than is assumed by certain of the school's stakeholders. It might be suggested that staff are in the best position to ascertain the most appropriate targets for pupils, in which case 'negotiation' might simply be seen as explaining the targets to pupils and getting them to agree that the targets are, indeed, appropriate. By not involving pupils in the construction and evaluation of targets, however, they are not being encouraged to take any responsibility for their own learning. The danger, then, is that pupils rarely become excited about learning, as they may not recognise any intrinsic value in it, nor do they see it as being for their benefit. Consequently, there is the potential for pupils becoming bored and disaffected, and acting out their frustrations through disruptive behaviour within the classroom (Bird, 1981; Smith and Laslett, 1990; Cooper, 1993), which is reflected, to some extent, by the number of pupils who opt to 'muck around,' and those who get sent - or walk - out of class to the withdrawal room.

Pupil attitudes to the withdrawal room, moreover – seen by some, according to Leah (Year 11) as a preferable option to the classroom - may well reflect a conflict of values and expectations towards learning between stakeholders, and the emphasis, in practice, may be more on ensuring that pupils are contained as much as possible within the classroom, rather than encouraging them to become more effectively involved in their own learning., which may perpetuate, subliminally, a culture of control and containment within the classroom. It also suggests a dilemma for staff in establishing the rationale for the withdrawal system: should it be punitive or 'therapeutic' in ethos? Should it be made to be unpleasant, so that it becomes perceived as a less desirable option than remaining in class, or should it be a place where pupils, who become genuinely distressed in the classroom, can come to calm down, at the risk of other pupils taking advantage of its availability rather than settling to the discipline of work within the classroom. Although, however, it may well represent a critique of the school's provision, and an indication that Line End is perceived as ineffective in this area by some pupils, other pupils perceive school as having become an irrelevance in their lives, as in the case of Sally (Year 10) - with an alcoholic and violent mother, a 21 year old boyfriend, regular drug use, and at the time of writing, recently pregnant. Non-attendance by this pupil was not necessarily a criticism of the school or its provision, but rather a reflection of

variables in her life that were outside the control of the school (Galloway et al, 1982;Howard, 1992; Boreham et al., 1995).

For some parents, on the other hand, the fact that their children attended regularly, stayed in school, and were generally motivated to turn up, was a sign of the school's effectiveness. This, however, throws up an obvious contrast in stakeholder perspectives – between parents, who take a 'micro' view on pupil attendance (ie. that of their own individual children,) and Ofsted, who take a 'macro' view based on the attendance figures for the whole school, which are used to inform evaluations of effectiveness in this area. Although, however, the school's attendance record was perceived by Ofsted to give cause for concern, it was accepted that it is largely beyond the school's control to ensure the attendance of some pupils. Ofsted conceded that the school did all that was practicable, whilst the headteacher commented:

“It's O.K. saying attendance figures are poor - that's true. But we've got no control over the kid's lives. We do everything we can do, but at the end of the day it's their choice.”

Despite there being a policy of 'first-day' response to pupil absence, however, and regular support from the school's educational welfare officer, it might be argued that the school is simply reacting to a problem, rather than being pro-active in attempting to identify and address the underlying causes of non-attendance, especially as the figures show that there is a marked deterioration in the attendance of a significant number of pupils at Key Stage 4 when compared to attendance patterns in earlier years. Although Ofsted (1999, page 18) concede that “EBD schools work against a background of outside sub-cultures which influences their pupils far more negatively than the generality of pupils in ordinary schools,” the earlier argument of Pearce and Hillman (1998) - that frequent truanting is the clearest expression of disaffection with school, and dissatisfaction with the education provided - should not be discounted. If attendance is perceived to be an area of concern, then it is incumbent upon the school, I feel, to examine any ways in which it might become more effective in raising attendance levels across all year groups.

There is a sense that for some parents, however, the regular attendance of their children at Line End can become an end in itself, as erratic attendance in previous schools has caused inconvenience, frustration and a sense of helplessness and disenfranchisement. For other parents, however, continuous attendance is seen in terms of educational entitlement for their

children – provision for their academic needs that has been missed out on previously due to the very difficulties that have resulted in placement at Line End. Hence it is important for these parents that provision is made for their children’s learning needs, perceived to have been exacerbated by the resultant disruption to the learning process in the past, not only in the areas of the basics – literacy and numeracy – but in the opportunities that would be available to them were they still in mainstream. The fact that their children took a pride in their achievements at Line End, brought certificates and awards home, and talked about what they had been doing, was for these parents a indicator of the school’s effectiveness in fulfilling its role according to their expectations. There is also a sense, moreover, that for those parents for whom regular attendance in the early stages of placement is paramount, expectations of what their children could and might achieve academically are raised, once such attendance patterns are established. Being present ceases to become enough, and they want their children to get something out of being at Line End – a palpable shift in expectations over time. In affirming Line End’s effectiveness, furthermore, some parents made a link between the happiness of their children at school, and the progress that they felt was being made educationally, an implicit endorsement of the perspectives of those staff who felt that providing opportunities for achievement and success through addressing pupils’ academic needs appropriately and meaningfully is also the most effective way of addressing their perceived emotional and behavioural difficulties.

Despite Line End being seen as being an effective school by some parents, however, there were others whose perception was that mainstream was still a better and a preferable option. This was not necessarily a judgement on the effectiveness of Line End as a school, I feel, but rather the pursuit of what Davies (1976) terms ‘normalcy,’ based on the inherent belief that mainstream is a better place to be, and the perception that it represents ‘normality’ and provides a more traditional, structured and disciplined education, especially when balanced against the perceived stigma attached to attending a special school, which may be perceived to address pupils’ academic needs less effectively than mainstream. Expectations amongst parents, however, naturally differ, and therefore the extent to which Line End’s provision is perceived to be effective will vary according to these differing expectations. It is clear that the perceptions of Line End’s effectiveness, for parents whose children are approaching the end of their time at the school, are based on what has been achieved, especially when balanced against the perceived educational cul-de-sac that they felt themselves to be facing during the latter stages of mainstream provision, and the gloomy prognosis for the future

contemplated during extended periods outside of any provision at all, bar, for some, a few hours of home tuition a week. There is also a sense of gratitude, reflected in the comments of these parents – recorded in the Phase II findings - that not only have their children stayed the course, but that they will have gained something from having been at Line End.

Although Ofsted spoke highly of Line End's provision for the academic needs of pupils, there is certainly a sense from the Report that sweeping statements about this provision are made without the benefit of the requisite evidence to support such claims, or upon evidence that lacks the appropriate reliability and rigour upon which to make sound judgements. To claim that the majority of pupils enjoy the learning experience begs the question: upon what criteria is such an evaluation based, and what is the evidence that supports such an evaluation? Such pronouncements are presumably made upon the classroom observation of specific lessons, and the eliciting of pupils views within those lessons. As the measure of 'enjoyment' involves a qualitative evaluation, and because Ofsted offers no criteria in its inspection schedule upon which such an evaluation might be based, I would suggest that it is arrived at in an arbitrary, random and unstructured fashion, lacking the appropriate methodological foundation – rigour, transparency and structure – necessary for conferring both reliability and validity to the judgements made (Phillips, 1989; Eisner, 1991). If the pupils are perceived by inspectors to be conforming to the classroom expectations of the school within lessons, it does not necessarily mean that they are enjoying, or even engaging with the learning process, and it would necessitate a more clearly thought out approach to this area of inspection if the issue of pupil enjoyment of lessons were to be realistically and meaningfully examined. The problem with the Ofsted findings is that what is claimed for all pupils through the language of sweeping generalisations, may only be true for some pupils, and then for only some of the time. By making such generalisations, however, the school may be given a false sense of its own progress or effectiveness, which in turn may lead to complacency and a resting upon of the institutional laurels – a model of the 'strolling school' (Stoll and Fink, 1996). This may obviate the willingness or desire of the school to examine seriously issues relating to the processes of teaching and learning, as these may be perceived as being 'safe ground.' Based on a snapshot observation of atypical lessons and meticulously prepared documentation, however, Ofsted findings may well paint a picture that does not necessarily reflect authentic or typical practice, and may give the impression that what is happening within the classroom constitutes good practice. For the lessons observed it may, but this is a 'showcase'

performance, and there is no guarantee that such practice is replicated throughout the rest of the year.

In balancing perspectives regarding Line End's provision for pupils' academic needs, finally, it might appear that there is agreement amongst a range of stakeholders that in this area the school, generally, is being effective. On closer examination, however, it can be seen that this is not necessarily the case; although Ofsted's perception that teaching and learning was a strength of the school, a significant number of other stakeholders – certainly amongst staff and pupils – felt that pupils were not realistically involved in their own learning, which by inference would suggest that teaching is not as effective as it might be assumed. And yet it is easy to bask in the aftermath glow of a positive Ofsted report, and if academic provision is perceived to be effective, why bother fixing something that 'ain't broke.' (Boothroyd et al, 1996; Parsons, 1998). And hence the potential for tension is clear – between those who are happy or willing to 'bask,' and those who perceive a need for more effective provision in this area.

Addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs.

For those staff who feel that the primary role of Line End is the addressing of pupils' emotional and behavioural needs, they will find support in the research findings of Cole et al (1998) which showed that this is how virtually all the schools in their study saw their principal role (156 EBD schools, both residential and day, primary and secondary.) Notwithstanding differences of perspective as to the principle role of the school, however, there is no disagreement amongst Line End staff that the addressing of pupils' perceived behavioural difficulties, and the development of strategies to support children's social and emotional health is fundamental to the work of the school. It is clear from the findings, however, that there is an 'implementation gap' - a disparity between the rhetoric of policy and the reality of practice. And although, moreover, there is an assumption amongst some staff that if pupil behaviour is 'managed' appropriately, then the emotional and behavioural difficulties of pupils are being effectively addressed, other staff perceive that simply managing pupil behaviour - change from without - is less effective than aiming to facilitate change based on pupils taking responsibility for and ownership of their own behaviour - change from within (Redl and Wineman, 1952; Chaplain and Freeman, 1994; Sanders and Hendry, 1997).

There is a clear sense amongst some staff that, in addressing pupils' emotional/behavioural needs, the prevalent culture of behaviour management is one of containment and control, based, at times, on 'macho' approaches to pupil discipline. Salisbury & Jackson (1996) argue that many male teachers maintain their authority over pupils by a 'hard-line' rule of fear. They control by threats and a loud voice to maintain control, and from such an aggressive disciplinary style, boys learn that this is how you get what you want - with clear implications for peer relationships within the school. As a result, some boys may identify with the 'tough male' approach, and may be less willing to respond to the self-disciplinary approach of other teachers. Hence it is that some Line End staff perceive such approaches to the addressing of pupils' needs as being ineffective. They can also be seen to breed resentment amongst stakeholders - pupils, who are on the receiving end of it, and those staff who feel it creates a two-tier system of behaviour management - whilst there are those who feel that it is an ineffective way of addressing pupils perceived needs - staff, Farside LEA, Ofsted, and the pupils themselves. There is a danger, too, that pupils may receive mixed messages as a result of differing approaches by staff. If pupils respond to the 'hard-line' approach of some staff, they may be less willing to respond to the less physical, more empathetic approaches of other staff - as suggested by Teacher A in her interview (Appendix Ki.) - the result of which may be greater conflict between certain staff and certain pupils, and increased levels of disruption in certain classroom situations.

There are, of course, ethical considerations associated with the more physical approaches to the management of pupil behaviour, and the extent to which staff responses to the challenging behaviour of certain pupils follow national and local guidelines relating to the physical restraint of pupils. Indeed, Line End has a whole-school policy on restraint, and it is clear that there are certain issues that are open to interpretation: what constitutes 'reasonable force' in the restraint of pupils; is the restraint of a pupil in a particular situation the most appropriate behaviour management strategy for that moment, or is it used too frequently as a means of stamping the school's authority on pupils, rather than being used as a last resort? Stakeholder perceptions will differ on these issues, but clearly there are other areas of the restraint policy that are far less equivocal, and far less open to interpretation: the use of force should not be used as a punishment, and the restraint of pupils should not occasion the infliction of pain or discomfort. Clearly, tensions will arise when it is perceived by stakeholders that physical intervention might sometimes be used unnecessarily and gratuitously, and yet to speak out would might be seen to lead to disharmony and discord

amongst staff, something to be avoided if at all possible – especially within a culture where the expectation is that staff support each other and back each other up.

The perception of some staff, moreover, is that such approaches help perpetuate a punishment culture within the school, and that although the school may be effective in containing pupils' inappropriate behaviours, it may be less effective in encouraging pupils to take ownership of and responsibility for their own behaviour. Consequently, it could be argued that pupils do things for 'us', not for themselves, and when they conform, it is to avoid the punitive consequences of not conforming, rather than seeing the value and appropriateness of what is perceived by staff as being acceptable. As a result, it is perceived that many pupils remain trapped within cycles of negative behaviour, which renders Line End ineffective in such cases in fulfilling its perceived role as the catalyst for behavioural change in pupils. More worrying, however, is that the 'quick-fix' punitive responses to inappropriate and challenging behaviour is seen to perpetuate a culture of aggression within the school which is replicated amongst pupils in the 'pecking-order' of the school environment (Apple, 1979; Bird et al, 1981; Cunnison, 1987).

Tensions can also be seen to be created when a culture or subculture exerts its influence on members of the school community. In the perpetuation of a culture of control and containment, its influence can be seen to be effected on pupils overtly, and on staff subliminally, through the messages transmitted by the practice of those who subscribe to and help perpetuate that culture. The conflicting perspectives of stakeholders, therefore, lead to tensions and frustrations, and differing perspectives of how effective the school actually is, as seen in the observations from SMT meetings (Appendix Wi). The aim of the headteacher when he first came to the school, for example - having a background in mainstream himself - was to develop Line End on a mainstream secondary model, based on high academic achievement through examination success, and the more rigid enforcement of acceptable behaviour. The perspectives of stakeholders clearly differ on the extent to which this has been successfully accomplished, and the extent to which these aims are either appropriate or desirable in addressing the perceived needs of Line End pupils. With one teacher arguing that "this is not a secondary school, as much as the head would want it to be," there is a perception that pupils' disaffected and disruptive behaviour might justifiably be seen as a reaction against the rigidity of the mainstream model; and consequently, tensions and resentments are generated by the perception of some that the school is not as effective as it

might be, were approaches adopted that were aimed less at control and containment, and more on empowering pupils to take greater control of their own learning, in its broadest sense.

From pupils' reflections on the school's approaches to their emotional/behavioural needs, there was an apparent disparity between what pupils expected and wanted in terms of teacher behaviour, and what they felt they got in some instances. Pupils generally wanted teachers to be strict, but fair (Appendix N) based on a desire, it might be assumed, for clear boundaries, as emotional security is often founded on the knowledge that should a pupil 'test' the boundaries and parameters within which they are expected to act, then the adults in 'loco-parentis' will care enough to address the situation through an application of the law - its spirit rather than its letter - with compassion and fairness, though not compromising the principles of what is right or appropriate. There is a perception from some, however, that some teachers can be too strict, whilst others are sometimes too 'soft' - too much control or too little. It was felt that in some instances teachers resorted to 'macho' response strategies based on an exercise of greater physical power - which reflect some of the staff's concerns. David's (Yr.11) perception was that the school's response were based on the need by staff to gain and maintain control, and suggested that allowing pupils more opportunities for negotiating behavioural strategies and giving pupils more responsibility in managing their own behaviour would be a more effective and appropriate approach. Ironically, this had been experienced by Peter (Year 11) who had brokered a deal with the headteacher, by which he could avail himself of a cooling off period outside the school premises if he found himself in a position where he felt he might lose control; this, though, seemed to be the exception rather than the rule, and not a reflection of whole school policy. On the one hand it could be seen as an example of crisis management, a reactive rather than a proactive response, rather than evidence of strategic planning for behavioural interventions, as this compromise deal was worked out after Peter had thrown a chair across the room in a fit of temper; on the other hand, however, it might be seen as differentiation for behaviour, a strategy tailored to meet an individual and specific circumstance, rather than a blanket, 'scatter-gun' strategy that might create more problems than it would solve, with pupils strolling out of lessons to 'calm down' at will.

Certainly, some Year 10 pupils felt that, rather than bad behaviour being their fault, it was the fault of the school for not giving them more responsibility and trust. It might be argued that if

effectiveness in any area is to be enhanced, then a certain level of risk-taking must be involved (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1992; Hopkins et al., 1994; Stoll and Fink, 1996). Investing trust and responsibility onto young people at Line End, however, might certainly be considered a risky undertaking by some, at odds with a culture of containment and control that represents the safety-zone for some teachers. The potential spin-offs, however, might be seen to justify the initial investment: the raising of pupil self-esteem; enhanced motivation and performance; peer-modelling; more appropriate and effective interpersonal relationships. Should an investment of such trust backfire, however, then the likelihood is that staff will feel less willing to take the risk again, for the fear of failure, and settle back into the security of the comfort zone where the system becomes the master rather than the servant, a reflection of what Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) term the 'implementation gap' in the management of change processes within schools. Sally (Year 10) suggests that trust and responsibility have to be earned, and recognises the dangers of dispensing it freely. The dilemma, then, becomes one of chicken and egg: is the responsibility given first, in the hope that it will lead to a change in behaviour, or is the responsibility dependent upon an initial change in behaviour?

From the perspectives of parents, the findings show that a large percentage feel positively about the school's provision for their children's emotional/behavioural needs, although there is a minority of parents which assumes a 'hospital' perspective in relation to the role of the school, whereby it is perceived that the school's job is to 'fix' the problem, and it is therefore perceived to be the school's fault if the problem behaviour is not fixed. This, I feel, is a reflection, in part, of the blame culture in which we live – if we can't fix the problem, then at least we can fix the blame. The danger of this attitude, however, is that it fails to recognise one of the premises upon which the effective intervention into the negative cycle of pupil behaviour is based: namely, that effective change must come from within, the starting point being the willingness of pupils to take responsibility for their own behaviour, and ultimately for their own learning. The experience of some pupils, however, is that when they are caught in wrong-doing, they hear their own parents – often in their dealings with authority figures – shifting the responsibility for inappropriate behaviour away from their children, and in my role as deputy head, I have experienced this first hand in pastoral meetings with parents and their children. Consequently the subliminal message given to these children is that they do not have to take responsibility for what they do. For them, their own inappropriate behaviour is always somebody else's fault - another pupil who has called them a name; a teacher who is

picking on them; a medical condition – ADHD – for which they have been prescribed medication. With such ‘supportive’ parents, however, it is less likely that the perceived emotional and behavioural needs of these pupils will be effectively addressed, and yet in the eyes of the parents, it will be the inability of the school to ‘fix’ the problem that will inform their evaluations of the school’s effectiveness in this area. Consequently, it is perceived by some parents that they become unnecessarily involved when conflict situations are not dealt with by the school effectively, and things have been allowed to escalate, when, after all, it is the role of Line End as a ‘special school’ to deal with such problems.

Some of the observations made by Ofsted, finally, are consistent with those of the school’s internal stakeholders – staff and pupils – particularly in relation to the use of the withdrawal room as a means of managing pupil behaviour, and the inconsistent implementation of whole-school policies by staff. This would suggest that if certain perspectives are shared by a number of the school’s stakeholders, then there is a likelihood that there is some credibility in what is being said, and therefore there is justification and need for examining those areas where stakeholders agree that provision is being less effective than it might. It also suggests that, despite the serious shortcomings of the Ofsted inspection process, it does not render the inspection team incapable of making observations that may be both appropriate and accurate. In the light of current educational reality, moreover, and the imposition of an inspection system over which schools have little control, it would be churlish to ignore every finding from the Ofsted Report on a point of principle, just as it would be equally wrong to pick and choose those findings which suited. The sensible approach would be to make an honest appraisal of what is said, and adopt an ‘if-the-cap-fits-wear-it’ approach, as the ultimate aim of any evaluation process, whether internal or external, should be to facilitate the improvement of provision, and enhance the effectiveness of practice.

Providing a safe, secure and positive environment.

Although it is perceived that there is a ‘positive’ ethos within the school, there is a recognition that the quality of peer relationships is a matter of concern, not least in the area of bullying - both verbal and physical, with 80% of staff agreeing that a culture of aggression permeates the school (Appendix Ii) In this, the school is clearly felt to be ineffective by some staff in fulfilling one of its three major ‘official’ aims – the provision of a safe, secure and positive environment, and as discussed earlier, it is likely that there is a causal relationship

between punitive, and sometimes physical approaches to the management of pupil behaviour, and the levels of aggression and bullying amongst pupils within school. If pupils feel they are being controlled and contained institutionally, then for some, the transmission of such values into the peer environment will be a natural response. As Salisbury & Jackson (1996, page 112) suggest:

‘A harsh punishing disciplinary system in schools... can be seen by pupils as violence directed upon themselves, so validating their own aggressive bullying behaviour.’

