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**ABSTRACT**

This thesis explores the experiences of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP) from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and the concept of the Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs). CYP who had experienced permanent exclusion from school were interviewed in order to explore how their BPN for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness were perceived to have been satisfied or limited across three contexts: previous mainstream provision, current provision and outside of school. A thematic analysis of transcribed interview data was conducted and the role of BPN satisfaction in relation to the experience of permanent exclusion was explored.

The experiences and perspectives expressed by participants suggested a range of social-contextual supports and limitations for BPNs across contexts. In line with existing SDT-based research, the findings suggest that participants’ experiences of reduced engagement, motivation, performance and well-being were associated with situations, events and relationships which were perceived to be limiting to BPNs. Where BPNs were perceived to have been supported, participants’ responses indicated increased engagement, autonomous motivation, performance and well-being.

The researcher suggests that further research into the BPN satisfaction in schools is needed, including further qualitative exploration of the experiences of our most vulnerable and hard to reach CYP. Possible implications for teacher training, school management and the delivery of Educational Psychology (EP) services are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
1.1. Overview of chapter

This chapter introduces the research study contained in this thesis. It begins by outlining the background to the research (1.2), including its theoretical underpinnings (1.2.1), and the local and political context (1.3). It then positions the study in relation to the existing school exclusion literature (1.4), before briefly outlining the researcher’s motivation to employ their chosen methodological approach (1.5). Finally, the contribution of the current study is considered in light of its theoretical underpinning and chosen methodology, and the potential implications of its findings (1.6).

1.2. Background to the research

This research study aimed to explore the experiences of a small group of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP) across three contexts:

1. Previous mainstream provision
2. Current provision (Pupil Referral Unit; PRU)
3. Outside of School (OoS)

It sought to construct an understanding of their experiences from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000).

The researcher was drawn to this area of study through their current role as a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) working for an Educational Psychology Service (EPS) in a Local Education Authority (LEA) with a high rate of school exclusions, and through their previous experiences working with permanently excluded CYP as a Learning Mentor in a PRU. Throughout their work in the field of education, they had developed and sustained an interest in inclusive education, in particular the long-standing issue of school exclusion. The researcher held a particular interest in understanding the range of complex and interacting factors that can lead to a CYP being permanently excluded from school, with a view to developing professional knowledge and practice. Their experience working with schools, CYP and families had
regularly revealed a myriad of differing and conflicting perspectives on school exclusion, suggesting it was both an emotive and pertinent issue for those involved.

For a long time, the voices of professionals and academics have dominated the research and discourse surrounding school exclusion (Gersch & Nolan, 1994). Whilst researchers have increasingly begun to consider the ‘voice of the child’ (Upton & Varma, 1996) in respect of this issue (De Pear, 1997; Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Pomeroy, 1999), the experiences, views and perspectives of CYP rarely inform the debate with regard to policy and practice (Munn & Lloyd, 2005; The OCC, 2012). In recognition of this, the study also aimed to listen to and promote the ‘voice of the child’ in line with the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC; UNICEF, 2012), in particular articles 12 (Respect for the views of the child) and 13 (Freedom of expression).

Through presenting an evidenced-based understanding of the minority-held experiences of this group, the study also aimed to positively impact on stakeholders (participants, parents/carers and school staff) through practice-based implications stemming from the findings. This is based on the idea of conducting research with and for, rather than on, participants; the principles of fairness, equality and social justice; and a conviction in the capacity for TEPs and Educational Psychologists (EPs) to affect positive change in the lives of those they work with.

1.2.1. The theoretical underpinnings of the research
The current study is informed and underpinned by Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000), a formal macro-theory of human motivation that emphasises the importance of evolved human resources for behavioural self-regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT is grounded in the assumption that all human beings are ‘growth-oriented’ and proposes that this tendency is supported or undermined by our experience of environmental influences: social-contextual factors (Ryan & Deci, 2002). These factors are defined by the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs).
BPNs Theory is one of five micro-theories that make up SDT. The concept of BPNs refers to innate psychological requirements that are universal, i.e. evident across all cultures and developmental periods (Ryan & Deci, 2002). They are: Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness. Each are defined and explicated further in section 2.3.1. Social-contextual factors that support or allow BPN satisfaction have been repeatedly shown to yield engagement, mastery and synthesis; whereas factors that thwart or limit BPN satisfaction diminish motivation, growth, integrity and well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

As stated above, the current study sought to understand the experiences of a small group of permanently excluded CYP from the perspective of SDT and the concept of BPNs; a theoretical understanding of SDT and BPN was applied to the analysis and interpretation of the research data. However, the theoretical tenets of SDT also permeated other aspects of the research methodology; for example, the recruitment process and data collection (see 3.4).

The researcher’s decision to apply the tenets of SDT to the current study followed a sustained interest and engagement with its extensive research literature. Contrary to early deficit- and pathology-based models of understanding challenging and inappropriate behaviour (Jones, 2003; Parsons, 1996), SDT provides an interactionist perspective in keeping with more recent approaches towards understanding Special Educational Needs (SEN) and in particular, Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) (DCSF, 2008a; DfES, 2001). Fundamental to this shift has been the recognition and understanding that these difficulties are linked to interacting factors both inside and outside of the CYP, and that steps should be taken by professionals and practitioners to reduce the barriers to the CYP’s learning that arise from these (DfES, 2001). It is the researcher’s view that the findings of SDT-based research can provide practical solutions to these problems. Central to this is the empowerment of CYP through their involvement in both research and practice; the author suggests that the theoretical underpinnings
of SDT support this. Further discussion of SDT and its contribution to the current study is provided in Chapter Two.

1.3. Professional and political context
This thesis was written within a changing context for professionals and practitioners working with CYP within education, health and social care; both the SEN Green Paper Support and aspiration (DfE, 2011c) and the Children and Families Bill (DfE, 2013) were published during the period of its completion. However, within the LEA in which the research was carried out, the Children Act (The Children Act, 2004) and the aims of the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda (DfES, 2004) continued to provide the legal and professional framework within which services for CYP were delivered.

The ECM agenda (DfES, 2004) specified five outcomes considered most important for CYP within the United Kingdom (UK):

- Be healthy
- Stay safe
- Enjoy and achieve
- Make a positive contribution
- Achieve economic well being

Considered universal goals for all CYP regardless of their circumstance or background, the ECM agenda clearly suggests that every child matters. Still, there are specific groups of CYP that are more likely to experience negative future outcomes, for example teenage parents (Swann, Bowe, McCormick, & Kosmin, 2003), Looked After Children (LAC) (DCSF, 2008b) and CYP who have been permanently excluded from school (Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Vulliamy & Webb, 2000). Furthermore, negative outcomes for CYP are more likely in areas experiencing deprivation across multiple measures (Lloyd, 2006).

The Index of Multiple Deprivation had identified the borough in which the research was conducted as one of the 15 most deprived boroughs in England (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2011). Furthermore, as
stated above, the LEA accounted for a high proportion of the total permanent exclusions in London in the year 2009/10 (DfE, 2011a). It was therefore an LEA and EPS priority to reduce this figure.

Over recent years, as the agenda for inclusive education has been increasingly adopted across LEAs, there has been an increased expectation that mainstream schools will actively seek to address the difficulties experienced by CYP before using the sanction of permanent exclusion. At the same time, there has been a continued focus on attainment through the publishing of school league tables. Munn and Lloyd (2005) suggest that:

‘…exclusion figures should, therefore, be seen in the context both of developments designed to heighten awareness of the importance of sustaining pupils in mainstream schools and of the continuing political concern with improving standards of attainment.’

(p. 210)

Within this context, official rates of permanent exclusion have consistently fallen in recent years (Figure 1.1), whilst other forms and varieties of exclusion continue to be widely used (OCC, 2013a) (see 2.6.2). Furthermore, the author suggests there has been a recent ideological shift away from inclusion at a governmental level, with policy makers stating that they will ‘remove the bias towards inclusion’ (HM Government, 2010, as cited in Booth, Bush, & Scott, 2011, p. 23). In respect of the use of school exclusion by mainstream schools, the Schools Minister Nick Gibb states the following on the DfE website:

‘With thousands of pupils being excluded for persistent disruption and violent or abusive behaviour we remain concerned that weak discipline remains a significant problem in too many of our schools and classrooms… We will back head teachers in excluding persistently disruptive pupils, which is why we are removing barriers which limit their authority’.

(DfE, 2011b)
The UK government recently conducted a review entitled *Improving Alternative Provision* (Taylor, 2012). In line with the school exclusion literature, the resulting report acknowledges that ‘many children who are referred to PRUs and APs come from the most deprived backgrounds’ (Taylor, 2012, p.4), and that ‘the academic outcomes for pupils who go into APs and PRUs are poor’ (p. 5). However, the review did not consult or present the views of CYP currently attending these provisions. The methodological and moral arguments for involving CYP in research that directly or indirectly affects them feature throughout *Chapter Two*.

Despite recent falls in the number of official school exclusions, it remains an important issue for professionals, practitioners and politicians alike, with pupil behaviour firmly at the centre of a discourse often dominated by adults in positions of power (Carlile, 2013). It was therefore an aim of the current study to both contribute to our understanding of school exclusion, whilst impacting positively on key stakeholders (CYP, parents/carers and school staff) at a local level.
1.4. Understanding exclusion

Exclusion is a disciplinary measure that a head teacher can use to respond to challenging or inappropriate behaviour. A CYP can legally be excluded for a limited period of time (‘fixed-term’) or permanently, with the latter requiring the school’s governing body to review the head teacher’s decision and consider the views of the parents before a final decision is made. Whilst the number of permanent exclusions has fallen in recent years, the Office of the Children’s Commissioner (OCC) recently revealed evidence of illegality in some schools, with exclusions increasingly unrecorded in the form of ‘informal’ or ‘unofficial’ exclusions (OCC, 2012).

In recent years, the OCC and the United Nations (UN) have raised concerns about systemic inequalities in school exclusions (OCC, 2013b; UN, 2008). Government guidance on school exclusion states that the decision to exclude:

‘…must be lawful, reasonable and fair. Schools have a statutory duty not to discriminate against pupils on the basis of protected characteristics, such as disability or race. Schools should give particular consideration to the fair treatment of pupils from groups who are vulnerable to exclusion.’