If bullying is perceived to be a problem within school – which it clearly is by a significant number of both staff and pupils – then Line End must also be perceived as being ineffective. Staff efforts to address the problem are perceived by some pupils to be ineffective, and rather than excluding pupils from discussion and decision-making in this area, it is felt that they should be included in the processes of planning for improvement (Tii). This view is certainly supported by the literature (Rudduck et al, 1996; Davie and Galloway, 1996; MacBeath et al, 1992; Cooper, 1993; Cole and Visser, 1998), which stresses the importance of involving children in the decision-making process. This is one area, moreover, where responsibility might be given to pupils, carrying with it a comparatively low risk factor, and giving pupils the feeling that they have some ownership and control of decisions made within an institution that is there to meet their needs as the consumers/clients of that service. There is also an implicit criticism that the school needs to be doing more to find out why pupils engage in bullying behaviour, rather than simply making a reactive and punitive response when it happens. It certainly strikes me that there is an encouraging level of perspicacity and maturity in some of these pupil reflections, that not only focus on areas where the school practices are felt to be less than effective, but offer suggestions on ways in which these practices can be made to be more effective.

The fears expressed by some parents of their children becoming ‘institutionalised’ within an environment in which it was felt that there were few, if any, effective peer role models, and where it was perceived that pupils would be dragged down to the lowest level, reflect the problems - both real and potential - of concentrating together a group of pupils, which, despite the all-embracing ‘EBD’ label, represents a heterogeneous rather than a homogeneous group, with a diverse range of needs and abilities, all of whom have demonstrated a penchant for behaviour that ranges from the persistently irritating to the bizarre and the dangerous. And where immersion into the delinquency sub-culture is often perceived as being a pre-requisite

for peer acceptance, there is often a cultural pressure on pupils to conform to this image (1971; Cohen and Manion, 1994; MacManus, 1995), though it is not necessarily an indictment of Line End's provision if and when this happens. Neither should Line End be held accountable for the gender balance of pupils within the school, although the predominantly male culture of the school elicited a vociferous response from one parent, whose daughter was one of only three in the school, and who felt it was a human rights issue. Where the school is perceived by the parent to fail in its duty to provide equality of opportunity, or to differentiate on the basis of need, then it is justifiable for the school to be judged as being ineffective in the provision it is making for the needs of this particular pupil. The fact that there are many more boys than girls should not be seen, however, as a reflection of Line End's effectiveness, but as a reflection, simply, of how things are. There are far more boys statemented for 'EBD' than girls, and according to fairly recent research findings, boys outnumber girls in off-site EBD provision by 12:1 (Cole et al., 1998).

More positively, some parents felt that as a result of being at Line End, their children were more settled at home, were behaving better, and relationships were generally improved, a more general endorsement of the school's effectiveness. This reflects, I feel, an eco-systemic perspective on pupil behaviour, whereby changes in one aspect of a child's eco-system will have an effect on other areas of that system (von Bertalanfly, 1968; Bateson, 1979; Cooper and Upton, 1991). In the past, conflict and tension in the mainstream school environment have had knock-on effects within the home environment, in dysfunctional and stressful relationships. By being at Line End, however, this negative cycle is seen by some to have been broken, and good news at school means good news at home.

There remain, however, tensions arising from differing stakeholder perspectives relating to the environment of the school. These are not so much in how the environment is perceived, as there is agreement amongst a significant number of stakeholders that peer-relationships are often poor, reflected in the perceived levels of verbal and physical aggression within the school. Rather, it is a divergence of opinion on the underlying causes, and what might be done to address the problem. A number of the older pupils – who might be considered as being more mature thinkers – felt that although they should be seriously considered as being part of the solution, they were, in reality, seen as part of the problem, and the perceived 'macho' response to inappropriate behaviour simply perpetuated and reinforced the culture of aggression within the school. The perceptions of some staff on the nature of 'EBD' pupils,

moreover, simply informed their expectations of pupil behaviour, and the view that peer aggression was to be expected in an 'EBD' school; the appropriate response, therefore, was seen to be effective systems for the management of pupil behaviour – systems that rely on containment and control. Hence the tensions – between the staff whose security is in the efficacy of such systems, and those who see them as being ineffective in addressing the needs of pupils; who would rather see pupils being empowered to address their own behaviours, and involving them more in their own learning in this area. Involving pupils more in this way would mean listening to their views, giving them greater responsibility, making them part of the decision-making process; and whereas the risk involved is greater – ceding some of the control to pupils – so is the potential for successful outcomes, one of which would be, undoubtedly, a more stable, ordered and positive environment for all members of the school society.

Reintegration.

Although the area of the reintegration of pupils to mainstream is not considered by stakeholders as being an example of effective practice – as is indeed the case in many day EBD schools (Topping, 1983) - the majority of stakeholders agree that it is more often variables outside the control of the Line End that militate against the successful translation of policy into practice. There is evidence of some tension, however, between the LEA and certain parents, arising from conflicting perspectives on whether pupils should be considered for a return to mainstream, and occasionally between parents and school, when parents simply want their children to be in a mainstream school, having not necessarily considered seriously whether they would actually cope.

Is a desire to return to mainstream, it might be asked, a criticism - implied or overt - of provision at Line End? The evidence would suggest that for some pupils, conscious of the stigma associated with special schooling, a return to a local high school would represent integration into the mainstream of school society, an important aspect of the process of 'normalisation' - hence the frequent references to 'normal' school by pupils, and the importance, for lower school pupils, of the prospect of reintegration. Interestingly, it was those pupils who had no experience of secondary mainstream education - either having come directly to Line End from Line End Junior, or having been referred from mainstream primary schools - who were most keen to get into mainstream secondary schools, but whose

constructions were based on the second-hand experiences of siblings and/or peers, or their own subjective perceptions of what secondary school life might be like, rather than first-hand experience. Conversely, those who were less keen to follow this route were those who had sampled secondary school life, and whose experiences were scarred by failure and rejection. It is interesting that these pupils are almost fatalistic about what would happen if they were to return to mainstream: there is an anticipation of failure and a return to Line End, as though the labels placed on them have become self-fulfilling, where they anticipate performing to the label and their perceived expectations of others. For the former, the desire to be integrated into mainstream education is not necessarily an indictment of Line End, but rather an endorsement of something that - driven by curiosity and/or personal ambition - they feel determined to try, though for some, the perceived strength of mainstream would appear to expose the comparative weaknesses of Line End. For the latter, wounded by their own taste of secondary mainstream life, Line End is seen by some as a place where they can experience success, where they will not be rejected for extremes of behaviour, and where the smaller numbers ensures that they are known rather than anonymous, where there is a certain security based on the intimacy of relationships and environment, as acknowledged by Ling (1987). It can be argued that, for them, the school is effective in meeting their needs - the need to be provided with an education within an environment where there is unconditional acceptance of them as individuals, despite their extremes of behaviour; and although unacceptable and inappropriate behaviours will be addressed, they will not herald the start of the process that will ultimately lead to their ejection, unless, of course, the behaviour is of such a severity that it is felt that the school has no other option.

For one pupil, finally, whose reintegration into mainstream had broken down before he had completed a year, there was a feeling that Line End was not as effective as it might have been in supporting him when he was there. With so little experience of successful reintegration to mainstream, there is maybe an expectation within school that for pupils who are reintegrated into mainstream, it is a case of 'when' rather than 'if' they return to Line End, and that setting up a support system for reintegrated pupils might have little significant impact upon the outcome, based on the perception that failure or success is more dependent upon the effectiveness of the support provided by the receiving mainstream school, rather than that provided by Line End.

Reintegration was also an issue which exercised the thoughts of some parents. It is understandable that some parents would prefer to see their children in a mainstream school, for some of the reasons outlined previously. It is equally understandable, however, why some parents feel that it is right for their children to remain at Line End; not only does it indicate that the provision made by Line End is perceived as being effective by these parents, but that taking away their children from the school would be detrimental to their progress, and would be a retrograde step. It is clearly felt that just because a child is doing well and experiencing success, it doesn't mean he should be returned to mainstream. In fact, it is perceived that it is because certain pupils are not at mainstream that they are flourishing - it is the smallness of Line End, with its more flexible, more tolerant, and more 'intimate' environment that has proved effective in meeting pupil's needs.

There is clearly the potential for tension, however, in the relationship between Line End and the Local Authority (LA), resulting from differing perceptions regarding the opportunities for the reintegration of pupils to mainstream – and in particular 'looked-after' children – and the perception of the LA that reintegration should be more of a priority for the school. In citing the number of pupils reintegrated as an important indicator of the school's effectiveness, the LA clearly feels that Line End is not being effective in this area, and clearly it is perceived that it is a matter of the school's will, rather than variables outside of its control, that holds pupils back. There is an implicit criticism, I feel, that the children for whom the LA has responsibility are being disadvantaged educationally, and yet to evaluate Line End's effectiveness on its reintegration record reflects a lack of understanding as to the process of reintegration, the networks of relationships that inform it, and the variables that impact upon it. It is incumbent upon Line End, therefore, to involve all parties who have a stake in the reintegration of pupils to mainstream in the processes of planning, implementation and evaluation, including the pupils themselves; participants will hopefully then have a clearer understanding of the processes involved, and their own role within them. Maybe then it would be more appropriate to evaluate Line End's effectiveness by the extent to which Line End is perceived to facilitate and manage these processes, rather than by the number of pupils who return successfully to mainstream.

Other factors.

In relation to the role of SMT and management issues within the school, there are clear concerns that crisis management rather than strategic management dominates the life of the school. This is at odds with Ofsted's evaluation, however, who felt that effective management and leadership provided clear educational direction for the work of the school. The danger that results from this perspective, though, is that it may serve to validate the school's leadership style, thus endorsing current practice and obviating the perceived need for change. This perceived crisis-management approach, moreover, has implications for vital areas of school life - culture, ethos, morale - and for the overall provision made by the school (Covey, 1992; Fidler, 1996; Jirasinghe, 1996), and it is apparent that differing perspectives can lead to frustration in and amongst stakeholders. It is the way these frustrations are managed, however, that will determine the extent to which tension and conflict are created and managed within the school, an area that is addressed in a later section. A crisis management approach to situations within the school environment may also manifest itself in an over-dependence on punitive responses to challenging behaviour, which, it is felt, leads to a culture of aggression within the school (Hargreaves et al., 1975; Reynolds and Sullivan, 1979), which in turn is replicated in and through peer relationships, and to create tension within and amongst stakeholder groups.

Staff perspectives on the inappropriateness of crisis management approaches also extended to relationships with parents, and as with the staff themselves, parents may come to feel disempowered and disenfranchised if their only involvement with the school is when they are contacted because things are perceived to have gone wrong (Goacher et al., 1988; Wolfendale, 1989). In such cases, the home/school partnership ideal may thus remain in the realms of rhetoric, the reality reflecting the perception of some staff that parents are often seen as part of the problem rather than part of the solution. Relationships with parents, therefore, are often characterised by tension and anxiety on both sides, often because parents carry with them a sense of feeling let down by the system. The concept of parents as consumers emphasises their rights, but it is a metaphor rather than a satisfactory description of the real relationship between school, pupils and parents. The DfEE uses parents rights and powers as big stick to put pressure on schools in its drive to raise standards and make schools accountable, and yet the extent to which parents actually enjoy these rights in practice is questionable. What exists is not so much parental choice in terms of schools for their

children, but rather parental preference, with no guarantee that what parents want they will get. As a result, schools are becoming polarised along social lines, and pupils' histories - and sometimes abilities - will often determine whether they gain admission to the school of their choice. Most of the parents of Line End pupils, however, have never been afforded the luxury of choice, but have simply been directed to Line End by the local authority, the author of pupils' statements of educational needs through its educational psychologists. When children come to Line End, therefore, their parents' attitudes to the school have been largely shaped by past experiences of authority figures in mainstream and the LEA, and are often characterised by tension, conflict and a sense of disenfranchisement. Coupled with the unhappy and unfulfilling time experienced by many of the parents in their own schooling, these can prove tough barriers to break through when aiming to establish a real and effective home/school partnerships.

There is evidence, too, that tensions are created in the relationships between home and school as a result of a 'blame culture' mentality adopted by some stakeholders. Some parents perceive the school as being ineffective by failing to 'fix' the problem of their children's perceived problems, whilst some staff blame ineffective parenting, and the perceived lack of support for the school as exacerbating and perpetuating pupils' difficulties. Unless this cycle of blame is broken, however, an effective partnership between home and school remains only the ideal, and the concerns of many of the school's stakeholders - staff, parents, LEA, Ofsted - will not be effectively addressed.

CONCLUSION.

What is clear from the study is that all stakeholders want Line End to be as effective as is possible, according, of course, to stakeholders' own criteria for what constitutes 'effectiveness.' There is a view amongst some stakeholders, however, that there are some problems over which the school has little or no control. It is important, however, to separate out these problems from those that fall within the power of the school to control or change. Certainly the school has very little control over the pupils referred to it by Farside LEA, as placement at Line End constitutes a legal requirement of pupils' statements of educational needs. Pupils arrive, therefore, 'pre-labelled,' and yet, although others may perceive 'EBD' pupils as constituting one homogeneous group, Line End's stakeholders are in a position to recognise the heterogeneous nature of the school's population - though this cannot be taken

as a given – and staff can construct, implement and evaluate provision aimed at addressing the diversity and individuality of pupils’ needs. How this is done, however, is not necessarily based upon a unanimity of perspective regarding the most effective means by which this should be accomplished.

What is clear from the findings is that some staff are unclear about the relationship between the academic and the affective curricula in the school’s overall provision for pupils’ needs; and if criteria for effectiveness indicate a lack of consensus amongst staff regarding the role of the school, then evaluations of effectiveness will also reflect this lack of consensus. When evaluating the effectiveness of the school’s academic provision, there would appear to be an emphasis on teaching, and in particular on the management of pupil behaviour within the classroom, rather than on the processes of learning. This is not to say that the former is unimportant, but an indicator of effective teaching must surely be the extent to which it facilitates effective and meaningful learning amongst pupils, and there is not the evidence to suggest that this is widely felt to be the case. Although it is perceived by staff that the school is effective in promoting a culture of achievement, there is a significant number of staff who feel that the level of challenge for some of the pupils is not high enough; if teachers give work to pupils that is well within their ability range, rather than work that will stretch them, it may be in the hope of reducing opportunities for disruption as a reaction against being extended academically, or as a means of raising self-esteem through being allowed to succeed and achieve. Although neither of these issues is unimportant, the means do not necessarily justify the ends, if the cost involves compromising pupils’ learning opportunities. In maintaining high expectation and high challenge of pupils, there is an element of risk-taking, but this is an integral and necessary aspect of effective change (Fullan, 1991; Scheerens, 1992; Hopkins et al., 1994, MacGilchrist et al., 1997), and it should be recognised that the promotion of a ‘culture of achievement’ may simply mask the perpetuation of the institutional safety zone, where keeping pupils within the learning environment lesson by lesson is counted as good teaching, but where any effective learning that takes place is just seen as a bonus. Ultimately, it raises questions about how effectively pupils’ academic needs are actually being addressed.

The same questions could also be asked of the school’s provision for pupils’ emotional/behavioural needs. Control from without rather from within can lead to a sense of disenfranchisement, and the consequent tension between those who are seen to exercise

power and those who feel subject to it, may undermine the best efforts of the school to address pupils' needs in this area. Real and meaningful pupil progress will only be as a result of effective learning – academic, emotional, social and behavioural; unless pupils are given the opportunity to take greater responsibility for their own learning, there will be a real danger that Line End will be little more than a 'minding' service for a small number of young people who will simply become a burden on the resources of other agencies when they leave full-time education – the justice system, health and social services. The control from without model, moreover, is seen by some to have an impact upon the school environment, and is seen as helping to perpetuate a culture of aggression, within which pupils become fixed in negative behavioural cycles (Sharp and Green, 1975; Reid, 1985).

There are some, however, who feel that a culture of aggression and bullying is to be expected in an 'EBD' setting due to the 'nature' of the pupils within the school. I would suggest, however, that the culture of an institution can be changed. The significance of school culture as a focus of attention is widely acknowledged (MacGilchrist et al., 1995; Salisbury and Jackson, 1996; Hopkins et al., 1994; Silver, 1994; Ainscow et al., 1994). The measure of a school's effectiveness, and the process of school improvement, moreover, are inextricably linked with the culture of the school; Hopkins (1995) suggests that the transformation of a school's culture is the ultimate achievement of School Improvement, whilst Schein (1985) argues that the development and management of an appropriate school culture is the only thing of real importance that leaders do. Culture however, is not fixed, and can be changed (Hopkins et al, 1994; Stoll, 1991; Salisbury and Jackson, 1996; Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992; Dalin, 1994) by addressing the internal structures that both inform and perpetuate it – given, of course, that the school has the perspicacity to recognise it, and the will to do something about it. The danger, however, is that the decision-makers – invariably those with the greatest power – will determine that what is important is a refining rather than a re-evaluation of present systems; and those who feel that a reliance on such systems alone is not an effective way of addressing pupils' needs, will continue to experience the frustrations of the disenfranchised, within an environment that is perceived to stifle creative-thinking and risk-taking, and ultimately, real and meaningful pupil progress.

The difficulty might be seen to be compounded, moreover, by parental attitudes which see the school as the remediating agent; the role of the school is to 'fix' the problem, and if it cannot be fixed, then it can be contained, and as has been seen, tensions between home and school

can arise when each blames the other for failing to address the perceived problems effectively. The crisis-management approach to home/school relationships – felt by some stakeholders to compromise the effectiveness of provision – clearly needs to be addressed. Although the school has no control over pupils’ backgrounds or home circumstances, it *can* choose to re-evaluate the meaning of partnership beyond the rhetoric of official policy, and *can* choose to be pro-active in involving parents in the educational provision for their own children in a way that respects their role as parents and carers, and that values their experience, perspectives and contributions.

With a multiplicity of perspectives, finally, between and amongst Line End’s stakeholders, the issue of ‘compatibility’ is raised: how compatible or otherwise are the perspectives of stakeholders and stakeholder groups, and what are the implications for provision and practice when perspectives conflict? It is possible that differing perspectives may not necessarily be incompatible – they may overlap or co-exist. Some, however, may be incompatible, and may lead to conflict and tension. Tensions may be created when particular issues become important to certain stakeholders, whilst not to others, or where the resolution of contentious issues becomes dependent on the differentials in power between certain groups; and where this happens, the school must live with and manage the tensions created by incompatible perspectives.

CHAPTER 8: REFLECTIONS ON THE STUDY.

Having completed the study, time has been given to reflecting upon what has been done, the approaches that have been taken, and the extent to which different or modified approaches might have enhanced the effectiveness of the study. These considerations revolve mainly around the involvement of the school's stakeholders – since the whole study hinges on the perceptions and perspectives of stakeholders - and the methodological approaches used in the generation of data from these stakeholders. One of the primary considerations was which stakeholders to use, and which not. The Stakeholders that I opted to use, and the rationale for their inclusion, are outlined in Chapter 3 of the research Report. Those whom I chose not to involve directly included governors, mainstream schools, and the local community.

Governors are clearly important stakeholders, not only responsible in law for ensuring that the school responds to statutory requirements, but also accountable to the other stakeholders for the overall performance of the school (DfEE, 1996: Section 130). Line End's position is unusual, however, in that it is part of the LEA's wider EBD service, incorporating a junior school, a Year 11 Pupil Referral Unit, an attendance support centre, and an outreach team which works in both primary and secondary phases; consequently, the governing board is not solely that of Line End, but rather the whole EBD service. In practice - apart from the head and the teacher governor - governors do not take an active part in the life of the school, and are dependent upon the termly Headteacher's Report to Governors, and verbal reports in governor's meetings for information on what is happening within Line End and the wider service. There is also pertinent documentation – Ofsted/Panda reports, official statistics (SATs, GCSE results, attendance and exclusion rates) but these are given out at the governors' meeting, and with the weight of other written guidelines and policy statements - courtesy of the LEA – that come with the governors' pack for each meeting, they may remain unread. The flow of information, therefore, is mediated by the head, and consequently any perspective on provision and practice within the school will be limited by the level and quality of information they receive. In such circumstances, I do not feel that the perspectives of governors would be necessarily balanced, nor informed by a realistic understanding of what happens at Line End upon which to base any appropriate evaluations as to its effectiveness, despite the fact that governors have clear statutory responsibilities in law regarding the provision made by Line End for its pupils. At the time of the study, moreover, there were no parent governors on the governing body, bar a classroom assistant who worked

at Line End, and had a child in a Farside primary school, and who therefore qualified as a parent governor – though somewhat tenuously. This is a reflection of the fact that Line End has always faced difficulties in recruiting new members to the governing board, a problem faced by the majority of special schools, according to Ofsted. (Ofsted, 1999). The only other governors ‘external’ to the school were a Farside councillor – the LEA representative, who attended infrequently – and the chair of governors, a retired Farside teacher, who relied heavily on the headteacher for information on the school.

Despite these arguments, however, I would elect to involve governors were I to start the Research again. They remain important stakeholders, responsible in law for the provision made by Line End, and despite Teacher A’s perception that Governors have only a ‘sanitised’ view of life at Line End based on the control of information to the Governing Body by the Headteacher, involvement in such a Research project would provide the opportunity for governors to become more realistically involved in issues of school performance, and in the processes of the evaluation and development of school improvement. It would also provide an opportunity for generating evaluations on the effectiveness of the school from different perspectives, and in doing so would show what different governors expected from the school.