(DfE, 2012a)

However, recent government school exclusion statistics reveal that particular groups of CYP are more likely to be excluded from school than others (OCC, 2013b). This is discussed further in 2.6.2.

A range of research and non-research school exclusion literature was reviewed for the current study (see Chapter Two). Much of the literature is dedicated to understanding the range of individual and social-contextual factors that put particular CYP at risk of exclusion (Bynner, 2001; Carlile, 2013; Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Solomon & Rogers, 2001). Other research studies address concerns about the short- and long-term effects of school exclusion (Berridge, Brodie, Pitts, Porteous, & Tarling, 2001; Daniels, 2011; Daniels &

Much of this research has been conducted from a sociological or educational research perspective, with few providing psychological insight into the difficulties experienced by this group. At the time of conducting the review, the researcher was unable to identify any SDT-based research studies conducted with permanently excluded CYP. The current study aimed to fill this gap in the literature and explore and understand the experiences of permanently excluded CYP with specific reference to SDT, and in particular the concept of BPN.

1.5. The research process
As the previous sections have demonstrated, the researcher’s previous professional experiences and current interests, the professional and political context and identified gaps in the literature established a rationale for the current study (see 3.2). It aimed to explore and interpret the views and experiences of permanently excluded CYP using qualitative research methods from a critical realist perspective. This allowed the researcher to adopt the positivist ontological position espoused by SDT: that BPNs are universal, objective, measurable constructs; whilst also accepting the relativist epistemological position that BPN satisfaction is subjective and personal to the individual. This is considered further in 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. The researcher chose to employ the use of Semi-Structured Interviews (SSIs) as a data collection method and Thematic Analysis (TA) as a data analysis tool. Further description and comment on the methods used is provided in 3.3.3 and 3.4. In using qualitative methods, it was important for the researcher to acknowledge their own active role in the research process, including an awareness of how their professional experiences as described above, along with their personal
views, beliefs and expectations could influence their interpretation of the participants’ accounts. Steps taken to mitigate against this are considered throughout Chapter Three.

Accessing the perspectives of permanently excluded CYP can be understood as a challenging concept and they are often labelled as a ‘hard to reach’ group or ‘hard to find’ (Macnab, Visser, & Daniels, 2007). This is due to their excluded nature and the educational difficulties they often face (MacCrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003). Furthermore, others have noted the challenges of gatekeepers (school principals) or parents/carers refusing access to participants (Robson, 2011). The researcher’s experience of conducting this research contrasted with these concerns; school staff and participants were both willing and able to cooperate and participate.

Seven individual SSIs were conducted with CYP attending a PRU in South London. The interview questions were designed to sensitively explore the CYP’s experiences across three contexts: Previous mainstream provision, Current provision (PRU) and Outside of School (OoS), with a view to answering the following research questions:

Main Research Question
‘What role does Basic Psychological Need satisfaction play in the experience of permanent exclusion from school?’

Sub-questions
1) ‘How did the children and young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

2) ‘How does the children and young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

3) ‘How do the children and young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

1.6. A unique and distinctive contribution
Finally, the author suggests that the study contained in this thesis makes a unique and distinctive contribution to the existing literature. In providing a
qualitative exploration and interpretation of the experiences of permanently excluded CYP from the perspective of SDT, it allowed the voices of the participants to be listened to, recognised and presented as a unified, coherent and evidence-based message.

The findings of the current study are presented in Chapter Four; further discussion is provided in Chapter 5. The author maintains the findings are relevant to the LEA in which the research was carried out, and also the wider UK education system, including mainstream schools, special schools, APs and PRUs; implications for both teaching practice and school management are discussed (5.5.2.1). The universal and humanistic nature of BPNs Theory may support schools in addressing systemic inequalities in school exclusions related to ability, ethnicity, gender and/or socio-economic background (OCC, 2013b) and further resist the use of deficit theories that focus on the pathology of the individual to understand pupil behaviour. Furthermore, the study raises implications for further research into the BPNs of CYP (5.5.1), and the wider delivery of psychological services as EPSs increasingly look to develop innovative and evidence-based practices in evolving professional circumstances (Frederickson, 2002) (5.5.2.2).

1.7. Chapter summary
This chapter has introduced the research study contained in this thesis. It outlined the background to the research (1.2), including its theoretical underpinnings (1.2.1) and the local and political context (1.3). It then considered the position of the current study in relation to our current understanding of school exclusion (1.4), before briefly outlining the researcher’s motivation to employ their chosen methodological approach (1.5). Finally, the contribution of the current study was considered in light of its theoretical underpinning and chosen methodology, and the potential implications of its findings (1.6).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1. Overview of chapter

This chapter evidences a review of existing research and non-research literature related to the current study. The chapter begins by outlining the scope of the literature review (2.2), including a description of the search strategies (2.2.1) and inter-rater reliability checks used (2.2.2). The review is divided into two strands. Strand 1 introduces Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000) (2.3) and the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) (2.3.1). The three individual BPNs are defined and explained (2.3.2), before a consideration of research into BPN satisfaction is given (2.3.3). Relevant SDT-based research in educational settings is then reviewed (2.4), before Strand 1 is summarised (2.5). Strand 2 examines the relevant literature relating to school exclusion (2.6). It begins by defining school exclusion (2.6.1) and considering some of the concerns about its use (2.6.2). Specific attention is then given to the reasons for school exclusion (2.6.3), and the individual and social-contextual factors that may increase the risk of exclusion for a CYP (2.6.4). Consideration is then given to the experience of permanent exclusion and research studies exploring the experiences and perspectives of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP) (2.7), before Strand 2 is summarised (2.8). Chapter Two is then summarised (2.9), before key findings of the literature review are synthesised with a view to framing the aims and rationale of the study presented in Chapter Three (2.9.1).

2.2. Scope of the literature review

In line with the broad research issue for the study, the Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) of excluded CYP, the literature review explores the relevant literature relating to BPN Theory and SDT-based research in the field of education, and the research and non-research literature relating to school exclusion. The focus of the review is guided by the following review question:

‘What is known about the BPN satisfaction of CYP excluded from school?’

As stated above, the review is presented as two strands, with each strand split into two further parts focussing on specific elements of the area concerned (see Figure 2.1).
Strand 1.a presents an overview of SDT, BPN Theory and research into BPN satisfaction and Strand 1.b. critically reviews relevant SDT-based research in the field of education. Strand 2.a synthesises a broad selection of the research and non-research literature on school exclusion and Strand 2.b critically reviews research exploring the views and experiences of excluded CYP.

The review presented below was carried out following an initial literature review completed at an earlier stage in the research process. The previous review focused on school engagement, disaffection and Basic Psychological Need (BPN) satisfaction, with a view to exploring and understanding the factors that lead to disengagement, disaffection, challenging behaviour and permanent exclusion. A highly systematic approach was applied to both the searching and reviewing of the literature, which, whilst fulfilling its aims of being an accountable, replicable and updateable piece of work (EPPI Centre, 2012; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006), was arguably overly reductionist and led to
limited selection of research papers. It therefore did not provide the necessary depth and breadth of the available research and non-research literature needed to sufficiently inform and locate the current study. Furthermore, an implicit causal hypothesis began to emerge: that BPN satisfaction led to engagement and BPN limitation led to disengagement and disaffection. This did not fit with the exploratory nature of the study. The study’s original title, ‘Supported or thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people’ was also changed to reflect this.

The review presented below was therefore carried out with a revised focus and alternate search strategy (see 2.2.1). This enabled the inclusion of a broader and more relevant volume of literature in relation to school exclusion, and additional SDT-based research papers, which in turn supported the design of the study, including the research questions posed.

2.2.1. Search strategies
The initial review employed the use of a systematic search strategy with searches and reviews carried out during the month of August 2012. The EBSCO HOST online search engine was used to initiate searches within various electronic databases: PsychINFO, PsychArticles, Teacher Research Center, Educational Research Complete and Academic Search Complete. Boolean search logic was employed, using various search terms, descriptors and key words. These searches were supplemented with further manual electronic searches of Google, Google Scholar, eBooks, eJournals and hand searches through recent volumes of *Educational Psychology in Practice* and *Educational and Child Psychology* journals.

The initial body of identified literature was expanded, updated and refined in July 2013, through further systematic searches as above, along with additional manual electronic searches of Google, Google Scholar, eBooks, eJournals and hand searches. The results of these are provided in Appendix 2 (2.i – 2.vi), including detailed search records, inclusion and exclusion criteria and lists of the reviewed documents for Strand 1b and 2b. Further inclusion
and exclusion criteria were applied to the research papers reviewed for Strand 1.b and 2.b, to ensure their quality, appropriateness and relevance to the current study (Table 2.1 and 2.5). Inter-rated reliability checks were also used to ensure a reliable selection procedure was used for the critically reviewed studies (Strand 1.b and 2.b) (2.2.2). These checks were not applied to the documents identified for Strand 1.a and Strand 2.a. The purpose of these strands was to provide a wide sweep of the broad, relevant literature in each area, and not to provide a critical and replicable review.

2.2.2. Inter-rater reliability checks for Strand 1.b and 2.b article selection
In order to ensure that the critically reviewed research articles (Strand 1.b and 2.b) had been reliably selected against the inclusion and exclusion criteria for each strand, inter-rater reliability checks were carried out between the researcher and a third party based on percentage agreement. The third-party researcher was a senior lecturer, experienced in conducting psychological research to doctoral level and a member of the British Psychological Society (BPS). The process involved both parties reading and assessing each article against the inclusion and exclusion criteria for each strand (Table 2.1 and 2.5). 100% agreement was reached following a short discussion, leading to 6 research articles being reviewed for Strand 1.b and 6 articles being reviewed for Strand 2.b.

2.3. Strand 1.a. Self-Determination Theory
As stated earlier (1.2.1), the current study is informed and underpinned by the theoretical tenets of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT is a formal theoretical approach to the study of personality growth, development and motivation, which is supported by over 35 years of research (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The vast majority of this research has applied quantitative research methods to experimental and field studies (Ryan & Deci, 2002; Ryan & Niemiec, 2009); the researcher was unable to locate any qualitative SDT-based research that held relevance to the current study (see search record in Appendix 2.i). However, despite its predominant use of empirico-theoretic methodological approaches, SDT arguably ‘aligns with many of the values reflected in critiques of, and resistance to, mainstream
sciences in the domain of education' (Ryan & Niemiec, 2009, p. 264). Unlike many empirical or ‘positivist’ theories, SDT acknowledges the unique meanings of individuals, and represents a resistance to hegemony and reductionism in line with many schools of educational thought (Ryan & Niemiec, 2009).