Mainstream schools might also be considered as stakeholders, in that many of the pupils come from them, and Line End’s continued existence is important as a repository for naughty, undesirable children. (Galloway et al., 1994; Armstrong and Galloway, 1996). Additionally, one of Line End’s institutional aims is to provide opportunities for pupils to return to mainstream where appropriate. Although, however, there would be ample opportunity to elicit the perspectives of mainstream practitioners on the perceived role of Line End, and the criteria by which it might be judged effective, lack of first-hand contact means that such perspectives would merely represent an official outsider view of the role of the EBD school, which I could simply obtain from the relevant literature. I would also envisage problems with follow-up research, based on the time implications, and perceived difficulties of assessing the extent to which mainstream practitioners consider Line End to be effective, and the evidence upon which these judgements might be made.

The local community, finally, is often considered to be an important stakeholder in its local schools. Line End, however, has little community identity; there is also local catchment area, moreover, as pupils come in from all areas of the authority - taxied in, and taxied out - and

thus pupils perceive no relationship with the local community, whilst the community has no relationship with the school. There is little point, therefore, in endeavouring to elicit more detailed perspectives about the school's provision and practice from those who neither care for, nor know much about the school.

One of the early dilemmas faced in establishing stakeholders' perspectives on the effectiveness of Line End was separating out the criteria by which the various stakeholder groups made their evaluations: in the analysis of these criteria, should I amalgamate them and select the major themes which emerged, or separate out the criteria specific to each stakeholder group, and base the evaluation of Line End's provision on these discrete responses? In reality, criteria might be described as 'insider' or 'outsider.' The criteria suggested by staff and pupils represent an 'insider' view, based on first-hand experience of the school environment on a daily basis. Criteria from other stakeholders, however – notably parents, Farside LEA and Ofsted – reflect those of outsiders looking in, set within the context of their own terms of reference, as they do not possess the requisite contextual and operational background or knowledge to validate 'insider' evaluations. Evaluations of the school's effectiveness were therefore based on each stakeholder group's own criteria, rather than an amalgamation of the criteria from all stakeholder groups.

Although parents were involved in the study, I would endeavour to widen the scope of their involvement, bearing in mind the constraints that obtain when aiming to elicit the views of parents (Armstrong, 1997). I would prepare a wider-ranging interview schedule that went beyond the basic 'two-question' interview of the present study, and I would ask each parent's permission to tape-record the session, rather than making any assumptions about their preferences beforehand. In writing down notes contemporaneously during the interview, there was less scope to respond to things that parents said – fewer opportunities to question in more detail and probe for 'thicker description' (Denzin, 1989). I would also conduct a preparatory survey, based on a questionnaire that would be sent to every parent as a means of raising the profile of the issues that were the focus of the research, generating data that might usefully inform the direction of subsequent interviews. This might address the problem of 'thinness' in parental contributions, and allow the opportunity to supplement and open up some of the perspectives of parents that emerge briefly in the Annual Reviews.

Second time around, I would record and separate pupil responses from surveys and whole-group interviews into the appropriate year groups, so that there would be an opportunity during analysis to relate responses to the particular educational stage of the respondent. This was done in part during the present study, but not as systematically and rigorously as I now feel would have been appropriate, as not only would the findings show that the criteria by which the school is perceived to be effective differ amongst pupils, but that these criteria are related to the age of pupils, and the stages at which they are in their educational lives.

In reviewing my own methodological approaches, there has sometimes been a problem with balancing the guiding of discussions with stakeholders – both individually and with groups – with the contemporaneous recording of stakeholder responses. If I had relied on memory to write up notes after these sessions, there is a danger that I might have missed important data; the corollary of this, however, is that note-taking in situ means that it is sometimes difficult to respond creatively to stakeholder responses in terms of directing discussions, and exploring the nuances of meaning that sometimes emerge from these responses. I have also had to balance the tension between the roles of researcher and practitioner: as a practitioner in the life of Line End, I am also a stakeholder, and I have endeavoured to ensure that I have not carried into the research process my own perspectives on the issues I have been investigating to such an extent that they have unduly affected the direction of the research, either in relation to the questions that I have asked of stakeholders, or the responses that have been recorded. I have also been aware of the temptation, at times, to be selective in the analysis and interpretation of data in an attempt to produce findings that reflect and support my own views, and have sought to avoid this pitfall.

Professional Relevance and the way ahead.

It has also been important to stand back from the study and consider the social, political and educational implications of the findings at a ‘macro’ level. Based on the reality of an ever-increasing number of referrals to Line End, I feel that what is needed is an investigation into why so many pupils continue to be excluded from mainstream education, and the problems of disaffection and disruption – particularly amongst boys - which lead to this. My own contention – based on the findings of my own study and supported by the literature (Barton and Meighan, 1979; Bird et al., 1981; Furlong, 1985; McManus, 1995) - is that for a significant minority of pupils, the curriculum has become irrelevant, a ‘blanket provision’

that does not always take account of pupils' individual and differing learning styles and needs. Such an investigation should be part of a fundamental re-thinking about the function of schooling and learning, and whether the educational agenda is to be based on a perspective that accepts the homogeneity of the school population and the subsequent expectation of institutional conformity based on social control and training, or whether the agenda is to be based on empowerment, driven by a desire and will to see pupils maximising their full potential through the encouragement of creativity, the growth of new knowledge, and the development of pupils as independent learners able to able critical and reflective thinking.

In reality, however, centralised curricula, standardised testing and league tables constitute the framework within which most schools in England operate. This might suggest that what is of importance is more the advancement of schools' reputations based on narrow measures of intellectual accounting, rather than the developing of the whole child. A consideration of what may be considered to be more relevant and appropriate models of learning (Gardner, 1983; Goleman, 1996) call into question the generic age-related and compartmentalised experience that is the lot of the majority of secondary mainstream pupils, and its relevance, appropriateness and effectiveness in preparing pupils for their future lives in a rapidly changing society, where yesterday's solutions are no longer appropriate for our post-industrial, new-millennial age. There appears to be a gap between the rhetoric of lifelong learning and the reality of pupils' experiences within the current system, and a real risk of the gap between what pupils need and what they actually get becoming wider. This would suggest the need for a re-evaluation of the extent to which the needs of pupils can be effectively addressed within current frameworks of provision, and whether schools' organisation, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practices provide best fit for the purpose of educating pupils in and for the 21st. century.

There are implications, too, for current thinking on the evaluation of school effectiveness and the processes of school improvement. The pre-eminent paradigm for school improvement, I would suggest, is based on school organisation and systems of management, and focuses on measurable outputs through making the present system more effective. Rather than simply striving to identify those actions which will lead to higher pupil attainments at the end of Key Stages – the predominant 'effectiveness criteria' for schools at present – what is called for is a deeper and wider-ranging exploration of the very concept of 'effectiveness' within the educational setting - an open debate on the criteria upon which an evaluation of 'success'

might more appropriately be based. Realistically, this should be through controlled longitudinal research that can lead to theory generation. This will not provide a quick fix, but should herald a more professional and thoughtful approach than the usual knee-jerk response of successive governments to perceived failures within the education system. Such research should lead to the development of more realistic and appropriate performance indicators embracing a broader range of outcomes that are appropriate to the changing world of the 21st century.

The research would investigate the influence and effect of the variables which might impact upon the provision made by schools, both educational – at classroom, school, LEA and DfEE levels – and societal – issues of deprivation, socio-economic factors, family circumstances. It might also incorporate a series of case-studies of schools involved in managing change for improvement, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of a range of change strategies used by schools within differing contexts which can inform individualistic and tailored improvement programmes which are institution and situation specific. Alongside this there is a need for in-depth research regarding pupils perceived as experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties, and the educational provision currently being made for them, both in mainstream and in the specialist setting. There are a number of areas I feel would be worthy of research projects: bullying and aggression, the efficacy of medication in addressing perceived behavioural needs, effective and appropriate interventions in pupils' behavioural cycles, the relationships between disruption/disaffection and schools' provision and organisation, the contextual variability of pupil behaviour, pupils' interpretation of their schooling – and not least, the labelling of pupils as being 'EBD.' The ultimate aim of such research would be to generate and develop positive alternatives to school exclusion – systems and practices which would meaningfully engage 'at-risk-of-exclusion-pupils' and those who might otherwise find themselves on the continuum of disaffection – a policy of inclusion that is more than just rhetoric.

This, then, brings the discussion full circle back to my own study – an example of such an in-depth study; and yet what I feel is most important in my own study is not so much how effective the school's provision is felt to be by its stakeholders, but rather the criteria by which these evaluations have been made, and the perspectives on 'EBD-ness' and the perceived role of the school that have informed these criteria. And because, furthermore, there remains an inextricable link between special, off-site provision and mainstream

schooling – though in reality the link is more often than not quite tenuous, and mostly one-way – what is called for, I feel, is a re-evaluation and redefinition of the role and function of mainstream schooling in the light of all the variables I have outlined, and a move away from a maintenance role to a transformational role, where all the needs of all pupils can be more appropriately and effectively met. This undoubtedly has implications for the training needs of mainstream staff; whilst the skills relating to the effective teaching of children perceived as experiencing emotional and behavioural difficulties should not be seen as the province of ‘experts’ only, there is still a role for specialists in supporting and offering training to non-specialist colleagues, so that mainstream schools can draw on the skills and knowledge of those working in specialist ‘EBD’ provision.

Although, moreover, the findings of my own research project are not necessarily generalisable, nor transferable to other institutions, I feel that there is value for other professionals and institutions when the study is looked at holistically, and where the methodology can be seen as a ‘type’ for similar investigations in similar circumstances. Very little has been written about the effectiveness of EBD schools, and that which has been conducted by ‘outsiders’ looking in. (DES, 1989; 1990; Cole et al., 1998; DfEE, 1998a). The criteria used to inform such evaluations have been presented as ‘givens’ and little attention has been paid to the reality of the multiple interpretations of effectiveness by stakeholders based upon multiple values and expectations. I believe that my own study might provide a model by which the perspectives of an institutions various stakeholders might usefully be generated, in terms of both the criteria by which stakeholders judge the effectiveness of a school’s provision, and evaluations of effectiveness based on these criteria.

In terms of taking my own research project forward at a ‘micro’ level, I feel there is enough in the findings to suggest that the area of provision for pupils’ academic needs is one upon which stakeholders are clearly divided, both in its relative importance when balanced against policy and provision for pupils’ emotional/behavioural needs, and in its overall effectiveness. More focused research would illumine more specifically those areas where this provision is felt by stakeholders to be less or more effective, based on their own criteria for effectiveness in this area. Findings would also suggest that there is a need to review provision for emotional/behavioural needs, and a re-evaluation of current systems and practices. It would also be important to involve the pupils within the review process, but further, to re-examine the issues of management and decision-making within the school based on the perceptions of

stakeholders regarding their own involvement in the process – both desired and actual, and a tendency towards crisis- rather than strategic- management. Clearly the findings suggest that there are certain of the stakeholders who feel that they should be more involved in the process of decision-making, and more focused research in this area would establish the extent of stakeholder involvement, and perceptions of how this is seen to impact upon the management and organisation of the school, and the implications for day to day practice. The findings from these areas of research should then be used as a basis for discussion amongst staff, training sessions where external research findings on these issues could be disseminated and discussed, and subsequent planning for improvement and more effective provision and practice in these areas.

Time should be set aside, moreover, to reflect upon the home/school partnership, and in the light of the findings, to set up programmes and practices for rebuilding relationships with parents, and developing a more constructive and effective working relationship with them. This may entail cutting through deeply felt negative parental attitudes formed by years of being disenfranchised and let down by the education system, particularly the professionals with whom they have come into contact – LEA officers, Educational Psychologists, Educational Welfare Officers, teachers. All that many parents want is to know that their voices will be heard, and that their views will be taken seriously. And finally, we, as a school, should ask all stakeholders on a regular basis what they expect and want of Line End, and whether they feel they are actually getting it. Such honesty and openness – both individual and institutional – is the only way that real and lasting improvement will be experienced at Line End, and despite the potential vulnerability that such risk-taking involves, the returns will ultimately outweigh the initial outlay.

REFERENCES.

- Ackland, J. (1981) *Problem Behaviour: Whose Definition?* in Gurney, P. (ed) (1981)
- Ainscow, M. (1995) *Education for All: Making it happen*,
in *Support for Learning*, 10(4), pp.147-157.
- Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., Tweddle, D., Malki, G. (1999) *Research Report No. 91: Effective Practice in Inclusion, and in Special and Mainstream Schools Working Together*.
London, DfEE.
- Ainsworth, F., Fulcher, C. (eds.) (1981) *Group Care for Children: Concepts and Issues*.
London, Tavistock.
- Anastasi, A. (1982) *Psychological Testing*. New York, Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Apple, M. (1979) *The Production of Knowledge and the Production of Deviance in Schools*,
in Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (1979)
- Armstrong, D. (1995) *Power and Partnership in Education*. London, Routledge.
- Armstrong, D., Galloway, D. (1996) *How Children with EBDs view Professionals*,
in Davie, R. and Galloway, D. (1996)
- Avelone, M., Dryden, W. (eds.) (1988) *Group Therapy in Britain*. Milton Keynes, OU Press.
- Ball, S. (1989) *Micro-Politics versus Management: Towards a Sociology of School Organisation*, in Walker, S. and Barton, L. (1989).
- Barker, P. (1977)) *Basic Child Psychiatry*. London, Crosby Lockwood Staples.
- Barth, R. (1990) *Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals can make the Difference*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Barton L (1988) *The Politics of Special Educational Needs*. London, Falmer.
- Barton, L., Meighan, R. (eds.) (1979) *Schools, Pupils and Deviance*. Nafferton, Driffield.
- Barton, L., Tomlinson, S. (eds.) (1984) *Special Education and Social Interests*.
London, Croom Helm.
- Bateson, G. (1979) *Mind and Nature: A necessary Unity*. Dutton, New York.
- Beedell, C. (1993) *Poor Starts, Lost Opportunities, Hopeful Outcomes: A Survey of 186 Children and Young People in nine Therapeutic Communities*. London, Charterhouse.
- Bell, J. (1987) *Doing your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

- Bellaby, P. (1974) *The Distribution of Deviance among 13-14 year old students*, in Eggleston. (1974).
- Bennathan, M. (1996) *Listening to Children in Schools: An Empirical Study*, in Davie and Galloway. (1996).
- Beresford, J. (1998) *Collecting Information for School Improvement*. London, David Fulton.
- Bird, C., Chessum, R., Furlong, J., Johnson D. (1981) *Disaffected Pupils*. Uxbridge, Brunel University.
- Blakey, L., Heath, A. (1992) *Differences between Comprehensive Schools: some preliminary Findings*, in Reynolds and Cuttance (1992)
- Booth, T., Coulby, D. (eds.) (1987) *Producing and Reducing Disaffection*. Milton Keynes, O.U.P.
- Booth, A., Statham, J. (1982) *The Nature of Special Education*. London, Croom Helm/O.U.P.
- Booth, A., Swan, V., Masterton, M., Potts P. (eds.) (1992) *Policies for Diversity in Education*. London, Routledge.
- Booth, T., Ainscow, M. (1998) *From them to us: an International study of Inclusion in Education*. London, Routledge.
- Boothroyd, C., Fitz-Gibbon, C., McNicholas, J., Thompson. M., Stern, E., Wragg, E. (1996) *A Better System of Inspection?* Hexham, Ofstin.
- Boreham, N., Peers, I., Farrell, P., Craven, D. (1995) *Different Perspectives of Parents and Educational Psychologists when a Child is referred for EBD Assessment*, in Farrell (1995).
- Bowers, T. (1996) 'Putting back the "E" in "EBD", *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 1(1), pp.8-13.
- Bowers, T. (ed.) (1987) *Special Educational Needs and Human Resource Management*. Beckenham, Croom Helm.
- Bourdieu, P. (1966) *The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities*, in Eggleston. (1974)
- Box, S. (1981) *Preface*, in Schrag, P. and Divoky, D. (1981).
- Brassard, M.R., Germain, R., Hart, S.N. (1987) *The Psychological Maltreatment of Children and Youth*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Brenner, M. (1985) *Intensive Interviewing* in Brenner et al. (1985).

- Brenner, M., Brown, J., Canter, D. (eds.) (1985) *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*. London, Academic Press.
- Bull, K. (1995) 'On Common Ground', *Special Children* (April 1995), pp.15-16.
- Burgess, R. (1983) *Experiencing Comprehensive Education: A Study of Bishop Mcgregor School*. London, Methuen.
- Burgess, R. (1984) *The Whole Truth? Some Ethical Problems in the study of a Comprehensive School*, in Burgess. (ed.) *Field Methods in the Study of Education*. Lewes, Falmer Press.
- Burland, R. (1981) *Requirements of the Behavioural Model as applied to changing behaviour, teaching skills, and management in an educational context*, in Gurney. (ed.) (1981).
- Cantwell, D. (1975) *The Hyperactive Child*. New York, Spectrum.
- Chaplain, R., Freeman, A. (1994) *Caring under Pressure*. London, David Fulton.
- Charlton, T. (1996) *Listening to Pupils in Classrooms and Schools*, in Davie and Galloway. (1996).
- Clark, A., Power, S. (1998) *Could Do Better - School Reports and Parents Evenings*. London, Research and Information on State Education Trust.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. (1994) *Perspectives in Classrooms and Schools*. London, Cassell.
- Cole, T., Visser, J. (1998) 'How should the 'effectiveness' of schools for pupils with EBD be assessed?' *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 3(1), pp. 37-43.
- Cole, T., Visser, J., Daniels, H. (1999) 'A Model explaining effective EBD practice in Mainstream Schools' *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 4(1), pp.12-18.
- Cole, T., Visser, J., Upton, G. (1998) *Effective Schooling for Pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*. London, David Fulton.
- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F., York, R. (1996) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, US Govt. Printing Office.
- Collier, A. (1995) *Emotional Abuse: Identification and Assessment in an Educational Setting*, in Farrell. (1995).
- Cooper, P. (1993) *Effective Schools for Disaffected Students in Integration and Segregation*. London, Routledge.
- Cooper, P., McIntyre, D. (1996) *The Importance of Power-sharing in Classroom Learning*, in Hughes. (1996).

- Cooper, P., Upton, G. (1991) 'Controlling the urge to control: an ecosystemic approach to problem behaviour in schools', *Support for Learning* 6(1), pp.22-26.
- Corbett, J. (1996) *Bad-mouthing: the language of Special Needs*. London, Falmer Press.
- Corrie, S., Zaklukiewicz, S. (1985) *Qualitative Research and Case Study approaches: an Introduction*, in Hegarty and Evans. (1985).
- Covey, S. (1992) *Principled-Centred Leadership*. London, Simon and Schuster.
- Cowburn, W. (1986) *Class, Ideology and Community Education*. London, Croom Helm.
- Creemers, B. (1996) *The Goals of School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, in Reynolds et al. (1996).
- Cronk, K. (1987) *Teacher-pupil Conflict in Secondary Schools*. London, Falmer.
- CSIE. (1985) *Integration: A Framework for Support*.
- CSIE. (1995) *The Integration Charter*.
- Cunnison, S. (1987) *Let us take these thoughts with us into the day: macho culture in the school* in Booth and Coulby. (1987)
- Cuttance, P. (1992) *Evaluating the Effectiveness of School* in Reynolds and Cuttance. (1992)
- Daniels, H., Visser, J., Cole, T., De Reybekill. (1998) *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties in Mainstream Schools*. Research Report RR90. London, DfEE.
- Davie, R., Galloway, D. (eds.) (1996) *Listening to Children in Education*. London, David Fulton.
- Davies, B. (1976) *Social Control and Education*. London, Methuen.
- Denscombe, M. (1983) *Interviews, Accounts and Ethnographic research on Teachers in Hammersley*. (1983)
- Denzin, N. (1978) *The Research Act*. New York, McGraw Hill.
- Denzin, N. (1989) *Interpretive Interactionism*. London, Sage.
- DES. (1978) *Special Educational Needs*. (Warnock Report). London, HMSO.
- DES. (1978a) *Behavioural Units: a Survey of Special Units for Pupils with Behavioural Problems*. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1978b) *Truancy and Behaviour Problems in some Urban Schools*. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1981) *Education Act*. London, HMSO.