Central to SDT is the ontological belief that:

‘…all individuals have natural, innate and constructive tendencies to develop an ever more elaborate and unified sense of self.’

(Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 5)

SDT suggests this occurs through a process involving autonomy, whereby people are driven to integrate their own thoughts, feelings and desires within their own psyches, and homonomy, the tending toward integration with individuals and groups in their social world (Ryan & Deci, 2002).

The idea that humans dynamically integrate their experiences into their sense of self is in keeping with humanistic theories of personality (Maslow, 1954) and cognitive theories of development (Piaget, 1971). However, in line with behavioural, cognitive and post-modern theories, SDT also acknowledges evidence of self-fragmentation and of conditioned responses to the social world (Ryan & Deci, 2002). SDT therefore provides a theoretical framework that allows for the integration of these discrepant viewpoints, suggesting that factors outside of the individual can influence our integrative tendencies in positive and negative ways. Central to SDT’s explanation for how and why this occurs is the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.3.1. Basic Psychological Needs Theory

Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) Theory is one of five micro-theories that make up Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Deci & Ryan (2000) align BPNs
with human physiological needs necessary for physical development and functioning, defining them as:

‘…innate psychological nutriments that are essential for ongoing psychological growth, integrity, and well-being.’

(p. 229)

Hence, SDT maintains that BPNs represent universal requirements that are evident in all cultures and across all developmental periods regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, sexuality and culture (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Although they may vary in their expression and be satisfied in a variety of ways, their core character is thought to be unchanging across humanity (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991).

SDT claims that all human beings possess the basic psychological need for: Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness; we strive for these nutriments and, when possible, gravitate towards situations that provide them (Ryan & Deci, 2002). As such, SDT applies the concept of BPNs to describe characteristics of the environment that are ‘supportive versus antagonistic to vital human functioning’ (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 6). Research has shown that personality growth, development and motivation are supported when these needs are satisfied, and thwarted when they are not (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.3.2. Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness

Autonomy

Seen as an extension of the concept of ‘internal perceived locus of causality’ (deCharms, 1968), Autonomy refers to being the perceived source of one’s own behaviour, i.e. it is self-determined (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This can mean acting from intrinsic interest or motivation, or from external values and requests that have been integrated into one’s self. In this sense, Autonomy is distinct from the concept of independence, as it is possible to be both autonomously dependent (for example, when sick or ill) and autonomously independent (for example, free to act with volition). In
short, the dimension of independence versus dependence is viewed by SDT as being orthogonal to the issue of Autonomy versus heteronomy. Where adolescents are often perceived as ‘wanting independence’, SDT would argue that they instead need supports for Autonomy to enable them to integrate the ideas, desires, traditions and values of the adult culture (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The degree to which an individual is able to integrate and internalise these extrinsically motivated behaviours is in turn correlated with how self-determined (or autonomous) they feel when carrying out the behaviour itself. For example, a CYP who resents having to complete homework assignments but understands and appreciates the long-term value of them is likely to feel more self-determined in his or her completion of homework than a CYP who completes their homework for fear of reprisals.

Self-Determination Theory proposes a taxonomy of types of regulation for extrinsic motivation arranged along a continuum (Figure 2.2). The first CYP in the example above would sit at the Identified Regulation point on the continuum, the second CYP at the Introjected Regulation point. Either side of these, Integrated Regulation provides the basis for the most autonomous form of extrinsically motivated behaviour and External Regulation the least (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Social and environmental factors such as threats, surveillance, evaluation (e.g. ‘high stakes testing’) and deadlines (e.g. ‘homework’) have all been shown to thwart the individual’s experience of Autonomy, suggesting a shift towards a more ‘external perceived locus of causality’ (Deci & Ryan, 2000). SDT maintains that the most controlling contexts hinder learning and development, reduce well-being and negatively affect performance (Ryan & Deci, 2009).

**Competence**

*Competence* refers to the individual’s need to feel effective in their continuous interaction with the social and physical environment, and experience opportunities to exercise and express their abilities (Deci & Ryan, 2000). This BPN leads people towards challenges that are optimal for their capabilities and to attempt to maintain those skills and capacities through activity. As such, *Competence* is viewed not as an acquired skill or ability, but as a
perceived sense of personal confidence and efficacy. As with the need for *Autonomy*, it is suggested that supports for this need will also aid the internalisation and integration of extrinsically motivated activities and behaviours (Deci & Ryan, 2002) and lead to higher levels of intrinsic motivation (Vallerand & Reid, 1984; 1988, as cited in Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991, p.334). Ryan and Deci (2002) state the following:

‘If people do not feel competent to perform a target behaviour, they are unlikely to internalize regulation of the behaviour; in fact, they will likely find an excuse not to do the behaviour at all, even in the presence of the significant other’.

(p. 19)

Negative feedback received from another, from failing a task/activity, or from the self through self-critical thought processes has generally been found to decrease intrinsic motivation and engagement (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991).
Relatedness

The concept of Relatedness refers to:

- Feeling connected to others;
- Caring for and being cared for by those others;
- Having a sense of belonging, both with other individuals and with one’s community

(Ryan & Deci, 2002, p.7)

Relatedness therefore concerns the need to feel oneself as being in relation to others in a psychological, rather than physical or sexual, sense. SDT proposes that individuals naturally internalise the values and regulations of their social groups, and that this is facilitated by both perceived Relatedness to socialising others and by a perceived ability (Competence) to understand the rationale behind and enact a specific behaviour (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Therefore, in order for CYP to value, integrate and endorse the ethos, rules and policy of the school, they need to feel both related and competent. This is likely to lead to Introjected or Identified Regulation of their behaviour within the school context, the most autonomous forms of extrinsically motivated behaviour (see Figure 2.2).

2.3.3. Basic Psychological Need satisfaction

Although the definition and specification of each individual BPN has been the source of extensive scientific debate (Ryan & Deci, 2002), a growing body of research referring both to SDT conceptualisations of BPN and to other congruent perspectives has provided evidence for the role of BPNs in psychological development and well-being (Patrick, Knee, Canevello, & Lonsbary, 2007). Social-contextual factors that support or allow BPN satisfaction have been repeatedly proven to yield engagement, mastery and synthesis, whereas factors that thwart or limit BPN satisfaction diminish motivation, growth, integrity and well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Furthermore, the universal and humanistic nature of SDT has led to its application in various life domains including parenting, environmentally friendly behaviour, health care, organisational management, exercise programmes and education
(2.4) (Ryan & Deci, 2002). This has led to a comprehensive understanding of the role of BPN satisfaction across contexts.

However, Ryan and Deci (2002) maintain that all contexts have the capacity to support or hinder people’s development and integrative tendencies:

‘Social environments can…either facilitate and enable the growth and integration propensities with which the human psyche is endowed, or they can disrupt, forestall, and fragment these processes resulting in behaviours and inner experiences that represent the darker side of humanity.’

(p. 6)

Cognitive Evaluations Theory (CET) is a branch of SDT that focuses on examining the conditions under which environments are facilitative or disruptive to motivation. It considers how social-contextual features such as feedback and rewards impact on the BPNs for Competence and Autonomy and in turn intrinsic motivation. Threats of punishment, evaluation, surveillance and imposed goals have been shown to reduce intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), whereas the provision of choice, opportunities for self-direction and the acknowledgement of feelings can enhance intrinsic motivation to the degree that they facilitate Autonomy and support Competence (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

**SDT and parents**

CET has contributed to the literature on parenting, with research findings highlighting the positive impacts of autonomy-supportive parenting (Joussemet, Landry, & Koestner, 2008). Koestner, Ryan, Bernieri and Holt (1984) showed that it was possible to encourage children to comply with behavioural limits without adversely effecting their intrinsic motivation, as long as the limits were provided in an Autonomy-supportive manner. Furthermore, SDT-based research has indicated negative effects of controlling parenting styles, differentiating between psychological control and behavioural control (Ryan, 1982). The former tries to change the child through parents
pressurising the child to think, feel or behave in a particular way using various techniques (Joussemet et al., 2008). These include guilt induction, love withdrawal, and invalidation of feelings (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004; Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). Joussemet et al. (2008) state the following:

‘It is not merely that children can develop well without external pressure and control: external pressure that goes against children’s developmental tendencies can actually have a negative effect on their development.’

(p. 194)

In contrast, *behavioural* control, which refers to parents communicating clear expectations and monitoring children’s behaviour related to those expectations, has been shown to support *Competence* and foster healthy development (Joussemet et al., 2008). Parent interview studies have demonstrated that parental *Autonomy* support is associated with academic achievement, teacher-rated academic adjustment and less ‘acting out’ in the school context (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Joussemet et al., 2008).

SDT-based research has identified a number of factors that can make it difficult to provide *Autonomy*-supportive parenting. These included external factors such as stress and lack of support from others, as well as child factors such as the child being difficult to parent (Grolnick & Apostoleris, 2002). Furthermore, these difficulties have been shown to undermine parents’ involvement with their children. For example, parents who viewed their child as difficult and themselves as ineffective were shown to be less involved in their children’s schooling than those seeing their child as easier and themselves as effective (Grolnick & Apostoleris, 2002). This research holds implications for the current study in respect of the importance of exploring the experiences of the participants outside of school in relation to parents and caregivers.
SDT and psychopathology

Also relevant to the broad research focus of the current study is the SDT-based research on childhood psychological health, well-being and psychopathology (Ryan, Deci, Grolnick, & La Guardia, 2006). Ryan and Connell (1989) found that higher levels of autonomous motivation in children was associated with greater empathy, more mature moral reasoning and more positive relatedness to others. Additionally, a number of studies with clinical samples have demonstrated how various forms of childhood and adolescent psychopathology are associated with lower levels of Autonomy support (Tuber, 1992). Furthermore, Ryan et al. (2006) suggest that childhood Conduct Disorder is a psychopathology of failed internalization. That is, due to deficits during their early development, the child has failed to internalise societal norms and moral principles at either an introjected or integrated level (see Self-Determination Continuum, Figure 2.2). Whilst acknowledging that biological factors may also contribute to the difficulties experienced, the authors suggest that the stated early developmental deficits can be robustly linked to the absence of social-contextual factors (as described by BPNs) that are essential for internalisation to occur (Ryan et al. 2006).