- DES. (1987) *Good Behaviour and Discipline in Schools*. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1988) Education Reform Act. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1989) *The Effectiveness of Small Special Schools*. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1989a) *Discipline in Schools: A Report of the Committee of Enquiry (Elton Report)*. London, HMSO.
- DES. (1990) *A Survey of Provision for Pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties in Maintained Schools and Units*. London, HMSO.
- DFE. (1992) *Choice and Diversity: a new Framework for Schools*. London, HMSO.
- DfE. (1994) *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*. London, HMSO.
- DfE. (1994a) *Pupils with Problems*
Circular 8/94. *Pupil Behaviour and Discipline*.
9/94. *The Education of Children with Emotional and behavioural Difficulties*. London, HMSO.
- DfEE. (1996) *Education Act*. London, HMSO.
- DfEE. (1997) *Excellence in Schools*. London, The Stationery Office.
- DfEE. (1997a.) *Excellence for All Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs*. London, The Stationery Office.
- DfEE. (1998) *Meeting Special Educational Needs: A Programme of Action*. London, DfEE.
- DfEE/Ofsted. (1998a) *Working for Success in the EBD Special School*. London, HMSO.
- Department of Health. (1991) *The Children Act 1989*. London, HMSO.
- Dingwall, R. (1981) *The Ethnomethodological Movement*, in Payne et al. (1981)
- Dowling, E., Osborne, E. (eds.) (1985) *The Family and the School*. London, RKP.
- Downes, P. (1997) *Let's hear it for the Boys*, in SHA. (April, 1997).
- Dyson, A. (1994) 'Towards a Collaborative Learning Model for responding to Student Diversity', *Support for Learning* 9(2), pp.36-41.
- Eggleston, J. (ed.) (1974) *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*. London, Methuen.
- Elsner, E. (1991) *Objectivity in Educational Research*, in Hammersley. (ed.) (1993).

- Entwistle, N. (1988) *Styles of Learning and Teaching: An Integrated Outline of Educational Psychology*. London, David Fullerton.
- Farrell, P. (ed.) (1995) *Children with EBDs: Strategies for Assessment and Intervention*. London, Falmer.
- Fidler, B. (1996) *Strategic Planning for School Improvement*. London, Pitman Publishing.
- Ford, J., Mongon, D., Whelan, M. (1982) *Special Education and Social Control: Invisible Disasters*. London, RKP.
- Fullan, M., Hargreaves, D. (1991) *What's Worth Fighting for in Your School?* Buckingham, OUP.
- Fullan, M. (1992) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. London, Cassell.
- Furlong, V. (1985) *The Deviant Pupil: Sociological Perspectives*. Milton Keynes, OUP.
- Galloway, D., Ball, T., Blomfield, R., Seyd, R. (1982) *Schools and Disruptive Pupils*. London, Longman.
- Galloway, D., Armstrong, D., Tomlinson, S. (1994) *The Assessment of Special Educational Needs: whose problem?* Harlow, Longman.
- Galloway, D., Goodwin, C. (1979) *Educating slow-learning and maladjusted children: integration or separation?* London, Longman.
- Galloway, D., Goodwin, C. (1987) *The Education of Disturbing Children*. London, Longman.
- Gardner, H. (1983) *Frames of Mind: the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York, Basic Books.
- Gersch, I. (1987) *Involving Pupils in their own Assessment*, in Bowers, T. (1987).
- Gillham, B. (1978) *Reconstructing Educational Psychology*. London, Croom Helm.
- Gillham, B. (ed.) (1981) *Problem Behaviour in the Secondary School: a systems approach*. London, Croom Helm.
- Gipps, C., Murphy, P. (1994) *A Fair Test? Assessment, Achievement and Equity*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Goacher, B., Evans, D., Welton, J., Wedell, K. (1988) *Policy and Provision for SENs: Implementing the 1981 Education Act*. London, Cassell.
- Goetz, J., LeCompte, M. (1984) *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Education Research*. Orlando, Academic Press.

- Goleman D (1996) *Emotional Intelligence: Why it matters more than IQ*.
London, Bloomsbury Paperbacks.
- Gray, J. (1995) *The Quality of Schooling: Frameworks for Judgement*, in Gray, J., Wilcox, B. (eds.) (1995) *Good School, Bad School*. Milton Keynes, OUP.
- Gray, J., Reynolds, D., Fitz-Gibbon, C., Jesson, D. (eds.) (1996) *Merging Traditions: the Future of Research on School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. London, Cassell.
- Greenhalgh, P. (1994) *Emotional Growth and Learning*. London, Routledge.
- Gurney, P. (1981) *Some principles and Basic Issues relating to the use of Behaviour Modification in Education*, in Gurney (1981).
- Gurney, P. (ed.) (1981) *Behaviour Modification in Education*. London, Croom Helm.
- Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1983) *The Ethnography of Schooling*. Driffield, Nafferton.
- Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1993) *Educational Research: Current Issues*.
London, OU/Paul Chapman.
- Hargreaves, D. (1975) *Deviance in Classrooms*. London, RKP.
- Hargreaves, D. (1982) *The Challenge of the Comprehensive School: Culture, Curriculum, Community*. London, RKP.
- Hargreaves, D., Hestor, S., Mellor, F. (1975) *Deviance in Classrooms*. London, RKP.
- Hegarty, S., Evans, P. (eds.) (1985) *Research and Evaluation Methods in Special Education*.
Windsor, NFER/Nelson.
- Herbert, M. (1978) *Conduct Disorders of Childhood and Adolescence*. Chichester, Wiley.
- Highfield, M., Pinsent, A. (1952) *A Survey of Rewards and Punishments in School*.
Newnes Educational Publishing.
- Hill, J. (1995) *Entering the Unknown: case – study analysis in Special Schools*, in
Clough and Barton. (1995).
- Hitchcock, G., Hughes, D. (1995) *Research and the Teacher - A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research*. London, Routledge.
- Holman, R. (1980) *Inequality in Child Care*.
London, Child Poverty Action Group/Family Rights Group.
- Holstein, J., Gubrium, J. (1997) *Active Interviewing*, in Silverman, D. (1997).
- Hopkins, D. (1985) *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*. Milton Keynes, OUP.

- Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., West, M. (1994) *School Improvement in an Era of Change*. London, Cassell.
- Howard, P. (1992) *Challenging Behaviour Support*, in Booth et al. (1992).
- Humphries, S. (1981) *Hooligans or Rebels: An Oral History of Working Class Childhood and Youth 1889 – 1939*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Hurt, J. (1988) *Outside the Mainstream: A History of Special Education*. London, RKP.
- Hutchinson, S. (1988) *Education and Grounded Theory*, in Sherman, R., Webb, R. (eds) (1988)
- ILEA. (1984) *Improving Secondary Schools: The Hargreaves Report*. London, ILEA.
- Jencks, C., Smith, A., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., Michelson, S. (1972) *Inequality: a reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America*. New York, Basic Books.
- Jirasinghe, D., Lyons, G. (1996) *The Competent Head*. London, Falmer.
- Kennard, D. (1988) *The Therapeutic Community*, in Avelone and Dryden. (1988).
- Kohn, A. (1990) *The Brighter Side of Human Nature: Altruism and Empathy in Everyday Life*. New York, Basic Books.
- Laslett, R. (1977) *Educating Maladjusted Children*. London; Crosby Lockwood Staples.
- Laslett, R. (1982) *Maladjusted Children in the Ordinary School*. Stratford upon Avon, National Council for Special Education.
- Laslett, R. (1995) 'Beliefs and Practice in the Early Schools for Maladjusted Children', *Therapeutic Care and Education* 4(2), pp.5-9.
- Lemert, E. (1967) *Human Deviance: Social Problems and Social Control*. Englewood Cliffs; Prentice Hall.
- Ling, R. (1987) 'Teaching the unteachable: Teacher strategies in Disruptive Units', *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education* 5(2), pp.30-35.
- Lingard, B., Ladwig, J., Luke, A. (1998) *School Effects in Postmodern Conditions*, in Slee et al. (1998).
- Lloyd-Smith, M. (1987) *Sorting them Out: Provision for Young 'Deviants'*, in Booth and Coulby. (1987).
- Lowenstein, L. (1975) *Violent and Disruptive Behaviour in Schools*. Hemel Hempstead, NAS.

- Lund, R. (1991) 'Curriculum Development for Children with EBDs',
Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education 9(1), pp.74-82.
- MacBeath, J., Thomson, B., Arrowsmith, J., Forbes, D. (1992) *Using Ethos Indicators in Secondary School self-evaluation: Taking Account of the views of pupils, parents and teachers*. HMI/Scottish Office Education Dept.
- MacGilchrist, B., Myers, K., Reed, J. (1997) *The Intelligent School*.
London, Paul Chapman.
- Maier, H. (1981) *Essential Components in Treatment Environments for Children*, in
Ainsworth and Fulcher. (1981).
- Maras, P. (1996) 'Whose are the "Es" in "EBDs?" *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*
1(3), pp. 25-30.
- Marchant, S. (1995) 'The Essential Curriculum for Pupils exhibiting Emotional and
Behavioural Difficulties', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 1(2), pp.36-47.
- Marshall, C., Rossman, G. (1989) *Designing Qualitative Research*. London, Sage.
- McCracken, G. (1988) *the Long Interview*. Qualitative Research Methods: Series 13.
London, Sage.
- McDermott, P. (1984) in Lloyd-Smith, M. (1984) *Disrupted Schooling*.
London, John Murray.
- McManus, M. (1995) *Troublesome Behaviour in the Classroom: Meeting Individual Needs*.
London: Routledge.
- Miller, J., Glassner, B. (1997) *The 'Inside' and the 'Outside': Finding Realities in Interviews*,
in Silverman. (1997).
- Millham, S., Bullock, R., Cherrett, P. (1975) *After Grace – Teeth*. London, Chaucer.
- Ministry of Education. (1955) *The Education of Maladjusted Children: Underwood Report*.
London, HMSO.
- Mittler, P. (1990) *Too Difficult to Address?* in TES. (23/2/90) p.26.
- Mongon, D. (1987) *Going against the Grain: Alternatives to Exclusion*, in Booth and
Coulby (1987).
- Montgomery, D. (1992) *Managing Behaviour Problems*. London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Mortimore, P. (1992) *Issues in School Effectiveness*, in Reynolds and Cuttance. (1992).
- Mortimore, P., Davies, J., Varlaam, A., West, A. (1983) *Behaviour Problems in Schools: an
evaluation of Support Centres*. London, Croom Helm.

- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D., Ecob, R. (1998) *School Matters: The Junior Years*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Myers, K. (1996) *Research in Practice* in Myers (ed.) (1996).
- Myers, K. (ed.) (1996) *School Improvement in Practice: Schools Make a Difference Project*. London, Falmer Press.
- Nias, J. (1991) *Primary Teachers Talking: A Reflexive Account of Longitudinal Research*, in Walford. (1991).
- Norwich, B. (1990) *Reappraising Special Needs Education*. London, Cassell.
- Ofsted. (1995) *Pupil Referral Units: the first 12 Inspections*. London, HMSO.
- Ofsted. (1997) *Inspection and Re-inspection of Schools from September 1997: New Requirements and Guidance on their Implementation*. London, Ofsted.
- Ofsted. (1999) *Principles into Practice: Effective education for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties*. London, Ofsted.
- Oppenheim, A. (1996) *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. London, Heinemann.
- Hutchinson, S. (1988) Education and Grounded Theory, in Sherman and Webb. (eds.) (1988).
- Orr, R. (1995) 'A prescription for Failure', *Special Children*. (September 1995) pp. 24-25.
- Parsons, C. (1998) 'The Shame of Ofsted: Not Improving but Policing' *Improving Schools* 1(2), pp.38-42.
- Parsons, C., Howlett, K., Corbett, F. (1994) *Institutional Development Planning*. Lancaster, Framework Press.
- Patton, M. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. London, Sage.
- Payne, G., Dingwall, R., Payne, J., Carter, M. (eds.) (1981) *Sociology and Social Research*. London, Croom Helm.
- Peagam, E. (1995) 'The Foolish Man built his house on Sand', *Therapeutic Care and Education* 4(1), pp.9-16.
- Pearce, N., Hillman, J. (1998) *Wasted Youth: Raising Achievement and Tackling Social Exclusion*. London, Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Perkins, D. (1995) *Outsmarting IQ: The emergence of Learnable Intelligences*. New York, Free Press.
- Phillips, D. (1989) *Subjectivity and objectivity: an objective enquiry*, in Hammersley. (1993).

- Pring, R. (1981) *Behaviour Modification: Some Observations*, in Gurney. (1981).
- Prior, L. (1997) *Following in Foucault's Footsteps: Text and Context in Qualitative Research*. in Silverman. (ed) (1997).
- Pritchard, D. (1963) *Education and the Handicapped, 1760 – 1960*. London, RKP.
- Rayner, S. (1998) 'Educating Pupils with Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties: Pedagogy is the Key' *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 3(2), pp.39-47.
- Redl, F. (1996) *When We Deal with Children*. New York, Free Press.
- Redl, F., Wineman, D. (1952) *Controls from Within*. New York, Free Press.
- Reynolds, D. (ed.) (1985) *Studying School Effectiveness*. Lewes, Falmer Press.
- Reynolds, D. (1991) *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: an updated review of the British Literature*, in Reynolds and Cuttance. (1992).
- Reynolds, D., Bollen, R., Creemers, B., Hopkins, D., Stoll, L., Lagerweij, N. (1996) *Making Good Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. London, Routledge.
- Reynolds, D., Cuttance, P. (eds.) (1992) *School Effectiveness Research, Policy and Practice*. London, Cassell.
- Reynolds, D., Reid, K. (1985) *Towards a reconceptualisation of theory and methodology in School Effectiveness studies*, in Reynolds. (ed.) (1985).
- Reynolds, D., Sullivan, M. (1981) *The Effects of Schools: a Radical Faith Re-stated*, in Gillham. (1981).
- Riddell, S., Brown, S. (eds.) (1991) *School Effectiveness Research: Its messages for School Improvement*. Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Robson, C. (1994) *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers*. London, Blackwell.
- Roe, M. (1978) *Medical and Psychological Concepts of Problem Behaviour*, in Gillham. (1978).
- Rudduck, J. (1995) Address to the International School Effectiveness and Improvement Conference, *School Improvement Network News* No. 5, p.3.
- Rudduck, J., Chaplain, R., Wallace, G. (1996) *School Improvement: what can pupils tell us?* London, David Fulton.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J. (1979) *15,000 hours: Secondary Schools and their effects on children*. Somerset, Open Books.

- Salisbury, J., Jackson, D. (1996) *Challenging macho values: practical ways of working with adolescent boys*. London, Falmer.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J., Mortimore, P. (1995) *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A review of School Effectiveness Research for OFSTED*, by the International School Effectiveness and Improvement Centre, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Sanders, D., Hendry, L. (1997) *New Perspectives on Disaffection*. London, Cassell.
- Saunders, M. (1979) *Class Control and Behaviour*. London; McGraw Hill.
- Scheerens, J. (1992) *Effective Schooling: Research, Theory and Practice*. London, Cassell.
- Sharp, R., Green, A. (1975) *Education and Social Control*. London RKP.
- Schostak, J., Logan, T. (eds.) (1998) *Pupil Experience*. London, Croom Helm.
- Silver, H. (1994) *Good Schools, Effective Schools: Judgements and their Histories*. London, Cassell.
- Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London, Sage.
- Silverman, D. (ed.) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London, Sage.
- Skrtic, T. (1991) 'The Special Educational Paradox: Equity as the Way to Excellence' *Harvard Educational Review*.
- Slee, R., Weiner, G. (1998) *Introduction: School Effectiveness for Whom?* in Slee et al. (1998).
- Slee, R., Weiner, G., Tomlinson, S. (eds.) (1998) *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements*. London, Falmer Press.
- Smith, A. (1996) *Accelerated Learning in the Classroom*. (Lancaster, Framework Academic Press.
- Smith, C., Laslett, R. (1990) *Effective Classroom management: A Teachers' Guide*. London, Routledge.
- Spradley, J. (1980) *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stenhouse, L. (1980) *The Study of Samples and the Study of Cases*, in Murphy and Torrance. (1987).
- Stenhouse, L. (1982) *The Conduct, Analysis and Reporting of Case Study in Educational Research and Evaluation*, in Murphy and Torrance. (1987).

- Sternberg, R. (1990) *Prototypes of Competence and Incompetence*, in Sternberg, R., Kolligan Jr. J. (eds.) *Competence Considered*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Stoll, L., Fink, D. (1996) *Changing our Schools*. Milton Keynes, O.U.P.
- Tattum, D. (1982) *Disruptive Pupils in Schools and Units*. Chichester, Wiley.
- Thomas, G. (1995) 'Special Needs at Risk', *Support for Learning* 10(1), pp.59-67.
- Thomas, G. (1997) *Exam Performance in Special Schools*. Bristol, CSIE.
- Tizard, B., Blatchford, P., Burke, J., Farquhar, C., Plewis, I. (1998) *Young children at school in the Inner City*. Hove, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tomlinson, S. (1981) *Educational Subnormality: A Study in Decision Making*. London, RKP.
- Tomlinson, S. (1982) *A Sociology of Special Education*. London, RKP.
- Tomlinson, S. (1994) *Educational Reform and its Consequences*.
London, IPPR/Rivers Oram Press.
- Topping, K. (1983) *Educational Systems for Disruptive Adolescents*. Kent, Croom Helm.
- Vincent, C. (1996) *Parents and Teachers: Power and Participation*. London, Falmer.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968) *General System Theory*. New York, Brazillier.
- Wade, B., Moore, M. (1993) *Experiencing Special Education*. Milton Keynes, OUP.
- Walford, G. (ed.) (1991) *Doing Educational Research*. London, Routledge.
- Walker, S., Barton, L. (eds.) (1989): *Politics and the Processes of Schooling*.
Milton Keynes/O.U.P.
- Wedge, P., Essen, T. (1982) *Children in Adversity*. London, Pan Books.
- White, J. (1997) *Philosophical Perspectives on School Effectiveness Research*, in
London University Institute of Education. (1997)
Perspectives on School Effectiveness and School Improvement.
- Wilkins, R. (1999) 'Empowerment is the Key to Quality', *Improving Schools* 2(3), pp.28-31.
- Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. London, Saxon House.
- Wilson, M., Evans, M. (1980) *The Education of Disturbed Pupils*. London, Methuen.
- Wolfendale, S. (ed.) (1989) *Parental Involvement*. London, Cassell.
- Wood, S. (1988) *Parents: whose Partners?* in Barton. (1988).

Woods, P. (1986) *Inside Schools: Ethnography in Educational Research*. London, RKP.

Wragg, E. (1987) *Conducting and Analysing Interviews*.
Nottingham, Nottingham School of Education.

Wylie, T. (1998) 'Improving Schools for All', *Improving Schools* 1(1), pp.18-22.

Youngman, M. (1987) *Designing and Analysing Questionnaires*.
Nottingham, Nottingham School of Education.

APPENDICES.

A – L: STAFF PERSPECTIVES.

- A. Reasons why pupils might disrupt/become disaffected.
- B. Ideal qualities of teacher of 'EBD' pupils.
- C. Behaviours that cause most concern in class. (Staff.)
- D. What would make Line End the 'ideal' school?
- E. What do you want for Line End?
- F. What constitutes quality at Line End?
- G. Effectiveness criteria for Line End.
- H. Strengths and weaknesses of Line End.
- I
 - i. 114 – statement survey.
 - ii. Follow-up survey.
- J
 - i. Questionnaire schedule: PGCE student.
 - ii. Completed questionnaire: PGCE student
- K. Interview extracts:
 - i. Teacher A.
 - ii. Outreach Team.
- L. Questionnaire: Teaching and Learning.

M – T: PUPIL PERSPECTIVES.

- M
 - i. Why I am at Line End.
 - ii. Thoughts about Mainstream.
- N. What would make Line End the 'perfect' school?
- O. What should Line End be doing for me?
- P. Good and bad things about Line End.
- Q. 60 – statement survey.
- R.
 - i. Questionnaire: Teaching and learning.

S. Follow-up survey (teaching and learning.)

T. Interview extracts:

- i. Year 11 pupil re. experiences of reintegration.
- ii. Year 11 pupil.

U. Data from Parents: i. Written response for Annual Review.
ii. Personal perspectives during Annual Review.
iii. Interview extract from Year 9. Parent.

V. Aims of Line End (1996).

W. Extracts from Research Journal (reflecting field-notes from observation in the Field.)

- i. Senior management team meeting.
- ii. Management of the target-setting process.

X. Government Reports on Line End's provision.

- i. LEA 'mini-inspection' Report: 1996.
- ii. Ofsted Report: 1996.

Y. School Performance Data.

APPENDIX A.

Staff perceptions of why pupils might disrupt/become disaffected

- Incident from previous class.
- Don't like work.
- Bored.
- Insecure.
- Frustrated.
- Lack of concentration.
- Feel ill.
- Don't understand.
- Temperature of Room.
- Home circumstances.
- Resentful of teacher.
- Interference from outside.
- Tiredness.
- Medical reasons.
- Ineffective parenting
- Past abuse (emotional, physical, sexual.)
- Fear.
- Attention-seeking.
- Showing off.
- Poor communication skills.
- Feelings of inferiority.
- Low self-esteem.
- Hyperactive.
- Dyslexic.
- Eye-sight problems.
- Hearing impairment.

- Ridicule from others.
- Racism.
- Under stimulated.
- Teacher expectations too high/low.
- Learnt behaviours (from background outside school).
- Peer pressure.
- Incidents outside of school.
- Time of day.
- Diet.
- Reaction to teacher temperament.
- Personality.
- Culture of the school.

APPENDIX B.

Staff perceptions of the strengths/qualities a teacher at Line End might be expected to have?