SDT research findings in relation to BPN satisfaction, and particularly in respect of Autonomy support, raise a number of implications for professionals and practitioners with regard to supporting motivation, development and psychological health. Furthermore, SDT offers very specific ideas concerning optimal parenting and teaching (Ryan et al., 2006), as well as insights into child psychopathology, which could arguably be of utility for those working with disaffected, disengaged or excluded CYP. Most importantly for the current study, SDT provides a framework through which one can understand how experience and perceptions can influence behaviour through the medium of BPN. This will be discussed further following a critical review of relevant SDT-based studies carried out in the domain of education.

2.4. Strand 1.b. Self-Determination Theory and education

As stated above, the field of education is one of many domains in which research and applied SDT-based work has been conducted (Ryan & Deci,
2002). Whilst no SDT-based research has been carried out with permanently excluded CYP, this strand identifies and reviews relevant SDT-based research with school-aged populations in educational settings in order to further understand the implications of SDT for CYP functioning in the school context. The following section contains the inclusion and exclusion criteria applied to the articles identified through the systematic search and a critical review of the selected papers.

2.4.1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria
Inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied at various stages of the process to narrow the search and ensure the relevance and appropriateness of the research papers identified (see Table 2.1). To ensure a generic level of quality assurance, it was important that the papers were research articles published in peer-reviewed journals. To ensure that the search covered the breadth of SDT research, the date range included papers published from 1985 onwards, the date of SDT’s seminal text (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Research had to be conducted in educational settings and participants had to be CYP of school age. Papers that were evaluating or assessing government policy, intervention programmes or treatments were excluded. Criteria 1-3 were applied during the electronic search process and criteria 4-6 at the abstract review stage. Following this stage, there was an accumulative total of 6 articles before inter-rater reliability checks. A detailed record of the Strand 1.b searches is included in Appendix 2.i and full list of papers reviewed for this section is provided in Appendix 2.iii.

2.4.2. BPN satisfaction and engagement, motivation and well-being in school
The six selected studies were approached from a psychological research perspective and employed quantitative research designs. In general, the articles consider the impact of social-contextual and individual factors on Basic Psychological Need (BPN) satisfaction in school, and in turn, the impact of BPN satisfaction on CYP’s engagement, motivation and well-being. The researcher did not identify any SDT-based research studies conducted with permanently excluded CYP, SDT-based research studies examining the relationship between BPN satisfaction and challenging behaviour, or SDT-
Inclusion Criteria | Exclusion Criteria
--- | ---
3. Participants aged between 5-19 years. | 3. Participants not aged between 5-19 years.
4. Research article. | 4. Not a research article.
5. Article does not evaluate or assess a policy, intervention programme or treatment. | 5. Article evaluates or assesses a policy, intervention programme or treatment.
6. Article references Self-Determination Theory and/or Basic Psychological Needs: *Autonomy*, *Competence* and *Relatedness* | 6. Article does not reference Self-Determination Theory and/or Basic Psychological Needs: *Autonomy*, *Competence* and *Relatedness*

Table 2.1. Strand 1b inclusion and exclusion criteria

based research carried out in educational setting applying qualitative research methods.

### 2.4.2.1. Engagement and motivation

Assor, Kaplan and Roth (2002) examined whether children and early adolescents could differentiate between the various types of *Autonomy*-enhancing versus -suppressing teacher behaviours and which of those were important in predicting feelings towards engagement in school. Participants answered questionnaires assessing both of these variables. Both groups differentiated between three types for each group (see Table 2.2). Assor, Kaplan, Kanat-Maymon and Roth (2005) expanded on this study by focussing on the potential effects of Directly Controlling Teacher Behaviours (DCTBs) on students. DCTBs included: giving frequent directives, interfering with children’s preferred pace of learning, and not allowing critical and independent
opinions. Participants completed questionnaires assessing their perceptions of their teacher’s DCTB, their own anxiety and anger, amotivation, and restricted and intensive engagement while studying in their teacher’s class. Findings suggest that the children’s perceptions of teachers as directly controlling aroused anger and anxiety, which enhanced amotivation and extrinsic motivation. This, in turn, led to undermined academic interest and restricted engagement (Assor et al., 2005).

Limitations to this study include the possibility that DCTBs may arouse other negative emotions in addition to those measured (anxiety and anger), and the reliance on student reports alone in assessing teacher behaviours. In addition, the relative cultural differences between Israel and the UK mean there is also a limit to which the findings can be generalised to the population identified for the current study. Furthermore, despite the findings of the second study matching their causal predictions, the correlational nature of the data means that a causal link cannot be made.

Opdenakker, Maulana and den Brok (2012) provide a further focus on the quality of teacher-student relationships, exploring how they develop over time and how they relate to student motivation. The findings indicate that the quality of teacher-student relationships decreased over time, whilst controlled motivation and autonomous motivation increased and decreased respectively.
Teacher-student interpersonal relationships emerged as significant predictors of autonomous motivation (Opdenakker et al., 2012), i.e. the better the perceived teacher-student relationship, the more self-motivated the students perceived themselves to be.

As with the research above, this study also has limitations in terms of cultural differences and correlational data. As such, the findings should be generalised and interpreted with caution. Moreover, when split into individual classes, the sample size presented is relatively small and there are potential regression towards the mean effects.

Tsai et al. (2008) find further supporting evidence for Autonomy-supportive teaching in their investigation into subject interest based on perceived Autonomy. Looking at both individual (personal interests) and situational (nature of the learning environment) characteristics, they found that they could predict which lessons individual students found interesting based on the level of Autonomy they perceived themselves to have in the lesson. It is important to note that the level of Autonomy a CYP experiences is affected by situational factors. For example, if teachers pay greater attention to CYP who show more interest during the lesson and give them more feedback, these CYP are more likely to experience them as Autonomy-supportive. Other external factors like exam pressure may also affect this measure by priming a negative mood in both teachers and students (Tsai et al., 2008).

2.4.2.2. Well-being
Van Ryzin, Gravely and Roseth (2009) investigated the effect of Autonomy, belongingness and engagement in school as contributors to adolescent well-being. Following the administering of self-report measures for: academic autonomy; belongingness (support from teachers and peers); engagement in learning; positive psychological adjustment (hope), students’ perceptions of academic autonomy and both teacher- and peer-related belongingness (i.e. support) in school were each found to have an independent positive effect on engagement in learning, which in turn had a positive impact on ‘adjustment’ (i.e. hope/well-being). Furthermore, their results also suggest that higher
levels of engagement in learning ‘contribute to increases in perceptions of academic autonomy and teacher-related support over time, which can create a positive feedback loop’ (Van Ryzin, Gravely, & Roseth, 2009, p. 10). The homogeneous socioeconomic nature of the sample (White middle-class secondary students) affects the external validity of this study. Self-report questionnaires were used, meaning that a portion of the relationship between the variables could have been due to shared-method variance.

Ryan and Grolnick (1986) examined the importance of children’s perceptions of their classroom environment for self-related constructs. The more autonomy supporting the children perceived the class to be, the greater the child’s self-esteem, perceived cognitive competence and mastery motivation. Furthermore, results suggested higher levels of aggressiveness when the child was less autonomously motivated or the teacher was perceived to be less Autonomy-supportive, indicating a link between aggression and perceptions of being externally controlled (Ryan and Grolnick, 1986).

In addition to the six studies considered above, there is a wealth of SDT-based research in educational settings demonstrating the benefits of autonomous motivation and Autonomy-supportive teaching across additional outcome measures, including academic achievement, creativity and positive emotionality (Reeve, 2002). Whilst it is possible to critique the correlational design and generalisability of the findings, SDT research in educational settings strongly suggests that autonomously (less extrinsically) motivated CYP thrive in educational settings, both developmentally and academically, and all students thrive when teachers support their Autonomy (Reeve, 2002). Furthermore, it emphasises the importance of teacher- and peer-relatedness for engagement and well-being (Van Ryzin et al., 2009). The implications for the current research are considered below (2.5).

2.5. Strand 1 summary and conclusions
As far as the author is aware at the time of writing, no SDT-based research has previously been carried out with permanently excluded CYP. Furthermore, upon carrying out extensive searches, the author was unable to
locate SDT-based studies employing qualitative research methods in educational settings. Nevertheless, it is apparent that SDT, BPN Theory and existing SDT-based research carried out in educational settings can inform the current study in a number of ways.

Firstly, as a theory of personality, development and motivation, SDT can inform the way in which the experiences and reported behaviour of permanently excluded CYP are interpreted and understood. Specifically, the concept of BPN provides a way in which social-contextual factors can be viewed as supportive or limiting to the individual (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT research into parenting and psychopathology contributes to the researcher’s understanding of the experiences of this group in terms of their lives outside of school and possible within-child factors respectively. This is discussed further below in relation to the school exclusion literature (2.9).

Secondly, SDT-based research in educational settings has evidenced and highlighted the importance of autonomous motivation for academic and developmental success in school (Reeve, 2002). Most relevant to the focus of the current study is the suggestion that CYP, regardless of circumstance, can benefit significantly from Autonomy-supportive teaching in terms of their engagement, motivation and well-being (Assor et al., 2002; Assor et al., 2005; Opdenakker et al., 2012; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986; Tsai et al., 2008; Van Ryzin et al., 2009). This is discussed further below in terms of how these aspects of school experience are related to school exclusion (2.9).

Thirdly, SDT recognises that contexts vary in their functional significance, depending the individual’s unique perceptions. Therefore, despite being a formal theory that predominantly uses quantitative researcher methods and correlational research designs (Vallerand, Pelletier, & Koestner, 2008), its theoretical tenets can arguably be integrated with qualitative research methods. This is also discussed further in 2.9 and 3.3.3.

Finally, SDT can inform the design and methodology of the current study. It is congruent with the ontological and epistemological position of the researcher
(discussed further in 3.3.1) and can inform interpersonal processes within the research process, e.g. encouraging and supporting participation (see 3.4.4.1).

2.6. Strand 2.a: understanding school exclusion
This strand examines and describes the relevant literature, legislation and research relating to school exclusion. In order to include a wide enough sweep of the relevant literature, a broad inclusion and exclusion criteria was applied to this strand (Appendix 2.iv). The list of papers contained in this strand includes 96 texts and as such is not included in the appendices. All cited texts are included in the references section. Subsections 2.6.1 – 2.6.4 provide a broad overview of the relevant literature under the themes: definitions, concerns, reasons and factors.

2.6.1. Defining school exclusion
The definitions of the word ‘exclude’ served as a starting point for the author’s understanding of school exclusion:

*Exclude* (verb)  
- deny (a living thing) access to a place, group, or privilege.  
- remove from consideration, notice or use.

(© Oxford English Dictionary, 2012)

The words ‘deny’ and ‘remove’ arguably house negative connotations and can be associated with notions of unfairness and punishment respectively. Indeed it has been suggested that to *remove* a CYP from mainstream education is to *deny* them of both educational and social learning opportunities (Blyth & Milner, 1993; Parsons, 1999).

Within the school exclusion research literature, the noun *exclusion* takes on a variety of forms. At its most comprehensive it can be defined as ‘being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social, economic, political or cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society’ (Macrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003, p. 88-89). At its most succinct, it implies rejection (Kyriacou, 2003). For the purpose of the current study and
thesis, the concept of school exclusion was understood to mean, as it is throughout the relevant literature, a disciplinary measure that prevents a CYP from attending a particular school.

The 1993 Education Act (HMSO, 1993) defined two types of exclusion: ‘fixed term’ and ‘permanent’ exclusion, discarding a third category of ‘indefinite’ exclusion introduced in the 1986 Education Act (HMSO, 1986). Fixed term exclusions can remove a pupil from the school premises for up to 45 days in one academic year (15 days per term), but allow the CYP to remain on the school roll (DfES, 2001). The process of permanent exclusion categorically removes the pupil from the school and the school roll forever, with the local education authority (LEA) responsible for finding the CYP an alternative school place elsewhere.

There are also widely used forms of unofficial school exclusion. Firstly, ‘managed moves’ allow a collaborating school ‘to accept a pupil at risk of exclusion from another collaborating school with the aim of providing a ‘fresh start’ for the child’ (Vincent, Harris, Thomson, & Toalster, 2007, p. 284). Whilst this may avoid the stigma attached to permanent exclusion (Vincent et.al, 2007), some have raised concern over the lack of government guidance available for schools on developing effective protocols for managed moves (Inaura, 2007). Secondly, ‘informal exclusions’, i.e. sending a child home from school without official record, are known to be used by schools despite their illegality (OCC, 2013a). The Office of the Children’s Commissioner (OCC) recently claimed approximately 1600 schools in England have ‘sent children home for disciplinary reasons without recording it as an exclusion’ (OCC, 2013a, p. 7). Finally, many schools operate an ‘internal exclusion’ policy, whereby CYP are put into ‘isolation’ for a fixed period of time, removed from certain lessons, or are sent home for the remainder of the day following an incident (Kyriacou, 2003).

2.6.2. Concerns about school exclusion
As stated above, there are concerns around illegal school exclusion practices in the form of ‘informal exclusions’ (OCC, 2013a). There are also a number of
negative outcomes associated with school exclusion, and specific concerns about the impact of permanent exclusion (MacCrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003). Short-term effects strongly associated with permanent exclusion from school include feelings of rejection and stigmatisation and low educational attainment (De Pear & Garner, 1996; Kinder, Wilkin, & Wakefield, 1997; Pomeroy, 2000). Long-term outcomes include wider forms of social exclusion (Osler et al., 2001; Social Exclusion Unit, 1998), including criminal behaviour (Berridge et al., 2001), an increased likelihood of becoming a teenage parent, and being unemployed and/or homeless later in life (MacCrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003). Berridge et al. (2001) found that:

'Permanent exclusion tended to trigger a complex chain of events which served to loosen the young person's affiliation and commitment to a conventional chain of life. This important transition was characterised by: the loss of time structures; a re-casting of identity; a changed relationship with parents and siblings; the erosion of contact with pro-social peers and adults; closer association with similarly situated young people and heightened vulnerability to police surveillance'

(p. vi)

In addition to the concerns with outcomes for permanently excluded CYP, the OCC and the United Nations (UN) have recently raised concerns about systemic inequalities in school exclusions (OCC, 2013b; UN, 2008). In 2010/11, students considered to have SEN were nine times more likely to be permanently excluded than those who did not have these needs; Black and Mixed White/Black Caribbean pupils were around three times more likely to be permanently excluded from school compared to the school population as a whole (DfE, 2012b; OCC, 2013b). Boys represented 75 and 77 per cent of the total number of fixed and permanent exclusions respectively and CYP who were eligible for free school meals were around four times more likely to be permanently excluded (OCC, 2013b). As a result, a Black Caribbean boy with SEN who is eligible for free school meals is 168 times more likely to be
permanently excluded from school than a White girl with no SEN from an affluent family (OCC, 2013b).

2.6.3. Reasons for school exclusion

The most commonly reported reason for CYP being excluded from school in England is consistently reported to be ‘persistent disruptive behaviour’. This is described as ‘challenging behaviour, disobedience, persistent violation of school rules’, and in 2010/11 accounted for 24.8% of fixed and 33.7% of permanent exclusions (DfE, 2012b). Other officially recorded reasons for school exclusion include the following:

- Physical assault against a pupil
- Physical assault against an adult
- Verbal abuse/ threatening behaviour against a pupil
- Verbal abuse/ threatening behaviour against an adult
- Bullying
- Racist abuse
- Sexual misconduct
- Drug and alcohol related
- Damage
- Theft
- Other

(DfE, 2012b, p. 19)

The number and percentage of exclusions reported under these categories is significantly lower than for the category of ‘persistent disruptive behaviour’ (DfE, 2012b). Daniels et al. (2003) note the possible ‘construction’ of reasons for exclusion, suggesting that many first hand accounts of exclusion challenge these descriptors, introducing elements of provocation or other staff-pupil relationship difficulties. Whilst there are likely inaccuracies and distortions in such data, and arguments to be made about the way such data is collected and analysed (Vulliamy & Webb, 2000; Carlile, 2013), it seems that CYP are excluded from school for reasons that are considered to singularly or
accumulatively challenge the rules and safety of individuals inside and/or outside of the learning environment. Such behaviour has been regular focus in the literature surrounding school exclusion for a significant period of time (Blyth & Milner, 1996), leading some to suggest that ‘whatever it is that drives permanent exclusion is a fairly durable feature of English schooling’ (Daniels and Cole, 2010, p. 116).

2.6.3.1. From reasons to interactive factors

‘Persistent disruptive behaviour’ and other school-based definitions for trigger incidents provide a way of documenting the type and severity of behaviours that lead to a CYP being excluded from school. However, many within the literature argue that in order to fully understand school exclusion, researchers and educational professionals need to move beyond descriptive, school-based definitions and examine the underlying precipitating factors that lead to its occurrence (Carlile, 2013; Gross & McChrystal, 2001; Macrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003).

Whilst the types of behaviours leading to a CYP’s removal from school have remained relatively constant, the way in which such behaviours are constructed, viewed and understood has arguably evolved, and continues to evolve, over time (Blyth & Milner, 1996). Historically, challenging behaviour was pathologised, with CYP exhibiting such behaviours referred to as ‘maladjusted’, ‘disturbed’ or ‘disturbing’ and treated with medication and/or sent to special schools or ‘borstals’ (Blyth & Milner, 1996; Galloway & Goodwin, 1987; Jones, 2003). Following the 1981 Education Act (HMSO, 1981), the previously used categorisation system was abolished and a new understanding of ‘Special Educational Needs’ (SEN) was presented in terms of the difficulties experienced by CYP as opposed to problems attributed to ‘within-child’ factors (Jones, 2003). However, Parsons (1996) argues that CYP continued to be viewed as the culprit as opposed to the victim, and highlights the language used in governmental and academic literature at the time, for example the Pupils with Problems Circulars (DfE, 1994).
The introduction of the 2001 SEN Code of Practice (DfES, 2001) extended the concept of SEN to CYP experiencing ‘Behavioural, Social and Emotional difficulties’ (BESD), stressing that some CYP face barriers that lead them to experience greater difficulty with learning than most of their peers (DfES, 2001). Moreover, this document includes a recognition that these difficulties, and their resulting behaviours, are linked to a range of interactive factors both inside and outside of the individual; this perspective has been acknowledged in subsequent guidance on school exclusion (DCSF, 2008a).

### 2.6.4. Individual and social-contextual factors

The vulnerability of CYP to unfavourable socio-economic conditions is well known (Lloyd, 2006; Yates & Masten, 2004). However, it has been suggested that how a child responds to risk is a function of a number of possible protective factors (Garmezy, 1985; Rutter, 1979). This is linked to the psychological construct of ‘resilience’, and research has identified various protective factors that promote positive development and resilience against adversity (Yates & Masten, 2004) (see Table 2.3).

However, Bynner (2001) suggests that although an understanding of protective factors can inform the specific nature of the intervention, an understanding of the risk factors affecting particular CYP is needed to inform practitioners as to the necessary area of intervention. Risk factors associated with school exclusion are considered below under the headings: individual; family, living circumstances and socio-economic factors; school and educational factors. Rutter (1990) argues that these factors should be viewed as processes or mechanisms, which act at various stages and within varying contexts to determine the direction a CYP’s development will take.

#### 2.6.4.1. Individual factors

As discussed above (2.6.3.1), the understanding of ‘within-child’ factors that influence CYP’s behaviour has broadened over recent years to encompass a range of difficulties and associated SEN (Jones, 2003). Behavioural difficulties are now associated with a broad spectrum of additional needs, including speech language and communication difficulties (Lindsay & Dockrell, 2000;
Policy
Policies that promote universal access to resources that facilitate positive adaptation:
- Preventative health care
- Adequate nutrition
- Affordable safe housing

Community
- Safe neighbourhoods
- Connections to pro-social organisations
- Connections to competent, caring and pro-social adult models (e.g. mentors)

Education
High quality schools
- Attentive, trained and compensated teachers
- After-school programmes
- School recreation resources (e.g. sports, music, art)

Family
Stable and organised home environment
- Close relationship to a responsive caregiver
- Positive sibling relationships
- Supportive kinship networks
Socioeconomic advantage

Individual
A history of positive adaptation
- Secure attachment in infancy
- Positive peer relationships
- Effective emotional and behavioural regulation strategies
Positive view of self (e.g. self-confidence, self-esteem, hopefulness)
Good intellectual and problem-solving skills

Table 2.3. Examples of protective factors that promote positive development
(Adapted from Yates and Masten, 2004, p. 525)

Lindsay, Dockrell, & Strand, 2007), literacy difficulties (Miles & Stipek, 2006; OFSTED, 2006) and cognitive impairment (Fisher & Blair, 1998). Hamill and Boyd (2002) claim that CYP considered to have behavioural difficulties are also more likely to experience low self-esteem, poor concentration, low motivation and poor interpersonal skills. Recent official exclusion statistics show a strong relationship between SEN and exclusion from school (see 2.6.2).