- Flexibility.
- Creativity.
- Tolerance.
- Objectivity.
- Thick-skinned and long fused.
- Sympathetic.
- Caring.
- Role model.
- compassion.
- Realistic expectations.
- Non-confrontational.
- Sense of humour.
- Clear aims educationally, able to differentiate behaviourally.
- Resilience.
- Keep smiling.
- Understanding.
- Ability to build relationships with pupils who experience difficulty establishing positive relationships.
- Consistency.
- Strong-mindedness - not to be bullied by pupils.
- Patience.
- Ten eyes.
- Empowerment of pupils to take responsibility for own learning/behaviour.

APPENDIX C.

The Behaviours that cause most concern to staff in class.

- Minding other people's business.
- Not putting hands up to answer questions.
- Leaving seat without permission.
- Lack of attention.
- Lack of concentration.
- Low level of ability/cannot access the lesson.
- Communal shouting out.
- Deliberate interruptions.
- Name-calling.
- Winding up between pupils.
- Refusal to work.
- Not listening to instructions.
- Not respecting other pupils' contributions.
- Abusive language towards staff.
- Shouting out.
- Bullying (physical).
- Bullying (verbal).
- Throwing pens, rubbers, etc.
- Interference from other pupils from other classes.
- Arguments with each other.
- Answering back.
- Unsafe practices in practical situations.
- Running around the classroom.
- Abusive language towards peers.
- Stopping others from working.
- Walking out of class to withdrawal as an easier option.
- Lack of respect for staff.

- Fighting.
- Bad language.
- Threatening behaviour.
- Put downs.
- Being off task.
- Not trying with the work.
- Not settling down straight away.
- Aggression.
- Non-co-operation.
- Stupidity.
- Prolonged inability to 'get into' the subject (over a period of several lessons).

APPENDIX D.

What would make Line End the 'ideal' school for staff?

Management/Leadership

- Strong leadership.
- Quality management.
- Clear aims and objectives (institutional) agreed by all.
- Clear overall philosophy.
- Clear management structure.
- Clear/effective communications within school.
- Equality for all (staff and pupils).
- Support for all.
- Involvement of all; consultation/collaboration in decision-making.
- Encouraging initiatives.
- Strategic planning (as opposed to crisis management).
- Regular meetings.

Teaching and Learning

- Effective teaching/learning.
- Priority given to literacy/numeracy.
- Positive learning environment.
- Opportunity for all pupils to achieve their potential.
- Varied, appropriate and adaptable curriculum.
- Lively, interesting subject delivery (through structured/organised programmes of study).
- Realistic, attainable goals/targets.
- Small, achievable steps for success.
- Assessment/recording policies which inform practice.
- Effective monitoring/evaluation of:
 - i. pupil progress/achievement/attainment.

- ii. progression in learning.
 - iii. subject planning and delivery.
 - iv. teaching styles.
- Variety of teaching styles.
 - Pupil involvement in own learning.
 - Pupils showing pride in their achievements.
 - Motivated, enthusiastic learners.
 - High expectations.
 - High achievement levels.
 - Good balance between academic and pastoral.
 - Constructive leisure time activities available.

Staff

- Staff who:- are understanding of pupil's needs.
 - have a desire to be where they are
 - are committed, dedicated and loyal
 - are motivated/enjoy their work
 - take a pride in the school
 - are flexible, patient and tolerant
 - are united, sharing the same standards and expectations
 - have high commitment/high morale
 - are consistent, hard-working and enthusiastic
 - have a sense of humour/fun.
- Positive sense of worth for staff (and pupils)
- Teamwork amongst staff - co-operation, collaboration, co-ordination, integration.
- Effective deployment of support staff.
- Recognition of equality and importance of all staff.
- 'Stakeholder' mentality: ie. no sense of disenfranchisement.
- Support for subject development.

- Opportunities for appropriate in-service training/career development.
- Respect for/value of differences.
- Ability/willingness to learn from mistakes.
- Self-awareness/self-evaluation.
- Effective/meaningful appraisal.
- Good subject knowledge.
- Desire/motivation to strive always to improve - personally and institutionally.

Behaviour Management and Support.

- Simple rules, easy to enforce, consistently applied.
- Quality rewards/sanctions system.
- Caring but firm approach.
- Effective behaviour management system - usable by all, seen as fair by all, applied consistently by all.
- Refusal to compromise on 'principles' - bullying, bad language, rudeness.
- Flexibility to compromise on 'practice' - the spirit of the law rather than the letter.
- Non-confrontational approaches as a preferred 'modus operandi' wherever possible/appropriate.

The School/Ethos

- Environment of trust, support, care, respect, good-will, confidentiality, co-operation.
- Atmosphere which is safe, warm, friendly, comfortable, pleasant, calm, non-aggressive.
- Clear, concise whole-school policies - agreed, understood, and implemented by all.
- Mutual respect, courtesy (staff/pupils).
- Good external relationships with parents, governors, external agencies/support groups, LEA, local community.

- Tidy building/clean environment (inc. absence of graffiti/vandalism).
- Variety of resources, equipment, etc. available to all.
- Visitors made to feel welcome.
- Happy, secure, well-motivated, enthusiastic pupils.
- Out of school activities.

APPENDIX E.

What do staff want for Line End?

... for the pupils?

- Positive environment - warm, safe, caring, secure, stable.
- Appropriate curriculum - varied, interesting, broad, balanced, relevant, differentiated, National Curriculum.
- Unconditional, positive regard for each pupil.
- Development of positive, physical, mental, emotional and spiritual health.
- Positive self-image/self worth/self-confidence.
- Support in all areas.
- Opportunities for pupils to address their emotional/behavioural difficulties.
- Positive inter-personal relationships (peers/adults).
- Raised expectations for themselves (behaviour and work).
- Each pupil to realise his/her potential.
- Ability to recognise need to balance rights with responsibilities.
- Sanctions system underpinned by consistency, compassion, and justice for all.
- Recognition, reward and celebration of achievement.
- Re-integration, where appropriate.
- Opportunities for external accreditation.
- Appropriate and positive feedback.
- Effective assessment and recording of progress.
- Preparation for citizenship/life in the real world.
- Appropriate resources.

...for the staff?

- Support of each other.
- Support of SMT.
- Job satisfaction.

- Comfortable working environment.
- Positive staff relationships.
- Positive feedback (constructive criticism and praise).
- Appropriate training/opportunities for ongoing career development.
- Recognition as being a valuable member of staff, not to be taken for granted.
- Confidentiality.
- A unified/united team.
- Respect from staff/pupils.
- Forum for honest exchange of ideas.
- Clear definition of roles.
- Parity of responsibility.
- Respect/backing for professional judgement.
- Isolation of individual subject teachers addressed.
- All staff to be part of the decision-making process.
- Strong and sensitive leadership.

...for the school as an institution?

- Common values, shared vision and clearly stated agreed goals.
- Positive within-school relationships: pupil/pupil, pupil/staff, staff/staff.
- To be and be seen as a centre of excellence: an achievement culture, both for behaviour and learning.
- Good external relationships with:
parents, the community, mainstream schools, external agencies.
- An ordered, non-aggressive working environment for both staff and pupils.
- Purposeful, visionary leadership.
- A good reputation.
- A successful policy/practice of re-integration.
- An environment where risk-taking is seen as positive.
- School as a centre for change and development.

- Efficient/effective communications networks and practice.
- High attendance rates.

APPENDIX F.

What, for staff, constitutes quality at Line End School?

- Good curriculum - relevant, etc.
- Exam results.
- High standards of politeness, manners, etc.
- Good pastoral care.
- Parent participation - willing.
- "Nice" environment.
- Opportunities for counselling.
- Different teaching and learning styles.
- Consistency - cohesive staff.
- Stability.
- Resources.
- Positive attitudes between staff and pupils - recognition and building up of strengths.
- Caring environment.
- Clear aims and objectives, shared by all.
- Positive ethos.

APPENDIX G.

By what criteria might Line End be judged effective by its staff?

- Attendance.
- Re-integration.
- Ability to deal with pupil problems.
- Exam results.
- Effective counselling.
- Exclusion figures.
- Reduction of crime.
- Levels of abusive behaviour around school.
- Links with outside agencies.
- Value-added.
- League tables.
- Destinations of Year 11 pupils on leaving.
- Quality environment.

APPENDIX H.

Staff Perceptions of Line End's Provision:

Teaching and Learning: Strengths.

- Structured Day
- Coverage of National Curriculum (et al.)
- Timetable = Curriculum driven
- End of module R. of A.
 - i. pupil self-assessment
 - ii. joint-target setting
- Rewards for good work
- Staff experience and expertise
- Modular approach to curriculum delivery
- Emphasis on differentiation
- NNEB support
- Good resources
- Recognition of achievement (assemblies, etc.)
- Staff consensus and willingness
- Staff data base (I.T., reading, etc.)
- Vibrant display work
- Practice in examinations from Year 7
- Opportunities for some external exams

Teaching and Learning: Weaknesses.

- Low expectation
- Low challenge
- Low reading ages of some pupils
 - limited access to curriculum areas
- Variables in behaviour
- Poor parental links (re. academia)
- Stressful/variable home environments

- Limited opportunities for external exams
- No KS3 English levels 4-7
- Few independent learning/study skills
- Inconsistent use of end of module R. of A.
- Appropriateness of KS4 curriculum
- Pupil involvement in addressing their own needs
- Pupil negative attitudes/outlook
- Pressure to obtain results for pupils that are unrealistic
- Pupils arriving late for lessons
- Isolation of pupils (as a punishment) mean they can miss out on curriculum
- Few educational visits

Behaviour Management and Support: Strengths:

- Documentation
- Clear processes
- Pupil profile
- Negotiated target-setting
- Whole-school policies
- House-system
- Rewards/sanctions systems
- Staff experience/expertise
- Dynamic approach
- Understood by all
- Regular briefings
- Small school
- Parents evenings
- Regular contact with parents
- Supportive parents

Weaknesses:

- Use of data
- Opportunities for counselling
- Over-familiarity of systems by pupils
- Little quantitative data
- No central records of sendings home/walkings out
- No official pupil 'voice'
- Lack of staff time for 1:1 interview
- Communication re. internal/external issues
- Involvement of staff eg. form teachers
- Few effective deterrents
- Lack of parental support
- Social services involvement
- Lack of respect for women
- Implementation of behaviour management not always based on whole-school policy, but on the reaction of the moment Lack of consistency in implementation of policy/handling of pupils (sometimes)
- Staff feel disadvantaged/discouraged by being unable/unwilling to discipline pupils as others might (ie. need for behaviour management system seen as fair by pupils, usable by all staff, and applied consistently to all pupils, regardless of age, size, sex)
- Behaviour management of girls more difficult than boys
- Apparent regression of pupils in years 10/11. Pupil disaffection at KS4
- Detention system - some staff made to feel (consciously or otherwise) that they are the problem rather than the pupils
- More time needed for individual pupil counselling
- Need for in-school sanction after isolation but before being sent home
- Some pupils who feel themselves to be above the rules, able to play the system
- Too much of a punishment culture.

- Cycle of behaviour on which pupils seem trapped

OTHER AREAS: STRENGTHS.

Organisation

- Pupil/teacher ratio
- Fully subscribed
- Positive performance indicators
- Pupil attendance
- Dinner: A chance for informal interaction with pupils
- Supportive management
- Few school rules, which should be easily enforceable
- Rewards/sanctions system
- Lunch-time activities
- House system

Ethos/Environment

- School support for all pupils
- Pupil/teacher relationships
- Secure place for pupils
- Achievement recognised/celebrated (no matter how small)
- Pupils' pride in school (illustrated by standard of physical environment)
- Good reputation (LEA/OLEAs)
- Caring environment
- Small environment - pupils known intimately by staff
- Visitors comments when looking around school
- Displays around school

Staff

- Dedicated team of staff
- Flexibility/co-operation of staff

- Desire/willingness by staff to improve
- Skilful, experienced and knowledgeable staff
- Good staff relationships
- Staff supportive of other staff
- Staff laugh a lot together
- Motivated staff
- Long-suffering, patient and tolerant staff

CONCERNS/FRUSTRATIONS:

Organisation:

- Lack of consultation, at times between SMT and staff
- Poor staff-staff communications at times
- Inappropriate deployment/use of nursery nurses by some staff on some occasions
- Lack of consistency of back-up from SMP re. discipline problems
- Lack of consistency in use of rewards/sanctions
- Crisis management, rather than strategic management, dominating the life of the school
- Closer links needed with external agencies
- Closer links needed with industry
- Poor re-integration record
- Poor relationships with parents
- Staff not feeling appreciated, often for the extra work they do
- Lack of commitment at times by staff
- Insularity of the school - 'separateness' from the world outside

Ethos/Environment

- Feelings at times of not being supported
- Levels of aggression within school
- Bullying

- Bad language in and around school
- Ignorance of others' needs/feelings by both staff/pupils
- Criticisms can be taken personally rather than professionally
 - some unable/unwilling to accept constructive criticism
- Rumour-spreading by both staff/pupils (malicious or otherwise)
- Gossiping about others/bickering and bitching
- Lack of respect for senior staff/authority
- Lack of confidentiality
- Litter
- Staff unable/unwilling to speak openly and honestly to appropriate 'others'

APPENDIX II.

Teacher Survey: N = 15.

KEY: A = Sometimes

B = Agree

C = Disagree

D = Unsure

There is regular praise and encouragement for pupils' work in the classroom.
Pupils enjoy the learning process within the classroom.
In the classroom there is more focus on content than on skills and competencies.
For pupils and staff, the classroom is a pleasant environment.
Pupils are able to experience a range of teaching strategies in each subject area.
Pupils feel that learning is for their benefit and satisfaction.
Teachers regularly discuss issues of teaching and learning with each other.
Pupils are treated with sensitivity and respect
An unacceptable number of pupils end up in the withdrawal room.
The appraisal process can be an effective means of enhancing teaching/learning across the school
Pupils are well-motivated in lessons.
Underachievement is a problem for many pupils.
Pupils find lessons interesting and engaging.
Pupils are clear about the aims and objectives of lessons.
Standards of learning and achievement are monitored and evaluated in all subject areas.
Staff share good practice and effective teaching strategies with each other.
There is regular feedback to parents re. pupil progress.
Pupils feel that school and parents are working in partnership.
Inappropriate behaviour in class is a major impediment to effective teaching and learning.
Pupils often don't see the relevance of what they're doing in class.
Staff have high expectations of pupil achievement.
Pupils have high expectations of their own achievement.
Poor communication between pupil/teacher often impedes pupil's motivation to learn.
Pupils feel ownership of their own learning.
The quality of teaching is monitored and evaluated in all subject areas.
The most important focus of the school should be on teaching and learning.
Teachers here believe that all pupils can learn and be successful.
Pupils are well-motivated to achieve academically.
Pupils are well-motivated to improve their behaviour.
Pupils are given challenging activities in lessons.
Pupils are able to work independently.
Teachers consistently look for ways to improve their teaching.
Pupils are encouraged to think for themselves.

A	B	C	D
	15		
5	8	1	1
	5	3	7
2	7	2	4
	11		4
1	1	10	3
5	6	2	2
5	9		1
2	10	2	1
1	5	2	7
8	1	3	3
	14		1
10	1	1	3
4	5	3	3
1	7	1	6
3	6	2	4
1	6	5	3
2	3	6	4
2	13		
2	8	4	1
2	9	3	1
2	1	9	3
2	5	5	3
3	1	6	5
2	4	5	4
	8	6	1
	13	1	1
5	3	5	2
4	3	5	3
5	9	1	
7		5	3
1	10	1	3
2	10	3	

34. The school has clear consistent rules.
35. School rules/expectations are enforced consistently by staff.
36. A major inhibiting factor in the improvement of pupil behaviour is that interaction with teachers focuses predominantly on negative aspects of behaviour.
37. There is a whole-school policy on literacy.
38. There is a whole-school policy on numeracy.
39. Pupils feel that they are liked by staff.
40. Addressing the emotional/behavioural needs of pupils should take precedence over curriculum needs.
41. The pupils have a desire to learn.
42. There is generally an orderly atmosphere in classrooms.
43. Pupils are involved in setting targets/evaluating their own progress. (Academic)
44. Pupils are involved in setting targets/evaluating their own progress. (Behavioural)
45. There is a whole-school policy on marking that is consistently implemented.
46. Pupils can see the value of what they do in lessons.
47. Teachers, as well as pupils, learn in our school.
48. Teachers have high expectations of pupil behaviour.
49. Most pupils achieve their academic potential.
50. Pupils feel a sense of achievement in their learning.
51. Achievement expectations are communicated to each pupil.
52. Pupils believe that they can learn and be successful.
53. Pupils are involved in setting targets for themselves.
54. There are a range of rewards for good work in lessons.
55. There is greater emphasis on success in school than on failure.
56. Measurable goals are set for pupils in class. (Academic)
57. Measurable goals are set for pupils in class. (Behavioural)
58. Pupils are encouraged to think for themselves.
59. Pupils are given opportunities to take on responsibilities.
60. Pupils see themselves as responsible and valuable.
61. Teachers work to enhance pupil self-esteem.
62. A positive feeling is evident in the school.
63. Pupils display positive attitudes to schooling.
64. The culture of the school encourages learning.
65. Pupils are enthusiastic about learning.
66. Teachers like working in the school.
67. Teachers enjoy the company of pupils and are genuinely interested in them.
68. Staff are effective at diffusing potentially difficult situations.
69. The atmosphere in classrooms is generally positive, relaxed and purposeful.
70. Discipline is consistent, fair and appropriate.
71. All dealings with pupils are positive and supportive.
72. The need of every child for a positive self-image is recognised and reaffirmed by staff.
73. Opportunities are created for counselling and guidance as required.

A	B	C	D
2	9	2	2
3	4	5	3
1	6	7	1
	5	4	6
	4	4	7
3	10		2
1	10	1	3
3	6	3	3
2	7	3	3
6	6	2	1
5	7	1	2
	3	5	7
7	3	2	3
12			3
1	8	4	2
1	2	10	2
6	6	2	1
4	8		3
5	3		7
1	8	4	2
2	11	2	
	13		2
1	10	1	3
1	6	3	5
	9	5	1
4	9	1	1
5		7	3
4	11		
2	9	1	3
3	5	4	3
2	6	1	6
7	1	5	2
1	8		6
1	12		2
5	10		
4	9		2
2	7	4	2
1	4	8	2
1	9	3	2
2	4	8	1

74. The school provides a safe and secure environment for pupils.
75. Verbal and physical aggression is commonplace in school.
76. Bullying is a problem in school.
77. Inter-personal relationships between peers are good within school.
78. Pupils need appropriate adult role-models within the school environment.
79. Pupils in school look to staff (consciously or otherwise) for effective role-models.
80. Staff in the school provide appropriate role-models.
81. There is a whole-school policy for sanctions throughout the school.
82. The policy on sanctions is applied consistently throughout the school.
83. Physical enforcement is sometimes an essential part of behaviour management.
84. Physical response as a behaviour management is a practised part of school life.
85. There is a culture of aggression that permeates the life of the school.
86. Given the nature of EBD pupils, this is an expected cultural norm.
87. A culture of aggression in an EBD setting can be turned around.
88. Evaluating one's own practice is a vital aspect of individual and institutional development.
89. Inconsistent behaviour management practices may disempower some staff.
90. Reluctant to air concerns and engage in open discussion impedes school development.
91. It is important for staff to feel safe and secure if they are to share genuine concerns.
92. The teaching and learning process is often interrupted by unruly behaviour in the classroom.
93. Most staff spend inordinate amounts of time sorting out crises of indiscipline, regardless of whether these are major or minor offences.
94. There is a whole-school policy on the physical restraint of pupils.
95. The use of restraint is practised fairly and consistently throughout the school.
96. Behaviour management strategies are characterised by high levels of control and punishment.
97. Pupils are realistically involved in the decision-making process in school.
98. Most contact with parents is at times of crisis.
99. Parents have a positive attitude towards the school.
100. Parents are given regular feedback on pupil performance.
101. Parents are felt to be a hindrance rather than a help to pupil progress.
102. Parents are involved positively in the life of the school.
103. The relationship between school and parents needs to be evaluated and addressed.
104. There is a consistent communication of a sense of belief in the children.
105. The school is effective in encouraging mutual respect, responsibility and self-discipline.
106. There are whole school approaches to talking about feelings as part of pupils' experiences.
107. There are whole school guidelines on teacher responses to difficult behaviour.
108. There is a whole school policy which addresses the issue of children's concerns/opinions.
109. Curriculum planning takes account of emotional factors in learning.
110. Pupils experience themselves as valued members of groups.
111. Academic progress can be evaluated in measurable terms in each subject area.
112. There are whole-school approaches to training pupils in social skills.
113. The school has guidelines for supporting bullies and victims.
114. Data collection and analysis are used to identify strengths and weaknesses within the school and are used to help determine future action.

A	B	C
2	8	2
3	12	
3	11	1
3	1	10
	15	
2	12	1
4	10	
	12	2
2	3	7
	12	1
2	5	6
	12	3
	10	4
1	13	
	14	
	14	
	14	
	15	
3	12	
1	7	3
		6
	5	7
1	7	4
1	2	8
	14	1
3	5	3
1	6	4
2	1	9
1	5	5
	13	
2	6	3
2	5	4
	2	9
	2	6
		9
1	4	6
3	4	6
	9	1
1	3	8
	4	5
	3	6

APPENDIX Iii.

Feedback from staff responses to survey

Staff response to survey: 12 out of 15 returned

A. Teaching and Learning

Within a classroom environment that is felt to be generally positive and purposeful, pupils experienced a range of teaching styles, and receive positive feedback for work. It is felt that pupils find lessons interesting, and generally enjoy the learning process. Teachers believe that pupils can do well, and maintain high expectations of pupil performance. Pupils are given challenging work and are involved in setting measurable targets for academic improvement, and in the evaluation of their own progress it is felt that both pupils and staff learn at Line End.

Staff feel that pupils do not necessarily see that learning is for their benefit and do not have high expectations of achievement. Inappropriate behaviour in class is felt to be a major impediment to effective teaching and learning; under-achievement is a problem for many pupils.

There is a significant divergence of perspectives on:

- i. whether pupils are clear about the aims and objectives of lessons, and the extent to which they are motivated
- ii. whether pupils see the relevance of what they do, and whether they feel ownership of their learning
- iii. the extent to which pupils are encouraged to think for themselves, and the extent to which they are able to work independently
- iv. the role/involvement of pupils in the target-setting process
- v. the emphasis that should be put on teaching and learning (as opposed to behaviour management)
- vi. the monitoring/evaluation of the quality of teaching across the

curriculum.

There appears to be some uncertainty/a lack of clarity re:

- i. the potential relationship between the Appraisal process and the enhancement of teaching and learning
- ii. the monitoring/evaluation of standards of learning/achievement
- iii. whole-school policies on literacy, numeracy, marking.

“Academic issues seem to be largely safe ground.”

“There is a need for curriculum planning taking into account specific individual needs.”

“Lessons should be interesting/stimulating - a major cause of disruption if lacking...this is the teachers’ recognised onus of responsibility.”

“We need to consider enrichment strategies for the curriculum.”

“There needs to be more encouragement and more flexibility in lessons.”

B. Emotional/Behavioural Issues

The school has clear, consistent rules. Staff are generally felt to be effective at diffusing difficult situations, part of which may necessarily involve physical enforcement. Pupils are involved in target-setting for behavioural progress, and evaluating their own performance. It is generally felt that addressing the ‘EBD’ needs of pupils should take precedence over curriculum needs.

It is felt that the number of pupils ending up in the withdrawal room is unacceptably high, and that unruly behaviour often impedes the teaching and learning process. It is also strongly felt that inconsistent behaviour management practices may disempower some staff.

There is a significant divergence of perspectives on:

- i. the extent to which discipline, and the enforcement of behavioural expectations, are consistent, fair and/or appropriate
- ii. the expectations of pupil behaviour, the setting of measurable targets, and the extent to which pupils are motivated to improve their own

behaviour

- iii. the amount of SMT time spent on 'trouble-shooting' or 'fire-fighting' incidences of perceived indiscipline
- iv. whole-school policy and practice re:
 - a. discussing feelings as part of day to day school experience
 - b. teacher responses to difficult behaviour
 - c. addressing children's concerns/opinions
 - d. training pupils in social skills
 - e. supporting bullies and victims
- v. the extent to which pupil behaviour is affective by teacher/pupil interaction that is negatively based
- vi. the opportunities for pupil 'counselling' and guidance
- vii. school policy on the physical restraint of pupils, and the extent to which it is practised consistently, fairly and appropriately
- viii. the extent to which the practice/exercising of control and punishment underpin and inform behaviour management strategies
- ix. the recognition/reaffirmation of the need for a positive self-image for each child, and the extent to which dealings with pupils are positive and supportive.

"There is doubt over whether whole-school discipline is consistently applied - also, whole school behaviour management policies."

"It brings home how difficult it is to know what a 'good' EBD school should be."

"There needs to be support for pupils' emotional and behavioural difficulties."

"The consistent application of sanctions is an issue that needs to be addressed." (This was echoed in all of the returned questionnaires)

"There is a need for more clarity and consistency of school policies."

"We are not as effective as we might be in dealing with pupils' emotional and behavioural problems."

C. Culture/Ethos

In need of appropriate role models, pupils look to staff, who generally provide such modelling; it is generally felt that a positive feeling is evident in school, with a perceived emphasis on success rather than failure. Teachers work to enhance pupil self-esteem, and pupils feel generally that they are liked by staff, who it is felt, treat them with sensitivity and respect. It is recognised that self-reflection and evaluation are vital to individual/institutional development, and that for staff to share concerns, there must be a feeling of safety and security.

It is generally felt that verbal and physical aggression are commonplace in school, and that bullying is a problem. It is felt that, although there is a culture of aggression which permeates the life of the school, it can be turned around. It is also felt that a reluctance to air concerns and engage in open discussion impedes school development.

Staff views differ on:

- i. whether the school provides a safe and secure environment for pupils
- ii. the quality of interpersonal relationships between peers
- iii. whether the culture of the school encourages learning, and whether pupils display positive attitudes to their schooling
- iv. whether pupils see themselves as responsible and valuable, whether they are realistically involved in the decision-making process in school, and whether a sense of belief in the pupils is communicated to them by staff
- v. whether the school is effective in encouraging mutual respect, responsibility and self-discipline, and the extent to which pupils experience themselves as valued members of groups
- vi. the effectiveness of the relationship between the identification of institutional strengths/weaknesses, and subsequent future action.

“There is a culture of aggression within the school.”

“The importance of encouraging mutual respect and responsibility and

discipline is paramount to pupils feeling valued members of school..”
“Pupils don’t generally believe they can be successful or responsible or valuable - they are not enthusiastic about learning..”

D. Parents

There was a general feeling that contact with parents is most often at times of crisis, and that the relationship between school and parents needs to be evaluated and addressed. It is not felt that parents are realistically involved in the decision-making process in school.

Opinion was divided on:

- i. the regularity of feedback to parents re. pupil performance, and the extent to which pupils perceive that school and parents are working together
- ii. parents’ attitudes towards the school, and the school’s attitude to parents - help or hindrance
- iii. the extent to which parents are involved positively in the life of the school.

“Parents need to be more involved and supportive rather than just crisis-contact.”

General observations

There are fairly noticeable differences in staff perspectives re. “...the aims and focus of the school - ie. Line End’s raison d’etre ... the big issue is surely that staff are split right down the middle on whether the main focus of this school is teaching and learning academically.”

“We need to take risks to effect change.”

“Whatever happened to reintegration?”

“There needs to be better communication between staff in all areas of strategies and whole-school development.”

“A very interesting observation of staffs’ feelings; maybe this is why the staff don’t work together as team players.”

“...that it (the survey) will actually be used, and there will be follow-up sessions on it...”

Also mentioned:

- i. need for more effective communications
- ii. problem of bullying and aggression
- iii. need to address issue of pupil counselling
- iv. relationships with parents.

APPENDIX Ji.

Interview Questions for mature PGCE student.

1. Short personal professional biography. i.e. Why you are at Line End for two weeks/PGCE etc. etc.
2. What was your understanding of the type of school you were coming to?
3. What were your first impressions when you started?
4. What is your overall impression now that you've spent two weeks here?
5. What do you feel relationships between pupils are like?
6. What difficult behaviour management strategies have you observed in action?
7. Which do you feel are the most effective? Why?
8. Which do you feel are the least effective? Why?
9. Do you feel that the curriculum experienced by the pupils is appropriate for them? Why/why not?
10. How do you feel pupils respond to the curriculum that they receive?
11. Do you feel pupils are motivated by them?
12. What are your views on the quality of teaching?
13. Do you feel that pupils find lessons interesting?
14. Are pupils challenged academically?
15. Do teachers set challenging targets for pupils?
16. Do you feel staff have high expectations of pupils?
17. Do you feel that pupils have a realistic say in their own education?
18. How do you see relationships between staff and pupils?
19. What aspects of the school do you feel reflect good practice?
20. What aspects of school life would you focus on as appropriate areas for development?
21. If someone asked you to sum up Line End, what would you say?

APPENDIX Jii.

Excerpt from questionnaire completed by mature student on placement at Line End.

1.

I am a PGCE student – main subject maths, second subject IT. I complete the one-year course in June of this year. I have an interest in SEN with a particular emphasis on behavioural problems. Accordingly I asked to be allowed to spend two weeks at Line End in order to study types of behaviour and strategies for effective management.

2.

Whilst other LEAs seem to be effectively dismantling their off-site EBD provision, Farside appears to be concentrating resources on developing theirs. I was aware of the Line End Service comprising Line End secondary school, Line End primary school, Farside Yr 11 Pupil referral unit, and Farside Outreach Support Service. I understood that Line End was a special day school providing secondary education for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties. I expected that some would also have additional learning difficulties.

3.

My first impressions when I started were extremely favourable. The quality of the pupil art work in the entrance hall is impressive, the staff were welcoming and helpful and the atmosphere is generally calm and conducive to learning. In the main the pupils were open and friendly which I found initially surprising. I had expected them to be more insular and remote. Most were happy to chat to me about virtually any topic I chose. I expected to witness anti-social and challenging pupil behaviour – I was not disappointed.

4.

I consider Line End to be a well co-ordinated and caring school with a positive ethos which provides a balanced curriculum together with the opportunities for pupils to learn to manage their emotional and behavioural difficulties. I have found that the

short time I have spent at the school I have grown genuinely fond of several of the pupils. This I attribute to their individual idiosyncratic characters. Whilst I have observed many instances of bizarre behaviour I have found that this takes place within acceptable parameters.

5.

The pupils – in particular the younger ones – seem to be solitary. They do not seem to form the friendship groups seen in other schools. However, this may be less a reflection on their social skills and more a consequence of the size of the school. The Yr 7s are a particularly immature and difficult group. A great deal of posturing and peer antagonism has been observed in this class. In general, though, most pupils seem willing to take responsibility for their own behaviour and understand the expectations made of them. I think that the House and House Captain system with its emphasis on mutual support and encouragement fosters good pupil interpersonal relationships. I have however, seen only one solitary girl at the school. I would guess that as a result of being a lone female her needs are possibly not being fully met.

10.

Their involvement in decision making in lessons gives them a degree of ownership of their own learning. I find this encouraging. I am particularly impressed by the fact that the GCSE maths course is completed in Year 10 rather than the usual Year 11.

11.

Pupils seem well motivated to learn. They are focused and able to concentrate for reasonable periods of time – particularly in work that interests them, such as CDT and PE. They join in discussions, co-operate in practical exercises and remain on task. A number seem able to also work collaboratively, although others clearly prefer to work alone. I understand that attendance figures are in line with, if not better than, mainstream schools. I would take this as a clear indication of motivation.

12.

The quality of teaching observed is excellent. All lessons are appropriately differentiated and the content is relevant. The teachers are skilled in gaining the attention and co-operation of the pupils before commencing the lesson. Poor

behaviour is managed efficiently and is not permitted to disrupt lessons. Goals are clearly defined. Homework is not generally set though, except on pupil request. Whilst their styles may differ considerably there is a consistent interpretation of the system of rules and management amongst all the teachers observed.

13.

Although several were observed to comment otherwise, most pupils seemed interested in their lessons. Even those who expressed a dislike tended fairly quickly to become absorbed in the work. I think that the topics covered were accurately targeted at the attainment levels and abilities of the pupils and that this doubtlessly assists in promoting pupil interest and participation. Enthusiasm for lessons seems to be proportional to the self-confidence of the individual pupil. As they gain in confidence the attitude towards lessons becomes more positive.

14.

I think that most pupils are academically challenged. Whilst some pupils are clearly of above average ability their behavioural difficulties determine the pace at which they can progress and this is probably detrimental to their overall ultimate academic achievement. Many pupils appear to have very low self-esteem and therefore derive greater satisfaction from achieving short term learning goals and objectives. Cumulatively these combine to help pupils achieve their full potential.

15.

Teachers seem to negotiate realistic pupil targets. These appear to be designed to promote individual success both behaviourally and academically.

16.

The expectations teachers have of pupil performance are generally high but realistic.

17.

Most pupils have an input into their own education. Academic and behavioural targets are fully negotiated and not imposed.

APPENDIX Ki.

Extracts from interview with Teacher A.

Q. How long have you been teaching at Line End?

A. A number of years.

Q. What was it like when you started?

A. It was all aged, five to sixteen. The head was very caring, a father figure, and it was more of a caring atmosphere. The older ones tended to look after the younger ones. But we also had a lot of the school phobics – the pupils were less aggressive.

Q. Would you say that the pupils coming in now were more aggressive?

A. Definitely, yes.

Q. What were the relationships like between pupils and staff?

A. Less formal, more like you'd expect in a junior school. I mean, they were junior school teachers, and they'd be loving them – arms around them, that kind of thing, which I found strange when I came, being a secondary school teacher.

Q. What do you think relationships between pupils are like now?

A. [Long pause] I don't think they care about each other too much.

Q. How does that manifest itself?

A. [Pause] They just want to bully each other, you know, as they go further up the School. They become bullies – they see that as their role, I think, bullying the younger ones.

Q. Do you think that this is exacerbated, in any way, by the school's policy and Practice of behaviour management?

A. [Pause] Yes.

Q. What?

A. [Long pause] I think we have an aggressive system of dealing with it... and I think one of the problems is that the pupils learn their behaviour from that.

Q. What needs to be done, do you think?

A. [Long pause] I think we need to change our behaviour.

Q. How?

- A. [Long pause] Well, it's very difficult, isn't it, to change behaviour after so many years, but I've said, I think we've got to try to be more caring and less aggressive, non-confrontational.
- Q. Do you think that the school is calmer now than it was before the reorganisation of the service?
- A. Yes, I think so... yes, it must be, because the academic results are improving as well.
- Q. So if the school is running smoothly, and pupils are contained, is that not enough?
- A. I don't think so, not now.
- Q. So what's missing?
- A. [Long pause] I don't think we're helping the pupils to manage their own behaviour.
- Q. Do you think it's possible?
- A. I'm sure it would be possible, but I think these sorts of kids need a lot of guidance... I also think they need listening to. We did have a school council – I think that did work. I think they felt they were listened to more.
- Q. So overall, do you feel things are changing for the better?
- A. Yes, things have changed for the better, but I think we've come to a bit of a Standstill
- Q. So what do you think the next step's got to be?
- A. I don't know. I don't know where we start, whether we start with the pupils – the bullies – or whether we start with ourselves. I think we're making an effort, you know with the pupils – sending the bullies home. We're not tolerating it amongst the kids.
- Q. And the staff?
- A. [Long pause] Through staff discussing it openly.
- Q. Is there a danger of people feeling threatened?
- A. [Pause] I think staff will feel threatened if they do it, and I feel staff who don't do it, who speak out, will feel threatened.
- Q. When you were a governor before the reorganisation, did they have involvement With issues of discipline and behaviour management?

A. Well, more pupils were brought before the governors and suspended or excluded.

Q. Do you see any differences between the role of the governors now, and their role then?

A. [Long, long pause]

Q. This is confidential, remember.

A. [Nodding to tape-recorder] But where are you going to leave that?

Q. I'm taking it home with me.

A. [Long pause] If you switch it off, I'll tell you.

At this point, I switched the recorder off and continued the interview, neither recording it nor taking notes. I wrote up the rest of the interview, as far as I could remember it, immediately after the interview had finished. Teacher A. went on to outline how she felt that the current head was able to manipulate the governing body, and get them to rubber-stamp the things he wanted passed through. She also felt that the only picture that they had of the school was the one presented to them by the head in governors meetings, and in the termly Headteacher's Report, and consequently their perceptions of the school did not embrace the reality of its day to day culture.

APPENDIX Kii.

Extract from interview with two members of EBD outreach team.

['H' works with junior schools, 'M' with secondary schools.]

Q. How do you see your role as an outreach team member within the EBD service?

H. Well, I see my role as sort of an intermediary, if you like, to prevent a child being put out of a mainstream school for behaviour problems and possibly into a special school where it will then be very, very difficult to get them back into the mainstream education system. I think I'm seen more of a cure, and I'm not necessarily a cure, but that is how we tend to be used; to make, to stick a sticking plaster on this problem to try to make sure it doesn't need a bandage.

M. Yes, in an ideal situation we should be topping up, you know - should be topping up the support that that child is getting to modify his or her behaviour; but I agree with H, I feel very much that it's a sticking plaster job because of the fact we're only offering 2 sessions a week, and a lot of my pupils are towards the middle years of high school anyway, and at that point you have so many other influences, not just the demands of the timetable and curriculum that may be causing their own problems, but the home problems and everything.

Q. If you provide 'top-up' support in schools, what support do pupils get already if they are experiencing difficulties?

M. From my experience it depends on the school they're at, really. I mean, at the best they get in trouble for being naughty at the end of the day, and they get the sanctions that come with that. And then, you know, it's a sort of escalating and then they get put out or suspended or whatever.

Q. Do responses differ from school to school?

M. Erm, I think a lot of schools try in their own way, but again, a bit like us, it's a sort of sticking plaster job. If there's a good deputy head or pastoral head or good head of year you'll get a hands-on approach.

Q. How, then, do you see mainstream teachers perceive your role?

M. I don't think schools again, because of the behaviour not being something that's been addressed in the way that other aspects of school like have been addressed, they don't understand the role of the EBD service; they don't realise, a lot of classroom teachers certainly, that children can be statemented for behaviour - it seems to them a strange concept... well, they're just naughty kids... statemented, what d'you mean? How can it be a special need, sort of thing...

H. I think it's two ways, really. They either see you as a complete and utter waste of time - this person who comes in for 2 hours a week, and what d'you think you're going to do in 2 hours a week, especially if they've got a child they've been experiencing a lot of difficulties with. The other way that causes me some concern

is that people feel the minute you're involved that child is no longer their problem. Suddenly, you're there, and that child is your problem and your responsibility and you will deal with it, and that's your job.

- Q.** To what extent do you feel that mainstream schools see the problem of challenging behaviour as being mainly 'within child?' and their fault?
- H.** I think it takes a lot for schools to hold their hands up and say "I think there's something wrong with our practices and with what we're doing." If the majority of the children are coping, and working within the parameters that are set, then they tend to turn round and say "Yes, well, it's working for all these other children - all these other children are behaving, so there must be something wrong with this child." What we try and say to them is that it might be working for these other children, but they haven't got the special needs that this child has. If they've got learning difficulties as well, the behaviour is often as a result of frustration or whatever, at not being able to cope with the curriculum, so it can't be purely within the child, but it isn't easy for schools to admit that there's something wrong with what they're doing.
- Q.** When you go into schools, do you ever feel there is another agenda that is not spoken about, not elaborated by the school, other than just supporting the child?
- H.** I think sometimes the agenda might be that they see us as a means of getting rid of the child. I think they see the natural progression from us as statemented provision - if that doesn't work then the next step is that they'll get rid of this child, and this is what we so much have to battle against and say to them, you know, the question is constantly "How long do we have to put up with you coming in for 2 hours so we can get rid of him?" And we have to say that isn't our role. Our role is to be here to ensure that you don't need to get rid of him.
- Q.** So to what extent might structures and practices within a school have an influence upon difficulties being experienced by pupils?
- M.** I suppose it gets down again to the way behaviour policy - if it exists - is implemented, and if the school has a good working practice - assertive discipline, good rewards and sanctions systems - all the basic sort of things you would hope to be in place; but also, I suppose the way that the pastoral system works with the special needs system. Again I keep coming back to it, rather than just catching them out, being in trouble - whether there's any sort of input put in to find out the reasons for this, or to modify it, or to try approaches and call staff together as a team to work with this individual child... I think if that happened more our job would be a bit easier. I'm not saying it would solve the behaviour problems of every child, but it would certainly improve things.
- Q.** Do you feel, then, that teachers and schools are open to examining their own practices and approaches to these difficulties?
- H.** Some, yes. Some welcome us with open arms. But if I'm being absolutely honest, at the end of the day, with league tables and all this, that and the other, behaviour isn't a priority - it's the GCSEs, SATs results that are the main thing - it's the results that they're going to have published that are so important to them, and you

can't criticise schools for that - but it pushes behaviour further and further down the list of priorities.

- Q.** Do you deal with many pupils who've been reintegrated from special provision?
- H.** It's a very, very small number - but this is one of the areas that the authority have highlighted as a big problem; that once they get into special, there is no flowback, and it's certainly one of the areas they've asked us to be involved in, using our support to support these children, to try and facilitate that movement, because before children have gone back from Line End Junior, or here (Line End) with very, very little support. They need support from us... it's important to go through a monitoring period of a few months to make sure that things don't blow up
- Q.** So, what would you change if you could?
- M.** More consistently in school management issues as regards the importance of behaviour as a whole school issue and staff issue. Training. A bit more liaison between the EBD service and mainstream in terms of what each of us should be offering and where we meet or where we differ.

PERCEPTIONS OF PUPIL LEARNING.

APPENDIX L.