These associated difficulties may be reciprocally linked with how efficacious a child feels within the learning context and the resulting amount, and quality of, of engagement and motivation (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 2002). Research has suggested that pupils are likely to avoid or disrupt those lessons that they find
boring, irrelevant, stressful or difficult (O'Keefe, 1994; Ryan & Deci, 2009; Solomon & Rogers, 2001) and motivation can therefore be seen to play a role with relation to engagement and success in learning (Reeve, 2002). Whilst the language surrounding exclusion can imply that such difficulties are located within the child, research increasingly points to the importance of social-contextual factors outside of the individual (Pajares, 2002; Reeve, 2002). It is therefore helpful to view the CYP and the difficulties they experience in relation to the social-context. These are considered under the headings:

- Family, living circumstances and socio-economic factors
- School and educational factors

2.6.4.2. Family, living circumstances and socio-economic factors
The importance of family, living circumstances and socio-economic factors is well documented in the research literature around school exclusion (Gross & McChrystal, 2001; MacCrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003; Thomson, 2002). Upon reviewing the literature in this area, MacCrae et al. (2003) state that:

‘…research findings clearly demonstrate correlations between aspects of disadvantage, emotional and social disruptions and high levels of family stress with higher levels of exclusions from school”.

(p. 93)

Bowlby (1969) attaches importance to the way in which infants form bonds and attachments with primary caregivers in the early stages of life, suggesting that insecure attachments lead to the development of a fragile sense of self and difficulties with relationships later in life. These difficulties may manifest in negative teacher-child relationships, where the child misbehaves to gain attention, acknowledgement and a sense of worth (Harris, Vincent, Thomson, & Toalster, 2006). Neurological research also emphasises the importance of early experiences, pointing to the vulnerability of the infant brain to environmental influences and the experience of stress (Bynner, 2001). Where sensitive and responsive parenting has been shown to help build connections
in areas of the brain known to be important for social and moral functioning (Raine & Yang, 2006), ‘children exposed to early social deprivation show long-term cognitive and behavioural deficits’ (Chugani et al, 2001, p. 1300).

Looked After Children (LAC) are a group more likely to experience negative early childhood experiences like those stated above and are more at risk of being excluded from school (Blyth & Milner, 1996). In the mid-1990s, a child living in a children’s home was around 80 times more likely to be excluded than a child living with his or her family (Firth & Horrocks, 1996). Firth (1995) demonstrated a close association between placement change and permanent exclusion (see Table 2.4). According to these figures, CYP with relatively stable care placements have a 20 per cent chance of being permanently excluded. In recognising the vulnerable nature of LAC, statutory guidance now states that educational provision should be made for excluded LAC beginning the first day of their exclusion (DCSF, 2010).

Parental mental health issues, family conflict and separation have been shown to impact on academic achievement, and can lead to CYP returning to earlier levels of cognitive performance and behaviour (Blyth & Milner, 1996; Caspi, Harkness, Moffitt, & Silver, 1996). Bynner (2001) describes how some children may develop ‘temperamental difficulties’ in the time preceding and following divorce, and provides an example of how such difficulties may manifest:

‘…children show low levels of attachment to their parents, which weakens further their often already ineffective social controls. The consequence is that the child enters primary school ill-prepared. Another set of relational problems, comparable to that in the family, then follow but this time between teachers and children. The child’s behaviour in the classroom is a source of stress for the teacher who will tend to exercise every effort to inhibit the child’s disruptive effects and consequently appears in the child’s eyes in even more of an authoritarian role. Exclusion from school may follow.’

(p. 20)
Table 2.4. Care placement change and permanent exclusion. Adapted from Firth (1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of moves</th>
<th>Number of permanently excluded</th>
<th>Percentage permanently excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bynner (2001) goes on to suggest that in such cases, frequent stand-offs between the teacher and the pupil allow the child to acquire a heroic quality with their peers leading to short-term boosts in self-esteem that in turn reinforce the problem behaviour. Such children may exhibit a form of alienation throughout their school careers that originates in alienation within their own families (Rutter et al., 1997).

Research also suggests that the extent to which parents can influence positive educational outcomes for the children is related to the quality of their own educational experience (Gazeley, 2010), and that children are less prepared for pre-school experiences when the parents' own educational resources are limited (Bynner, 2001). It becomes clear that there are a number of social-contextual factors linked to a CYP’s family/living circumstances that can influence their experience, behaviour and success at school. These are often closely linked with and influenced by socio-economic factors surrounding the CYP (Bynner, 2001).

As stated above, CYP from ‘lower’ socio-economic backgrounds have a greater chance of being excluded from school than their peers (see 2.6.2). They are also more prone to risk factors associated with family and/or living circumstances as discussed above (Blyth & Milner, 1993). Social and economic disadvantage has also been shown to be one of various predictors
of cognitive development and in turn achievement at school (Bynner, 2001), and some suggest a strong inter-generational link between achievement levels and poverty (MacCrae et al., 2003; Parsons, 1999). Other studies have suggested that CYP at risk of low attainment are at increased risk of involvement in disciplinary processes (Gazeley, 2010) and that CYP from lower socio-economic backgrounds feel a lower sense of belonging at school than their peers, leading to disaffection and a greater chance of school exclusion (Willms, 2003).

2.6.4.3. School and educational factors

The National Curriculum was introduced in 1988 as part of the Education Reform Act (HMSO, 1988). The standardisation of the content taught across schools enabled assessment and led to the introduction of and increasing importance of school ‘league tables’. Some argue that high-stakes testing can result in increased pressure on school staff, leading to a reduced focus on inclusion and a greater tendency to permanently exclude CYP (Carlile, 2013; Cooper, 2002; Hayden and Dunne, 2001). Others have noted the correlation between the rise of high-stakes testing and the rapid rise of permanent exclusions in England the 1990s (Blyth and Milner, 1993; Hayden, 2003; MacCrae et al., 2003; Parsons, 1996).

A further criticism of league tables focuses on their failure to take into account economic inequality, and the challenging social conditions that contribute to and exacerbate the difficulties experienced by failing schools and their staff (Blyth & Milner, 1993). Social and economic inequality, along with other local and/or regional factors, lead to significant variations in levels of attainment, and also in the values, ethos and behavioural expectations of different schools (Evans, 2006; Gillborn & Mirza, 2000). This inequity of experience and opportunity is arguably compounded by academic and social selection (Smithers & Robinson, 2010). As such, challenging behaviour is likely to be perceived as more or less challenging depending on the environment within which it manifests (Barkley, 2006; Greene, 1995). Incongruence between teachers’ or schools’ standards of acceptable behaviour, teaching style and
behaviour of the CYP are therefore likely to influence teacher-student relations (Barkley, 2006).

These interactions can also be influenced by the experience, knowledge and beliefs of the teacher, for example affecting whether the teacher attributes the child's behaviour to volitional action and intentionality, or to underlying causes outside of their control (Weinstein, 1995). It has been suggested that this can lead to a process known as the 'sustaining expectation effect', in which the teacher expects the child to continue or maintain previous patterns of behaviour (Saracho, 1991). Anderson, Vogel and Reuschlein (1991) state that:

‘…teachers expect students to sustain previously developed behaviour patterns to the point that they take these behaviour patterns for granted and fail to see or capitalize on changes in the students’ potential.’

(p. 22)

Attwood, Croll and Hamilton (2002, cited in Daniels et al., 2003, p. 137) have drawn attention to the fact that poor relationships permeate children’s problems at school prior to exclusion. Furthermore, Hayden and Dunne (2001) found that parents believed that personality clashes with particular teachers was an underlying reason in 60% of their sample of 80 families. 78% of this group of parents also believed that major underlying reasons were:

- Schools concerned about its public image or position on examination or other league tables;
- Schools needing a scapegoat;
- Other parents complaining about their child.

(Hayden & Dunne, 2001)
At a whole school level, variables such as ‘teacher-setting compatibility’ (general school environment, student population preference and teaching satisfaction) and ‘child-setting compatibility’ (size of class, seating arrangements, open vs. closed classroom environments) have been shown to impact on the effective management of children exhibiting challenging behaviour (Greene, 1995). In relation to school policies, the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) identified the presence of a good behaviour policy as a significant difference between schools with high and low rates of exclusion (OFSTED, 1996). A good behaviour policy advocating consistent expectations and boundaries for acceptable and unacceptable behaviour contributes towards a predictable learning environment within which the CYP can feel safe, secure and rewarded. It has been suggested that such environments can ‘have a protective effect for children under stress and living otherwise unrewarding lives’ (Rutter, 1991, p.9).

The literature considered above suggests that our understanding of school exclusion and the precipitating issue of challenging behaviour can be informed by the consideration of associated individual and social-contextual factors. An interactionist perspective such as this moves away from a reliance on school-based definitions such as ‘disaffection’ and ‘challenging behaviour’ when trying to understand the reasons for school exclusion and towards an acknowledgement and exploration of a range of complex factors. The following subsection explores an area of the school exclusion literature that is of further relevance to the focus of the current study: the experience of permanent exclusion.

2.7. Strand 2.b. Experiencing permanent exclusion

As stated earlier, the experiences and perspectives of CYP have been increasingly acknowledged in recent years (UNICEF, 2012). Since the inception of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) in 1989, governments have been obliged to uphold, implement and promote the human rights of CYP. Pomeroy (1999) refers to CYP as ‘recipients of policy in practice’ (p. 466), suggesting a moral imperative to involve them in direct and indirect processes such as policy formation and
research. The Children Act (2004) emphasises the need for organisations to involve the most vulnerable CYP in the decisions and actions that affect them. As well as enabling CYP to voice their own views, perspectives and experiences, the ‘voice of the child’ can arguably provide an insight into the way school systems operate and how CYP experience the range of individual and social-contextual factors outlined above (Pomeroy, 1999; Munn & Lloyd, 2005). As such, their direct involvement in research can represent a methodological strength (Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Pomeroy, 1999).