Staff perspective

pupil and group attitudes, motivation and commitment.

lost pupils are confident.

lost pupils have positive attitudes to their subjects.

lost pupils have positive attitudes to learning.

lost pupils work well together.

lost pupils are supportive of each other's learning.

lost pupils have a strong commitment to achieving high grades.

achievement and success are celebrated.

pupil self-esteem is enhanced by the course.

lost pupils receive regular positive feedback about their progress.

understanding of what is required.

lost pupils understand intended the learning outcomes of their lessons.

lost pupils understand the assessment criteria and standards required.

lost pupils understand the relevance of any activity to the course.

lost pupils understand the structure of the course and any relevant accreditation.

lost pupils are able to make links between the modules of the course.

lost pupils know their own abilities in relation to the course.

lost pupils know their own learning targets and goals.

lost pupils are committed to those goals and targets.

pupil learning behaviour

lost pupils prepare and plan for their learning activities.

lost pupils organise their own learning.

pupils review their prior learning before commencing a topic.

lost pupils collect information about future topics.

lost pupils take part in discussions/question & answer sessions.

lost pupils take notes from teacher expositions.

lost pupils review their own progress.

opportunities for pupil responsibility.

open-ended questions are asked by the teacher.

open-ended tasks are provided by the teacher.

tasks are challenging but achievable.

tasks provide the space for pupils to come to their own solutions.

lost pupils are able to learn from mistakes.

lost pupils are regularly able to review their work with the teacher.

lost pupils are able to identify their own learning goals.

Often		Sometime		Rarely
2	11%	11	61%	5
5	28%	7	39%	6
5	28%	8	44%	5
2	11%	10	56%	6
1	6%	6	33%	11
		13	72%	5
12	67%	6	33%	
11	61%	6	33%	1
13	72%	5	28%	

5	28%	11	61%	2
4	22%	12	67%	2
8	44%	8	44%	2
4	22%	11	61%	3
3	17%	11	61%	4
14	78%	3	17%	1
7	39%	10	56%	1
4	22%	13	72%	1

3	17%	6	33%	9
		8	44%	10
3	17%	6	33%	9
		7	39%	11
10	56%	7	39%	1
1	6%			17
3	17%	8	44%	7

9	50%	9	50%	
9	50%	8	44%	1
13	72%	5	28%	
9	50%	7	39%	2
6	33%	12	67%	
8	44%	8	44%	2
1	6%	14	78%	3

APPENDIX Mi.

Pupils' perceptions of why they are at Line End:

Year 7

- I wasn't behaving at Line End Junior (L.E.J.) - fighting and swearing.
- I was naughty in mainstream.
- I'm in a stupid special school.
- I'm fostered.
- So I didn't get excluded from my other school.
- The headmistress was horrible - she gave you lines for making mistakes by accident.
- I've been told that I'd never be able to go to a normal secondary school because of my behaviour.
- If Mrs X (t. in c. of L.E.J.) finds out I'm in a mainstream school, she'll send you back to Line End, 'cos she knows what I'm like.

Year 8

- Being naughty at my old school.
- I was supposed to go to 'Normal High School' - I got a letter saying they was looking forward to me going there. Then on the day I was supposed to start there, a letter came saying I was starting at Line End.
- A bit to do with my reading - not as good as it should be - and my behaviour.
- I've got two reasons: I missed my SATs, and I kept running out. I hated the teachers - they wouldn't help me with my work.
- Mum decided Line End to get more help.
- I'm dyslexic and a bit naughty: got expelled on last day.
- If someone helped me with the stuff, I'd be fine. If I can't do me work, they tell me to do it on my own, and I get annoyed.
- I was out of school for a year before L.E.J. - I only got two hours a week.

Year 9.

- My brother came here, so we chose Line End.
- I didn't get a choice; I was at L.E.J. and they said I had to come to Line End.
- The school ("Normal High School") was too big.
- We're naughty - I'm not naughty any more.
- We need to catch up on some more work.

Year 10.

- Can't behave (that's what I think and what the teachers think).
- We've been suspended; because we mess around.
- I had learning difficulties - other people could do the work and I couldn't, so I disturbed the rest of the class.
- I've been naughty in other schools - if I can't do my work I rip it up.
- We can't control ourselves, disturbing other classes who want to get on with their work.
- We prefer to be here - you get more attention.
- When you go to another school, they don't give you a chance - one thing wrong and you're out.
- I wasn't given a chance - one fight and I was out.

Educational Experiences of 4 Year 10 pupils:

- Pupil 1: "Normal High School" (1) (permanently excluded) -
"Normal High School" (2) (permanently excluded after 6 weeks) - Appeal to stay overturned...out of school for 2 years.
- Pupil 2: Line End Junior - "Normal High School" (lasted 3 days...
had been due to go straight to Line End, but mum pushed education department to give him a try at "Normal High School).
- Pupil 3: "Normal High School" (1) (permanently excluded) - "Normal High School" (2) (lasted 5 weeks) - out of school for 2 years.
- Pupil 4: "Normal High School" (1) (lasted 1 term into Year 7) -
"Normal High School (2) (lasted 5 weeks) - out for 7 months.

- We do things for attention, but there aren't enough teachers to help you.
- Work was hard and we needed help.
- They don't want their school given a bad reputation from pupils who are expelled from other schools. They find a reason to kick them out.
- We're the rejects - we're not given a chance.
- Teachers couldn't come to you straight away - there were too many people in the class.
- They put labels on you - 'Bad people', 'arseholes', 'bad names', 'troublemaker', 'vandals', 'thugs'. "It takes two minutes to get a bad name, a lifetime to live it down."
- People don't give you a second chance.

Year 11

- Things have gone wrong emotionally.
- It's because we're thick.
- Because I couldn't stay in my seat at primary.
- Some of us because we're not all that smart, some 'cos they're naughty at school.
- "Normal High School" put up with me for two and a half years. I had loads of chances. I'm surprised I didn't get expelled earlier.
- I would like to have tried it, but I wasn't given a chance; it was a choice between Line End or a home tutor.
- I was offered a choice to go to mainstream after 2 days at Line End, but chose to stay. (Also spurned opportunity for reintegration).
- I should have gone to mainstream, but wasn't given a chance.
- (After being reintegrated in a local High School after time at Line End: 'I was just dumped into school - I didn't have a clue. They kicked me out after one term.)
- They labelled me straight away: 'You can come here but we've read your reports. We don't want any of your messing about here.'

- We're stereotyped. As soon as they read the reports, that's it. You're the bully, you're the bad one - you've got no choice about it. You haven't got a chance.
- They should give you a chance to prove yourself.
- My mate's been suspended 15 times, but he still hasn't been expelled. They keep saying, one more time and that's it, but he's still there.

APPENDIX Mii.

Pupils' reflections on mainstream.

Year 7

- I don't want to go back - it's boring.
- I want a fresh start - no winding up.
- My friends are there.
- I'd want someone from Line End to come and see how we're doing.
- I hated it. They ripped work up, got me suspended, smacked me, work I didn't like; dead snotty attitude; threatened us if we didn't finish the work.
- To get back I suppose I'd have to be good.

Year 8

- They should have a massive school and a small school like Line End at the side, and when you're ready to get back into the big school you could.
- If I went to mainstream I'd get sent back here - 'cos I'll probably be naughty again.
- They should have a behaviour unit with teachers to help you.
- They have better facilities, more friends, bigger classes.
- There are too many lads in mainstream. I don't like to mix. If I got sent back to mainstream, I'd do my best to get sent back here. I wouldn't do any work, talk to people.

Year 9

- It's better than here. All my friends are there. More people. Proper work. My sister goes there.
- I'd have to change my attitude - be nice to people. Make my work neat and tidy.
- Loads of my friends go to the school I want to go to.

- They do harder work in mainstream. I'd behave better in a normal school.
- I wouldn't want to go there 'cos they have to wear uniform and the teachers are dead strict - you have to do essays and it's much bigger; more people in class.
- You get a better education 'cos its a mainstream school.

Year 10

- We do things for attention, but there aren't enough teachers to help you.
- The work was hard and we needed help.
- They're always shouting and going on at you all the time - they pull you for everything.

Year 11

- If everyone was in mainstream, loads wouldn't turn up. If you go back half-way through, you wouldn't have any mates.
- Teachers ignore you in mainstream - tell you to get to classes.
- Mainstream is too big.
- My mate is autistic and he gets help in mainstream, but we get chucked into a Special School.
- I'd have a special unit in a school, so you could go to calm down and maybe stay for a couple of months if you need to.
- You get more GCSEs - more education in mainstream.

APPENDIX N.

What, for pupils, would make Line End their 'ideal' school?

Year 7

- Opportunity to make their own way to school (as opposed to being taxied).
- Good friends.
- Good school meals.
- Good/interesting lessons (games, woodwork, swimming, art, cooking).
- Good facilities (computers, pool-tables, football pitch).
- Rewards for good work/behaviour (treat lessons, certificates, house-points).
- Tuckshop.
- Good teachers (give rewards, help with work, strict but fair).
- Allowed to wear jewellery.
- Opportunity for discussion in lessons (talk lessons).
- Activity afternoons (colouring/painting).
- Breaktimes.
- Able to have fun.

Year 8

- Quiet room.
- No smoking in school.
- Assembly every day.
- T.V. room.
- No bullying.
- Decent breaks.
- No racism.
- Snooker tables.
- Cafeteria-style canteen.
- Good teachers (strict but fair).

- School teams (football/basketball) to play other schools.
- After school detentions.
- Large play areas.
- Swimming pool.
- Treat lessons.
- School uniform.
- Good reputation.
- Vending machines.
- Friendly atmosphere.

Year 9

- Go-karting.
- Golf-course.
- More games (rugby, hockey...)
- Bike track.
- More examinations.
- More pupils.
- Good teachers (well-qualified, well-tempered, good manners, calm, strict, dress smartly).
- Rewards for good work/behaviour.
- Trips.
- Good computers.
- No fighting.

Year 10/11

- Good facilities (inc. swimming pool, smoking-room, tennis courts, T.V. room, nice toilets).
- School holiday trips (during summer vacations).
- Outdoor pursuits, eg. rock-climbing, orienteering, abseiling, camping.
- Regular opportunity for reading (half-hour per day).

- Choice of lessons, and whether or not to attend.
- Allowed to come on bikes/somewhere safe to leave them.
- Leave school at 15.
- Trips out.
- Cafeteria system.
- Early start, early finish.
- Ice-cream van on site.
- Shorter lessons.
- Leave premises at lunchtime.
- Learn to ride motor-bikes.
- Comfortable chairs at desks.
- Have friends around you.
- Treat lessons.
- Well-equipped craft rooms.
- Boxing in school.
- Work-experience in Year 10...
- Up-dated computers...
- Warm, comfortable classrooms.
- School mini-bus...
- Enjoy yourself/have fun.
- Good teachers (fair, firm, sense of humour, don't shout, able to have a laugh)
- No bullying...
- Bins around school.

APPENDIX O.

What pupils think Line End should be doing for them:

Year 7

- Should try to get us back to mainstream.
- They should give us a good education - not to get bullied.
- The lunch-time activities and dinners are good, but I don't like bullying, or bullies getting away with it.

Year 8

- There's no girls at Line End - you haven't got any mates.
- Should be trying to get people back into mainstream.
- We want you to trust us more - letting us out at lunch-time. That's what a normal secondary school does.
- If you say you've been to Line End, you won't get a proper job.

Year 9

- I'd like to get good work, GCSE's, getting a job.
- I want to stay because in a normal school I'm naughty.
- In a normal school you get sent home for winding up and running out, so I'd end up back here anyway.
- I don't know anyone there - I might get bullied - I know everyone here, so I want to stay.
- At Line End you should make people behave and work hard.

Year 10

- Here you get more help and shorter lessons.
- Line End is full of ruffians - everyone's got a criminal record.
- The school should help us work, get people to settle down.

- Should get you educated, good qualifications and a job, so you don't ruin your life.

Year 11

- I feel ashamed to say what school I go to.
- I had a home-tutor for one year, 'cos I only did 4 months at "Normal High School", then I came to this dump.
- It's better at Line End, 'cos at mainstream there's about 30-odd in a class. There's only seven in a class here so they can keep an eye on you.
- Half the things we've done here we would have been expelled for in mainstream, but we're not here.
- I was a lot worse at mainstream - I've been better here. [Why?]... Smaller school, teachers help you through it.
- Line End is like a little village. Here you know everybody - you don't in mainstream.

APPENDIX P.

Things that pupils like about Line End.

Curriculum (including teaching/learning, classroom experiences.)

Some subjects; some teachers; the school supplies equipment (pens, pencils, etc.) small classes; help with work; experiments; tests; learning to read; rewards for being good in lessons; making things; learning to swim; visits/trips out of school; no homework; school providing games kit; getting trophies; house-system; school competitions; assemblies; help with work; work experience; opportunity to do GCSEs/external exams; shorter working day than mainstream.

Behaviour management/support systems and practice.

(including rewards/sanctions, behaviour management, rules/codes of practice, pupil support.)

Fair rules; allowed to wear earrings; no detentions after school; no uniform; teachers strict but fair; good systems for punishment; being able to talk to someone when upset; teachers who will listen; teachers can help sort out problems; supportive teachers.

Ethos/Environment (including physical and emotional/social.)

Friends; few bullies; doing jobs for teachers; clean school; displays around school; people can be nice to each other.

Facilities: Smoking area; dinners; taxis; computers, sports equipment; library; tuck-shop; mini-bus; lunch-time activities; nice grounds.

Other: Opportunity to return to normal school (sic); chance to return to mainstream; reintegration.

Things pupils don't like about Line End.

Curriculum:

Some subjects; some teachers; having to read (on reading recovery programme) using primary school books in some subjects; no school sports teams.

Behaviour management/support:

Being sent to withdrawal room; no going to toilet during lessons; no smoking in school; having to take coat off in lessons; getting detentions; teachers pull you around; teachers don't see things sometimes; getting your hair pulled by teachers; not allowed off premises at lunch-time; getting searched for fags by teachers; punishment; some teachers too strict/too soft; being on report; teachers making mistakes; rule-breaking.

Ethos/Environment:

Older pupils 'taxing' things off you (like fags); thieves/stealing; bullies; fighting; smoking; bad attitudes; enemies; behaviour of pupils; stupid/daft people around school; bad language; put downs/name calling; messing about; pushing into the dinner queue; frightened of some of the older pupils; too much winding; arguments/fights; people stirring; people tormenting others; nastiness; school is too small; more pupils needed; not enough girls; litter; graffiti.

Facilities:

Fewer facilities than mainstream; not enough choice of dinners; limited choice at tuck shop; no lockers; not enough litter.

APPENDIX Q.

	%	No.
1. The school is tidy and well looked after.	71	24
2. Pupils are pleasant and polite to each other.	9	3
3. Pupils are polite and pleasant to staff.	24	8
4. Staff are pleasant and polite to pupils.	79	27
5. Pupils are proud of the school.	41	14
6. Pupils are generally well-behaved in school.	29	10
7. The school is a happy place to be in.	50	17
8. Bigger pupils push their way to be first in line.	85	29
9. There is a lot of name calling in school.	41	34
10. There is a lot of bullying in school.	94	32
11. Bullying is taken seriously by teachers.	76	26
12. Toy-fighting happens a lot in school.	76	26
13. Teachers tell pupils off a lot.	79	27
14. Staff always listen to what I have to say.	65	22
15. Pupils generally get on with each other in class.	65	22
16. Staff are usually fair in the way they treat pupils.	68	23
17. Staff sometimes push pupils around or bully them.	44	15
18. Sometimes pupils push or shove teachers.	56	19
19. There is a lot of swearing in school.	94	32
20. Pupils are often praised by staff.	44	25
21. Pupils have a say in what happens in school.	62	21
22. Staff ask us our opinions about things.	65	22
23. Staff respect our views and opinions.	47	16
24. Pupils are treated with respect by staff.	62	21
25. I know and understand the rules of the school.	71	24
26. The rules of the school are fair.	59	20
27. If rules are broken, the person deserves to be punished.	76	26
28. The punishments I have received in school are fair.	50	17
29. There are lots of opportunities for praise and rewards in school.	88	30

	%	No.
30. I get sent out of lessons more than I should.	44	15
31. I walk out of class more than I should.	35	12
32. I like being in the withdrawal room.	18	6
33. I know what my particular difficulties are.	74	25
34. I know what I have to do to overcome them.	65	22
35. Teachers/staff are supportive in helping me to overcome them.	76	26
36. Teachers/staff in school are kind and caring.	65	22
37. I would like to go back to a mainstream school.	53	18
38. I would like more of a say in what happens in school.	74	25
39. I enjoy being at Line End.	65	22
40. I sometimes get bullied at Line End.	65	22
41. Sometimes I bully other pupils.	82	28
42. I feel safe and secure in school.	50	17
43. I am sometimes called names in school.	85	29
44. Sometimes I call other pupils names.	88	30
45. I sometimes get involved in toy-fighting in school.	62	21
46. Sometimes I am rude to teachers.	71	24
47. Teachers treat me fairly most of the time.	76	26
48. I have been physically pushed around or bullied by one or more teachers at least once since I have been at Line End.	62	21
49. My parents/carers are happy for me to be at Line End.	71	24
50. My parents/carers think Line End is a good school.	62	21
51. My parents/carers want me to go back to a mainstream school.	62	21
52. My parents/carers and the school work well together.	62	21
53. My parents/carers support what the school is doing.	71	24
54. My parents/carers come to the Parent's Evening held once every year.	56	19
55. My parents/carers are interested in how I am getting on at school.	94	32
56. My parents/carers are concerned/worried about my progress at school.	88	30
57. My parents/carers are concerned/worried about my behaviour at home.	74	25
58. Generally, I think I am getting on O.K. at school.	85	29
59. Generally, I think Line End is an O.K. school.	63	23
60. I would like to stay at Line End until I leave school	53	18

PUPIL RESPONSE TO INDIVIDUAL LESSONS.

For each subject, answer Y if you agree with the following statements, or N if you disagree.

I like/enjoy it.

I find it easy.

I find it interesting.

I am not bored about in it.

I usually learn something.

I set targets for myself.

The teacher sets targets for me.

I feel I am improving.

I get rewards for doing well.

I like the teacher.

I can see the reason for studying it.

APPENDIX I

RESULTS:

P.T.	Percentage (%)										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	45	55	39	74	55	32	48	52	61	32	58
	68	52	52	68	74	45	65	81	81	55	77
	71	71	71	42	84	48	48	81	65	61	77
	52	68	42	61	68	32	61	55	39	16	55
	65	74	68	58	81	55	61	74	81	74	81
	58	65	68	55	81	45	58	84	90	71	87
	97	77	84	55	90	42	45	84	68	65	77
	97	97	94	35	87	35	61	97	84	77	90
	84	87	74	58	81	42	48	68	45	61	65
	81	84	71	52	84	39	55	81	84	77	94
	42	35	29	55	58	35	52	52	32	48	61
c.	77	97	74	45	87	42	52	84	65	55	74
	52	68	45	45	74	45	68	77	74	52	68

Number (Raw score)											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
14	17	12	23	17	10	15	16	19	10	11	12
21	16	16	21	23	14	20	25	25	17	22	23
22	22	22	13	26	15	15	25	20	19	20	21
16	21	13	19	21	10	19	17	12	5	11	12
20	23	21	18	25	17	19	23	25	23	24	25
18	20	21	17	25	14	18	26	28	22	23	24
30	24	26	17	28	13	14	26	21	20	21	22
30	30	29	11	27	11	19	30	26	24	25	26
26	27	23	18	25	13	15	21	14	19	20	21
25	26	22	16	26	12	17	25	26	24	25	26
13	11	9	17	18	11	16	16	10	15	16	17
24	30	23	14	27	13	16	26	20	17	18	19
16	21	14	14	23	14	21	24	23	16	17	18

APPENDIX S.

Teaching and Learning: Follow-Up Questions

1. What sort of things do you like/enjoy in lessons?

Treats, the work (easy and hard), you can get away with anything, when I learn things, messing about, interesting work, easy things (word searches), making things, "nothing", sports not doing any work, 'getting in trouble- it's funny watching teachers go off their head', drawing, practical.

2. What sort of things do you find difficult?

Work, written work, writing, understanding some things, "teachers - they do me head in...", understanding what teachers say, just make you write things, getting to class, getting up in the morning, coming to school, teacher telling you what to do; co-operating with teachers - they get on my nerves... they think they run the place. "Half the stuff I've already done at (mainstream)", "Doing new work". "Sometimes teachers expect you to do more than you do, more than your best"; "Reading - if you can't read, it affects what you can do."

3. What sort of things do you find interesting?

Messing about, because you don't have to think; when you draw things that are good, you appreciate yourself, being able to draw all the time; watching videos - as long as it's not work. "Using the computers - I love it. They're good fun and fun for learning."

4. How do you muck around?

Calling names, out of seat, shouting out, screwing up work, fighting, being cheeky to teacher, winding each other up, throwing things, winding up teachers, being out of seat, refusing to work, drawing on table, lifting tables, swearing at teacher, distracting each other, making funny noises, arguing with each other, throwing pencils/chairs, take the piss, swearing so you get sent out, being silly.