Despite this, there are a limited amount of studies exploring the experience of exclusion, and more specifically permanent exclusion, from the perspective of CYP (Brown, 2007; Munn & Lloyd, 2005). Some have attributed this to the ‘hard to reach' or ‘hard to find’ (Macnab, Visser, & Daniels, 2007) nature of this group, due to the complexities of the difficulties they face (Chilokoa and McKie, 2007). Others have highlighted the difficulties that these CYP may experience with trusting those in positions of authority or in expressing their feelings (Bond, 2006). Furthermore, some have suggested that adults across various cultures have been ‘reluctant or unable to regard children’s knowledge and understanding as worthy of respectful consideration’ (Lloyd-Smith & Tarr, 2000, p. 62). Nevertheless, it is increasingly agreed that efforts should be made to listen and promote the voices of CYP before imposing adult-led solutions to the challenges they face (Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Lewis & Lindsay, 2000; Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999; Upton & Varma, 1996).

2.7.1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria
Inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied to narrow the search and ensure the relevance and appropriateness of the papers identified (see Table 2.5). Criteria 1-2 were applied during the electronic search process and criteria 3-5 at the abstract review stage. A detailed record of the searches carried out for Strand 2b is included in Appendix 2.v and a full list of papers reviewed for this section is provided in Appendix 2.vi.
Inclusion Criteria | Exclusion Criteria
---|---
1. Participants aged between 5-19 years. | 1. Participants not aged between 5-19 years.
2. Research article. | 2. Not a research article.
3. Sample includes CYP who have experienced a form of exclusion from school. | 3. Sample does not include CYP who have experienced a form of exclusion from school.
4. Study considers, analyses or presents the perspectives of CYP who have experienced a form of exclusion from school. | 4. Study does not consider, analyse or who have experienced a form of exclusion from school.
5. Study does not evaluate or assess a policy, intervention programme or treatment. | 5. Study evaluates or assesses a policy, intervention programme or treatment.

Table 2.5. Strand 2.b inclusion and exclusion criteria

### 2.7.2. The experiences and perspectives of permanently excluded CYP

Gersch & Nolan (1994) interviewed permanently excluded CYP \((n=6)\) about their perspectives of school and school exclusion. Listening to the views of the CYP suggested that prior to their exclusion the participants had experienced a number of difficulties and challenges both inside and outside of school. These included:

- Adverse family circumstances;
- Difficulties with peer relationships and behaviour (often beginning at primary school);
- Frequent changes of primary school placement;
- Poor teacher relationships;
- Difficulties with schoolwork.

(Gersch & Nolan, 1994)

CYP identified positive relationships with members of staff to be the most important factor that would support them when reintegrating following exclusion.
This was a small-scale study with a small sample. As such, the findings cannot be deemed representative of all excluded children. They do however provide an insight into the difficulties that some CYP face, and the risk factors that may lead to unsuccess- ful mainstream school experiences. Furthermore, the qualitative methods employed serve to promote the ‘voice of the child’ (Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Upton & Varma, 1996); the authors call for more studies of this kind to elicit the views and experiences of this group.

Pomeroy (1999) interviewed Year 10 and 11 pupils (n=6) who had been permanently excluded from school in order to explore their perception of their school experience. Findings suggest that interviewees saw themselves at the bottom of a social hierarchy and viewed the way they were treated ‘as treatment suitable for children: lack of autonomy, responsibility and, most importantly, respect’ (p. 477). Fair and respectful discipline, and the mutually respectful treatment between individuals in a working relationship were identified as the ideal model of teacher-student relationships. Pomeroy (1999) suggests:

‘…consideration must be given to both the structural and interpersonal features of school life which hinder the development of positive and mutually respectful relations between teachers and students who experience difficulty at school.’

(p. 480)

As part of a larger mixed-methods study aimed at identifying common factors and issues around the exclusion of statemented pupils from mainstream schools, Gross and McChrystal (2001) conducted semi-structured interviews with permanently excluded CYP with statements of SEN. Of six case studies, identified from a larger sample, two CYP were interviewed; one of these participants was ‘not willing to talk about his school experience’ (Gross & McChrystal, 2001, p. 355). The other child was reported to view his difficulties as related to difficulties with teacher- and peer-relationships. Given the
difficulties experienced in recruiting and engaging CYP in this aspect the research process, this data contributes little to the overall findings of the study or to our understanding of the experiences and perspectives of permanently excluded CYP. It does, however, demonstrate the difficulties that can be faced when trying to access the views of this particular group of CYP (Robson, 2011).

Munn and Lloyd (2005) interviewed excluded pupils involved in three separate projects. In relation to the ‘fairness of exclusion’, many CYP expressed the view that their exclusion from school was unfair due to unequal treatment from teachers, and cited other CYP who behaved in similar ways but were not excluded. In terms of ‘who and what cause exclusion?’ a range of views were expressed, although all CYP ‘accepted responsibility for actions which, in their view, justly resulted in their exclusion’ (Munn & Lloyd, 2005, p. 213). The authors link this to a tendency for CYP to individualise problems and see them as private troubles. However, some CYP suggested that the behavioural expectations of schools were unreasonable and resisted the pressure to conform and adhere to ‘automatic authority’ (p. 214). In respect of ‘difficulties outside of school’, in line with Gersch and Nolan’s (1994) findings, a number of CYP reported difficult experiences at home (i.e. parental domestic violence, substance misuse) and difficulties with peer relationships. Some CYP reported difficulties with peer relationships following their exclusion from school, suggesting a link between educational and social exclusion. Whilst the authors acknowledge the results hold no statistical significance, they suggest they contribute to the debate in three ways, with implications for schools, further research and policy (Munn & Lloyd, 2005).

Solomon and Rogers (2001) used a mixed-methods approach to investigate the perceptions of the circumstances of pupils registered with Pupil Referral Units (PRUs). As part of this design, interviews were conducted with CYP (n=6) drawn entirely from PRUs, to elicit information and opinion through an open discussion. Solomon and Rogers (2001) note that, contrary to predictions, the CYP did not reject the idea of academic learning or embrace the principles of vocational study:
'In the interviews, views on curriculum were based variously on a dislike of school in general, liking/dislike for particular subject teachers and a preference for more active subjects, but the majority of informants were not personally interested in any form of education, however ‘relevant’ or practical.’

(p. 336)

By cross-referencing the findings from the interview data with a quantitative measure of motivation, the authors suggest that low feelings of self-efficacy (particularly in terms of agency and choice) are related to the CYP’s espoused perspectives. Participants portrayed themselves ‘as people to whom things happen which are largely out of their control’ (Solomon and Rogers, 2001, p. 341). In line with elements of Munn and Lloyd’s (2005) findings, in the interviews, CYP attributed the ‘fault’ of their current situation to teachers or to uncontrollable aspects of themselves, e.g. attention deficit disorder, having a temper, getting in a mood, being stressed. Furthermore, most CYP did not express a clear vocational direction, presenting ‘an unworried and unrealistic view of the future that sometimes approached self-protection’ (Solomon & Rogers, 2001, p. 341).

More recently, Daniels (2011) interviewed students two years after they were permanently excluded from school. The aim of the study was to identify both positive and negative contributing factors to their current situations. In line with Gersch and Nolan’s (1994) findings, the young people identified the strength of a relationships with significant others in school (i.e. pastoral support worker, teacher) as contributing to positive outcomes outside of school. Furthermore, participants also cited the level of commitment demonstrated by staff to challenge existing barriers to success as contributing to positive future outcomes. However, many of the young people ‘retained limited horizons, lacked self-belief and their marginalisation tended to increase, sometimes associated with increasing offending’ and believed ‘the direction of their lives was outside of their control (Daniels, 2011, p.46).
Whilst the above studies are predominantly small-scale studies that lack generalisability across contexts, their strength lies in the essential perspectives contributed by the CYP (Solomon & Rogers, 2001). Their unique understanding of school and school processes leads to concrete examples of good and bad practice (Pomeroy, 1999), and highlight the importance of staff-student relationships to their behavioural and academic success (Daniels, 2011; Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Pomeroy, 1999). Furthermore, their voices shine a light on the way they view themselves and the range of difficulties they experience inside and outside of school (Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Munn & Lloyd, 2005). The importance of this is considered further below (2.8).

2.8. Strand 2 summary and conclusions
This strand has served to provide a broad sweep of the relevant research and non-research literature on school exclusion. Strand 2.a places the current study in the context of an evolving understanding of ‘challenging behaviour’ and the individual and social-contextual factors that often precipitate school exclusion. Despite falling rates of both fixed-term and permanent exclusions, concerns exist about the use of ‘informal’ exclusions, the short and long term effects of school exclusion (MacCrae et al., 2003), and systemic inequalities apparent in the national exclusion statistics (OCC, 2013b). Strand 2.b reveals the utility and importance of listening to CYP, and particularly those who have experienced school exclusion in its most ultimate form. The illuminating insights provided by these studies suggest validity in the qualitative exploration of these minority-lived experiences. By allowing and supporting CYP to be heard in this way, our understanding of school exclusion arguably acquires an authenticity that is otherwise unachievable. Hence, best practice and policy can then be informed in ways that are respectful to and cognisant of the views, experiences and perspectives of the people and lives it directly affects.

2.9. Chapter summary
This chapter has evidenced an extensive review of the existing research and non-research literature related to the current study, with a view to answering the following review question:
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‘What is known about the BPN satisfaction of CYP excluded from school?’

Strand 1.a outlined the theoretical underpinnings of the research through an introduction to Self Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000) (2.3) and the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPN) (2.3.1 & 2.3.2), before considering research into BPN satisfaction, including research in the domains of parenting and psychopathology (2.3.4). The contribution of SDT to our understanding of intra- and inter-personal processes in the classroom was then considered through a review of relevant SDT-based research in educational settings (2.4). The contribution of SDT to the current study was then considered (2.5). Strand 2 explored the relevant literature relating to school exclusion (2.6). It began by defining school exclusion (2.6.1) and considering some of the concerns about its use (2.6.2). Specific attention was then given to the reasons for school exclusion (2.6.3), and the individual and social-contextual factors that may increase the risk of exclusion for a CYP (2.6.4). Research studies exploring the experiences and perspectives of permanently excluded CYP were then reviewed (2.7), before Strand 2 was summarised (2.8). The final subsection in this chapter (2.9.1) synthesises the key findings of the above literature review, in order to frame the rationale and aims of the current study presented in the following chapter.