5. Why do you muck around?

Don't like the lesson, boring, get sent to withdrawal (better than lesson), don't like teacher ("If you don't like teachers it affects your work"). "We want a treat all the time - if we don't get one, we don't do the work;" it's good; bored with lesson; "It's one of those days; we don't get enough treat lessons, so we take it into our own hands and have our own treat lessons," "We get annoyed, 'cos teachers are talking too long." "I don't always understand - it's too hard sometimes." It's better than work; makes the time go quicker; don't like the lessons; works too easy; teachers piss you off; to have a laugh; showing off; don't get on with each other; get stuck with work and teacher doesn't help/come over; teachers do me head in: "It's funny; it annoys teachers, 'cos if I can't do the work I just muck about." "Teachers piss me off so I mess around" (making you do things, giving you orders, not having any manners like saying thank you when you've done something;" "Teachers get on your nerves; - do this, do that;" sometimes I come in with a mood and I'm sick of school; something to do, isn't it; because it's boring doing work; 'sometimes you lose your rag because you can't do the work and Miss/Sir won't help you;" people calling you; because when you get sent to withdrawal you want someone else to go with you; some teachers

ignore you for no reason whatsoever. You put your hand up for 10 mins: "I'll be with you in a minute," then 10 minutes later: "I'll be with you in a minute."

6. What sort of targets do you/your teacher set for you?

No winding, my behaviour, sit on seat properly, not pick table up, general behaviour, to behave in class, not shout out, do good work, not to fight; don't take no notice, don't think they're useful - only in P.E... to beat the school record. "Don't know;" not to use bad language; get on with other pupils; talk to each other politely; I don't set targets - teacher does it for me... I can't remember them; come in a lesson, sit down, do your work; Miss sets us targets for the lesson... if we don't do it, we get a detention; no calling; to be good in all your classes.

7. Do the targets help you in your learning?

No, they make us worse; we just ignore them. If we want to do that, we'll do it - we don't want to be told what to do. "We don't want targets - we like the way we are. This is our personality - that's the way we want it;" "It means you know what to do, you just get on with it instead of teachers telling you what to do."

8. How do you feel you are improving in your learning?

Reading, you get better at things;

9. What are the things you like about those teachers you like?

Kind; gives treats; nice - treat you with respect; they help you, don't shout at you when you're naughty - just tell you not to; give you rewards; dead kind; comes and helps us; make me laugh; don't shout; give treat lessons/rewards; someone who's sweet with you and understands if you can't do the work; who respects you; treats you like human beings; they're understanding, listen to your problems; they're funny - can take a joke and make a joke; if you behave they'll help you more, give you treats.

10. What are the things you don't like?

Put you on detention (punishment generally); give you beats, twist your arm up your back; punish the whole class; moody, boss you about; get sent out or get sent home; always take other teacher's side, never our side; irritate you, always moaning - go to withdrawal if you don't do what you're told; it's like being back at home when your mum tells you to do the washing up; they shout at you... teachers keep going on at you; some are very lenient on certain people; twist your arm up your back/pull your ear/poking; ignore you; put you in detention if you don't put your hand up; lines for shouting out; spend the whole lesson with one person - if you put your hand up they ignore you.

APPENDIX Ti.

Extract from interview with Year 11 pupil re. experiences of reintegration.

Q. Why did you want to go back to a mainstream secondary school?

P. Well, I was kind of forced into it really by my nana and grandad and the rest of my family to try and get me back into school.

Q. Did you want to go back?

P. In some ways yes, in some ways no, 'cos of some of the friends I'd be leaving behind and it'd be like a new start – I wouldn't get to know everyone and its further away from home, so I wasn't sure, really.

Q. How were you prepared for it?

P. I filled in a series of sheets every day – reintegration sheets – and it was reviewed after a few weeks to see how I'd gone on. I didn't really know what it would be like 'cos I only went there once before I started properly.

Q. What did you do on that visit?

P. They showed me around the school and explained the rules to me.

Q. How did it go once you started?

P. Well, it was a bit stricter than here. It didn't go too well as I was getting picked on by the bigger kids and stuff like that – I think it was because I came from Line End, and they took the micky out of me because it's a special school. They used to call me a spastic 'cos I came from a special school.

Q. How did you deal with that?

P. I just kicked out, lashed out... I kept getting sent home, then I got expelled.

Q. What support did you get when you were there?

P. Line End kept phoning up and asking how I was and everything, but I didn't get much support there; I was treated like I was just any other pupil. No-one at the school asked me how I was getting on, except my nan and Mr. C. (Line End.)

Q. What could have been done, do you feel, to make your reintegration work?

P. I suggested to Mrs M (Head of Year at mainstream) that I did a day there and a day Here, a day in and a day out, then make it two days here and two days there, and build it up. It's a big shock going in all at one, so its better doing it a bit at a time. I thought: 'I'm in a different school, I don't know what's going on.' I had that idea from being, you know, after a few weeks I thought – they could have just taken it slowly at a time.

Q. And what about while you were there?

P. They should offer more support – be genuine and not yell at you all the time; relax a bit more and not make you so tense and nervous...Line End should give you more advice about some of the problems that might happen in mainstream. I thought it was up to me to make it work. I told the staff that other pupils were winding up, and they promised they would sort it, but nothing changed. They got away with it because I didn't know their names.

Q. Given the choice, would you go back to mainstream again?

P. If the system was better, if they gave you more support, if it were better than what it was, I'd give it a go.

APPENDIX Tii.

Extract from interview with Year 11 pupil.

Q. Do you think that bullying is a problem in the school at the moment?
(this question was based on a response to an earlier question.)

L. Yeh.

Q. What do you feel could be done about it?

L. Well, I'd want pupils to..thingy..d'you know, like, to be involved, 'cos at the moment you're battling with us, aren't you, but if you had a group, a group of pupils who were willing to help you and to work with you, you could say lot, like we've got this problem – try and sort it out; and then you can both work together, and you're more likely to come up with a better result, aren't you.

Q. Is it something you would like to have been involved in, given the chance?

L. Yeh, 'cos there's a big problem with bullying. I mean, all the Year 11's bully now, But it's only because they got bullied when they were younger. D'you understand? Because when I first came here, I got bullied all the time.

R. So how would you turn it round – break the cycle of bullying?

L. Well, you have to talk to 'em, don't you, and find out why they're bullying, 'cos they're bullying for a reason; you just don't bully someone for nothing, do you. But they get away with it most of the time.

Q. Why?

L. Because they don't get caught, and that's encouraging 'em. 'I didn't get gripped for this, I'll do it again.'

Q. Should the bullies be punished?

L. I think sometimes you need to punish 'em, but most of the time you need to talk to 'em, and find out what's wrong with them. I mean people walk out of school for bullying, but if there's no bullying going on, they've got no excuse for walking out of school, and if they've got no excuse for walking out, then they can stay in school and do the work, can't they.

Q. Is there a problem, do you think, with people being out of lessons, in the withdrawal room, as well as being out of school?

L. Yeh, when I were a first year, you didn't have a withdrawal room, did you, so there weren't as many people getting sent out.

Q. Do you think, then, that as a result of having a withdrawal room, more people get sent out of lessons?

L. Well, with having a withdrawal, people can think, ‘this lesson is crap, so we’ll go to the withdrawal room.

Q. So what happened in the days before the withdrawal room if someone was disruptive in class?

L. Well, they’d have to stand outside the door, or get sent to the top of school. But There weren’t as many people getting sent out. But once you’ve got a withdrawal room, everyone thought they could go there and have a talk, or go to withdrawal and see who’s in there and have a laugh – better than working – so they’re missing out on their lessons again.

R. Do you think people are concerned about losing House-points for ending up in Withdrawal?

L. I think some of ‘em, yeh, but some of ‘em are just not bothered. I mean – what’s house-points! I think you need to talk to them about the importance of lessons and everything, because if someone had spoke to me a couple of years ago and said: “Look, you need so much...your work, your lessons. It’ll help you when you leave.” I think you need to talk to them about that.

APPENDIX UI.

STATUTORY REVIEW OF A STATEMENT OF
SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

NAME: DANIEL SIDDALL.....
D.O.B.: 06.08.85.....

Unfortunately I am unable to attend due to P
arrange

Please delete as appropriate below:

* I/~~we~~ shall not be attending the review meeting on: 09.03.99.....
at 11.00 am.....

Please record below any views you wish to contribute in advance of the review meeting on Daniel's..... progress in relation to meeting his/her special educational needs:

Daniel seems to be doing quite a lot better than he was.

I used to be worried as he used to walk out a lot and end up missing a lot of lessons. I dreaded the phone ringing as I would think Daniel would be calling to say he was coming home; however I can not remember when I last had to take him into school over this.

The school I think have done a great job with getting him down and making him realise that he can not get out of doing his work in lessons by walking out. Daniel has come to accept that now.

When he produces good work at school he takes pride in showing me certificates he has got.

I can only praise the school for showing Daniel he has and can achieve good results when he wants to.

Please return this form to the school as soon as possible. Thank You

is capable
in his exc

Thank you.
A

APPENDIX Uii.

Progress Achieved Since The Last Review

What are the parents' views on the pupil's progress and their aspirations for his/her future? Mrs Redmond is very pleased with Micky's progress at Dale Grove. She feels he is much more settled and is much happier at school. She was open to the suggestion by Mrs Williams that Micky might be considered for reintegration but was concerned about the level of support he might get at mainstream and was not happy with the

What are the pupil's views on his/her progress and aspirations for the future? Micky is happy here at Dale Grove. He enjoys sport particularly. He says he realises the importance of staying on task. We have discussed strategies for identifying when he is starting to become frustrated. He is enjoying the extra lessons on the Reading Recovery Scheme.

What are the school's views on the pupil's progress?

Please see Educational Advice.

What are the views of other contributors on the pupil's progress?

Please see Educational Psychologists Report.

Please see report: Dr. Kushlick
Consultant Child + Adolescent Psychiatrist

suggestion of an MLD school.

APPENDIX Uiii.

Extract from interview with parent of Year 9 pupil.

Comments from this parent were in response to the question: What do you want Line End to be doing for your son, and what are the things that would make you feel that the school was being effective in its provision?

“ It’s in his statement, isn’t it – but I was conned into that. I knew that A. needed support, but when I asked the LEA they said he would only get it if he was statemented, so I agreed. Now its become a label that’s a millstone around his neck. It’s my own fault, I suppose because I pushed and pushed – I actually wrote to John Patten – but he’s my only son, my only child. I’ll fight for everything for him. Most parents are grateful that their kids are in school and don’t want to upset the apple-cart. They’re thankful that the school will take their children, especially when the kids are out of school a long time. Also, there are a lot of female parents who are less challenging to professionals. They expect me to be grateful that they’ll find him a place that they expect me to let him be put anywhere.”

“ Ideally, I want A. to be reintegrated into mainstream, but I know it’s not going to happen – if it was going to happen, it would’ve happened years ago. The main aim of his last school (EBD day school in neighbouring authority) was reintegration, but whenever I asked, they just said: ‘he’s not quite ready.’ If reintegration is not practical, then good exams. I want him pushed academically and worked to his ability, and not below it – he needs motivating and pushing...He’s not a real problem at home – lots of kids are being dragged down to the police station. I just want him to stay on the straight and narrow.”

When asked about how effective she felt Line End was in making provision for her son, she said:

“ I think it’s too early to say. I mean, he’s coming every day, but attendance has never been a problem. He knows I’d kill him if he wagged it. My concern is that he’s mixing with ‘EBD’ kids – put them all in a pile and you’ve got A. in the middle.”

APPENDIX V.

AIMS OF LINE END SCHOOL

- To provide a broad, balanced, relevant and fully differentiated curriculum to meet the individual needs of each pupil and the requirements of the National Curriculum
- To provide a structured, stable and positive environment in which the emotional and behavioural needs of each pupil can be addressed.
- To give each pupil the opportunity to be integrated into mainstream school.

To achieve these aims the school should provide:-

- * An effective strategy for identifying the individual needs of all pupils.
- * A broad, balanced and relevant education which is differentiated to meet the individual needs of pupils and enables them to:
 - i. gain access to relevant educational experiences and learning opportunities;
 - ii. acquire relevant information and knowledge;
 - iii. develop a relevant understanding of educational concepts;
 - iv. develop relevant abilities, skills and competencies; and
 - v. be able to reflect on their educational experiences in order to develop attitudes and values which are consistent with being members of a modern society.
- * An environment which is caring, supportive and creates equal opportunities for all regardless of sex, race or culture.
- * The opportunity for all pupils to succeed through a wide range of formal and informal rewards used and applied consistently by all staff.
- * A range of sanctions that are fair, understood by pupils and parents, proportionate to the offence, and applied flexibly, constructively and consistently.
- * A policy for assessment, recording and reporting, which involves the pupils both in the assessment process and the target setting.
- * Lessons which are well prepared and clearly delivered through an appropriate range of teaching and learning styles in a range (variety) of learning environments.
- * Access to individual personal, social and vocational guidance.

* Regular reviews of all pupils to include individual:

Pupil profiles.

Action plans.

Educational plans.

Annual reviews.

Transition reviews.

Reintegration reviews.

APPENDIX Wi.

SMT: Friday 2nd. October: 8:30 am.

Present: Head, deputy, FV and AD (middle managers.)

1. Discussion on need to address target-setting issues as matter of urgency.
2. Progress of LEA school-improvement project.
3. Discussion of pupil groupings.
4. Pupils causing concern.

School secretary interrupts meeting to hand round voting forms for teacher governor election.

5. FV. Expressed concerns about levels of aggression within school. After two pupils had been withdrawn from her class for fighting, one of the two remaining said jokingly: 'Anyone else want a fight?' to which the other pupil replied: 'Well, that's the sort of school it isn't it.'
FV: 'Sometimes I don't feel I can protect some of the pupils in class anymore. It isn't a safe place for a lot of pupils.'

From this point, the meeting drifted into an open discussion on how the problem could be addressed, resulting in a number of ideas being suggested – though no notes were taken nor any action agreed.

6. FV. 'We need to stop play-fighting and pupils rolling about on the floor'
HT. 'We'll have a blitz – I'll talk about it in assembly.'
7. HT. Then changed direction to talk about staff role in managing pupil behaviour:
'We need some consistency amongst staff – getting to classrooms on time, as this can lead to friction before the lesson and lead to problems in it... hats on in class – if I see it I'll confiscate them.'
8. Comments made about behaviour of pupils at lunch-time in dining hall:
FV. 'I don't want to sit with them... maybe staff could sit at a table on their own and just keep an eye on pupils.'

Then followed an open discussion on how to address lunch-time behaviour issues, from which emerged a range of suggestions, none of which were minuted or agreed upon as a course of action for consideration amongst staff. After time spent discussing the various merits and demerits of each suggestion, AD said: 'We need time to talk about it.'

As a result of all that was discussed, the meeting overran by 15 minutes, interrupted only by the bell for the start of school, and consequently, the 9:00 am staff briefing was missed, and did not take place – although staff were waiting in the staff room from 9:00 am.

Friday 2nd. October. 11:00 am.

Unscheduled meeting called by HT with DH to discuss earlier SMT meeting.

HT. 'The meeting went on when you left – the grievances carried on.'
(The two middle managers had stayed on to express their concerns about the perceived aggressive culture of the school.)

'I know people think we've got an aggressive school because I'm aggressive, but that's me. It's the same in sport – I'm very competitive. I should have learned over the years but I haven't.'

'When I threw DJ out of the classroom, the message came back (from DJ's form-tutor) that if it had been her son, she'd have had me in court.'

'People have very short memories; they conveniently forget what it was like. This school was a mess when I came, and it was a lot more aggressive then. They want it both ways – it's me they come to see when they want something sorted out, 'cos they know I'll get a grip of it.'

'If you ask the kids if they think I'm fair they'll say yes. I think I've quietened down a lot.'

'I think we've brought the levels of aggression down from what it used to be. But look at the kids - PT (Year 11 pupil) can't help walking past the younger kids without giving them a clip.'

'Look at what the kids do academically, look at what Ofsted said. WE're ticking over like no other EBD school. Look at MF (an EBD school in a neighbouring authority) – they don't even attempt the national curriculum. They (Line End staff) should go and see how they operate – spend a couple of days somewhere else. All EBD schools will have to provide the National Curriculum – we're doing it and setting the pace.'

APPENDIX Wii.

SMT: Wednesday 14th. October. 8:30 am.

Present: HT, DH, FV and AD (two middle managers.)

After the first ten minutes of the meeting, which were spent washing up the business from the previous day, the HT said he wanted to talk about target-setting, as the statutory targets for pupil performance were due in.

‘We’ve got to set targets for the year 2000 , and I’ve got to present them to governors in three weeks time. We haven’t got much time – what are we going to do?’

‘I’ve got the budget to look at – ‘new deal for schools,’ about three bids for different funds, and the possible building project for here... I’ve also got to do the governors report, parent governor elections, the school day (one of the Key Issues from the Ofsted Report) a budget deficit, performance indicators..’

(To DH.) ‘Are you going to take this forward or shall we find time to sit down...?’

Then: ‘Hold on,’ and started jotting down performance targets for pupils, and thinking aloud about target-setting:

‘What we could do is ask staff to make predictions for Year 11 exams. Can we use the CAT results to make predictions for GCSE?’

As HT flitted through various ideas, he mentioned Circular 11/98 – all about target-setting, which had not been passed on to DH (curriculum and assessment) and who had been planning staff training on target-setting:

‘Sorry, I thought I’d given you a copy.’

HT then rang Line End Junior School to ask the teacher-in-charge whether she was setting behavioural targets.

‘If I haven’t got something sorted by this morning I’m going to look silly.’

‘If I don’t get this sorted out soon I’m in the shit’

‘We’ll get the teachers of the core subjects together during Friday’s SMT to see if they can make predictions for pupil performance.’

Meanwhile, HT called core subject teachers to his office at various times the same day and asked them to give him their predictions for pupil performance in their subjects – an on-the-spot assessment that formed the basis of the performance targets presented later to governors.

APPENDIX Xi.

LEA 'mini-inspection Report: 1996.

Teaching and Learning.

“Targets are not sufficiently focused on attainment to give clear indication of what has been learned.”

“There is clear evidence of progress in understanding and skill development in some lessons...but in others, the learning objectives were less clear, and it was difficult to see measurable progress.”

“There is a need for closer monitoring of pupils’ academic progress to ensure they achieve their potential.”

“The school should consider how it will most effectively present pupils’ baseline attainment so that measurable progress can be demonstrated.”

“It is possible to make only limited judgements about attainment and progress from the evidence seen. Attainments are below national expectations at the end of Key Stage three in all core subjects. Data is likely to be skewed by the small size of the cohort, and there may be considerable variations from year to year... the lack of external accreditation makes it very difficult to provide objective evidence of attainment or progress.”

APPENDIX Xii.

Ofsted Report on Line End: 1996.

Effective practice was observed in the following areas, all comments being taken directly from the Ofsted Report:

1. The curriculum is a strength of the school.
2. The majority of pupils enjoy the learning experience.
3. Overall, the quality of teaching is good across both key stages.
4. The majority of pupils have access to a relevant and appropriate curriculum leading to national accredited examination courses.
5. Pupils concentrate and remain on task in lessons; pupils are well-motivated.
6. In the majority of lessons, the good quality of teaching promotes good learning.
7. The expectations most teachers have of pupil performance are high but realistic.
8. The curriculum effectively supports pupil's intellectual and personal development.
9. A strength of the curriculum design is the opportunity for pupils to have input into lessons, with negotiated targets being set to promote good understanding and individual success.

Areas of perceived ineffectiveness were also pointed out:

1. The main weakness is the inappropriate management of pupils coupled with low expectations and poor explanation of lesson intentions and outcomes; such lessons tend to focus on negative issues of behaviour, and pupils attitudes and performance decline as a result.
2. Information generated in school is not sufficiently detailed to identify appropriate targets for learning or accurately judge the rate of individual progress.
3. There is no system for reviewing and monitoring individual learning targets, though there is an effective system for behaviour targets.
4. Job descriptions lack the degree of clarity needed to ensure that the monitoring of pupil progress is rigorously implemented.

APPENDIX Y.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA.

Attendance figures for 1992 - 1998:

	1992/3	1993/4	1994/5	1995/6	1996/7	1997/8
Year 7:	88%	95%	70%	72%	85%	92%
Year 8:	82%	84%	93%	65%	72%	81%
Year 9:	81%	74%	81%	89%	77%	56%
Year 10:	71%	62%	67%	71%	84%	60%
Year 11:	56%	72%	48%	57%	58%	81%

TOTALS FOR THE WHOLE SCHOOL:

1992-93: 74%

1993-94: 77%

1994-95: 72%

1995-96: 71%

1996-97: 76%

1997-98: 73%

Reintegration figures: 1992 - 1997.

The following shows the record of the ten pupils who were reintegrated into mainstream schools - the Year groups they came from, and how long the placement lasted.

Year 7: Pupil 1: 5 months

Year 8: Pupil 1: successful.

Pupil 2: 2 months.

Pupil 3: 9 months.

Year 9: Pupil 1: successful.

Pupil 2: 4 months.

Pupil 3: 2 months.

Year 10: Pupil 1: 3 weeks.

Pupil 2: 1 term.

Pupil 3: 2 terms, then permanently excluded from Year 11.