2.9.1. SDT and school exclusion
‘What is known about the BPN satisfaction of CYP excluded from school?’

Despite no SDT-based studies having been conducted with permanently excluded CYP, the utility of SDT and its accompanying research base to the current study is apparent. As a theory of personality growth, development and motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2002), SDT offers insight into the functional significance of precipitating individual and/or social-contextual factors as identified in the school exclusion literature, to the extent that these factors can be seen as supportive of limiting to the CYP’s BPN. SDT arguably sheds further light on the educational and school-based factors identified by the school exclusion literature, including the importance of teacher-student...
relationships, suggesting that the thwarting of the BPN for *Autonomy*, *Competence* and *Relatedness* is associated with reduced engagement (Assor et al., 2005), motivation (Tsai et al., 2005) and well-being (Van Ryzin et al., 2009) in the classroom. Furthermore, insights from SDT research into parenting (Joussemet et al., 2008; Koestner, 1984) and psychopathology (Ryan et al., 2006; Tuber, 1992) widen our understanding of the individual factors and social-contextual impacts of family, living circumstances and socio-economic factors. Hence, whilst SDT is yet to be applied to the understanding of challenging behaviour and school exclusion, its utility is apparent.

It is also evident that the school exclusion literature identified and presented above, whilst broad and comprehensive in its coverage, is limited in application of psychological theory to its focus; most research in this area appears to approach the issue from sociological, educational or policy-focused perspectives. Whilst a limited number of studies stem from a psychological research perspective (e.g. Daniels, 2011; Gersch & Nolan, 1994), none apply explicit, evidence-based, psychological theoretical underpinnings to their design and methodology, or the interpretation of their results. SDT-based research in educational settings has demonstrated the value of such an approach, with best-practice solutions emerging from the findings (Assor et al., 2005; Reeve, 2002).

Finally, the literature review demonstrates that whilst no research has focused specifically on the BPN of permanently excluded CYP, various studies have sought out and listened to the voices of that group (Daniels, 2011; Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Gross & McChrystal, 2001; Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999; Solomon & Rogers, 2001). Whilst this research has discussed both the moral imperative and the value of listening to these CYP (Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Pomeroy, 1999; Upton & Varma, 1996), the author suggests it is also vitally important to understand the meaning and implications of the words they say. The application of SDT to their message may support this in a way that is both illuminating and beneficial to key stakeholders, most importantly the CYP.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY
3.1. Overview of chapter

This chapter provides a description of the research design and methodology employed in the current study. It begins by explaining the rationale for the research (3.2), its consequent aims (3.2.1) and research questions (3.2.2). Following this, the chapter outlines considerations made to the design of the study (3.3), including: ontology and epistemology (3.3.1); the ontological and epistemological position of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000) (3.3.1.1); the critical realist research paradigm (3.3.2); the adoption of a qualitative research methodology (3.3.3) and the role of the researcher (3.3.3.1). The necessary methodological considerations are then presented in terms of the research context, population and sample (3.4.1), ethical issues (3.4.2), data collection (3.4.3) and data analysis (3.4.4).

3.2. Research rationale

A systematic review of the available research and non-research literature relating to the broad area of study suggests there is utility in applying the findings of over 35 years of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) research into Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) to our understanding of the experiences of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP). In addition, it suggests there is a need to:

a) Further utilise qualitative methods and exploratory approaches to explore and realise the experiences of permanently excluded CYP (Gersch & Nolan, 1994).

b) Use SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000) to explore the human meanings (implicit and explicit; latent and semantic), emotions, cognitions and behaviours that may be associated with permanent exclusion from a psychological research perspective.

c) Voice the experiences, concerns and hopes of a group who are arguably underrepresented in SDT-based research literature and in society at large (MacCrae et al., 2003; Munn & Lloyd, 2005; OCC, 2012).
3.2.1. Research aims
The current study aimed to explore the experiences of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP) across three contexts:

1. Previous mainstream provision
2. Current provision (Pupil Referral Unit; PRU)
3. Outside of School (OoS)

The primary goal of this exploration was to construct an understanding of the experiences of these CYP from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000), and the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Through this it sought to uncover how possible social-contextual supports and/or limitations were experienced by participants, and how they may have impacted on their engagement with and success within the education system provided.

In recognising the value of exploring the views and perspectives of CYP, as well as the need for them to be heard more frequently in the research, discussion and debate about permanent exclusion (Munn & Lloyd, 2005; OCC, 2012), the study also aimed to listen to and promote the 'voice of the child' (Upton & Varma, 1996). This was in line with the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC; UNICEF, 2012), in particular articles 12 (Respect for the views of the child) and 13 (Freedom of expression).

Furthermore, the study aimed to positively impact on the stakeholders (participants, parents/carers and school staff) through practice-based implications stemming from the findings, for example best-practice training, information sharing and policy influence. These additional aims were informed and underpinned by the principles of fairness, equality and social justice, alongside a conviction in the capacity for Educational Psychologists (EPs) to affect positive change in the lives of those they work with.
3.2. Research questions

It was important that the research questions were in line with the conclusions drawn from the literature review (2.9.1), the research rationale (3.2) and the research aims (3.2.1). The research questions consist of one main question that addresses the broad focus of the study, and three sub-questions, which explore particular details of the CYP’s experience of the three contexts:

Main Research Question

‘What role does Basic Psychological Need satisfaction play in the experience of permanent exclusion from school?’

Sub-questions

1) ‘How did the children and young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

2) ‘How does the children and young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

3) ‘How do the children and young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

3.3. Design considerations

The key question at the heart of the research design was how to apply the empirically grounded postulates of SDT, whilst simultaneously attempting to respectfully explore and understand the experiences of the participants as an ‘excluded’ group. It was therefore essential to adopt a research paradigm and methodology that fitted the aims of the research, along with the ontological and epistemological position of the author.

3.3.1. Ontology and epistemology

Crotty (1998) describes ontology as ‘what is’ and epistemology as ‘what it is to know’ (p. 10). The researcher’s philosophical perspective on each of these determines their research paradigm and the resulting design considerations. For example, a true objectivist, foundationalist or positivist position may maintain that the world exists independently of our knowledge of it, and that ‘we can establish regular relationships between social phenomena, using theory to generate hypotheses which can be tested by direct observation’
(Furlong & Marsh, 2002, p. 22). On the other hand, a constructivist, interpretivist or relativist position might argue that the world is individually, discursively or socially constructed, and that ‘we should focus on identifying those discourses or traditions and establishing the interpretations and meanings they attach to social phenomena’ (Furlong & Marsh, 2002, p. 26). Although epistemological and ontological issues usually emerge together, researchers do not always assume an identical position on both (Crotty, 1998; Furlong & Marsh, 2002). When adopting a realist or critical realist position, often referred to as the ‘third way’ between positivism and relativism (Robson, 2011), it is often the case that researchers will share an ontological position with positivism, but an epistemological position with relativism. This is arguably true of SDT (Ryan & Niemiec, 2009).

3.3.1.1. The ontological and epistemological position of SDT
As stated earlier, SDT is a psychological theory that is firmly routed within a formal and empirically focused framework. It makes explicit assumptions about human nature and proposes testable hypotheses for both experimental and field studies that are primarily supported through quantitative research methods (Ryan & Deci, 2002). However, SDT’s psychological analysis looks at the causes, reasons and sources of human motivation in terms of human meanings. From this perspective, the interpretation of, and meaning attached to, individual experiences give rise to resulting reactions, emotions and cognitions. Ryan and Niemiec (2009) explain how SDT views psychologically meaningful states as the primary causes of most behavioural events:

‘...it is the felt humiliation by a teacher that causes despair; it is the experience of mastery accompanying a student’s accomplishment that sustains further effort; it is the feeling of being emotionally supported that helps a classroom cohere; and it is the experience of threat when being controlled that incites reactance or rebellion.’

p. 265
Through its belief that there are universal truths and general principles about human nature (e.g. BPNs), which are measurable and observable and its predominant use of quantitative research methods and empirical designs, SDT arguably shares an ontological position with positivism. However, in acknowledging the importance of the individual’s frame of reference in shaping meanings and behaviours, it arguably shares an epistemological position with relativism.

Maxwell (2012) makes the case that ontological realism (positivism), when integrated with epistemological constructivism (relativism), provides a more accurate understanding of our relationship to the world through its emphasis on process, the experiences of ‘social actors’ and context. The attempt made in the current study to synthesise the empirical (or positivist) knowledge gained from SDT-based research with the qualitative (or constructed) experiences of the participants, suggested a ‘fit’ with this ontological and epistemological position; the critical realist research paradigm. This in turn impacted on the design of the study and the formulation of its aims.

3.3.2. The critical realist research paradigm

Critical Realism is a philosophical approach originating from the work of Roy Bhaskar, which attempts to describe the interface between the social and the natural world (Bhaskar, 2008). The critical realist research paradigm holds the view that ‘there is a real world out there, but emphasises that outcomes are shaped by the way in which that world is socially constructed’ (Furlong & Marsh, 2002, p.31). Contrary to positivist and relativist paradigms, it acknowledges the utility of both quantitative and qualitative data and data collection methods. As Krauss (2005) points out:

‘With [critical] realism, the seeming dichotomy between quantitative and qualitative is therefore replaced by an approach that is considered appropriate given the research topic of interest and level of existing knowledge pertaining to it.’

(p. 762)
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As explored earlier (1.4.1, 2.3 & 2.4), there is a wide-ranging, robust and high quality existing body of SDT-based research spanning over 35 years (Deci & Ryan, 2002; Vallerand, Pelletier, & Koestner, 2008). This has largely been conducted from a positivist paradigm, utilising quantitative research methods. However, as stated above, whilst SDT’s conceptualisation on BPNs is as objective and observable phenomena, the theory also places significant emphasis on the phenomenological aspects of human experience as the shapers of motivations and behaviours (Ryan & Niemiec, 2009). The critical realist paradigm both accepts the concept of BPN, but permits the use of alternative (qualitative) research methods to enable further exploration.

Furthermore, instead of being value-free (positivist) or value-laden (constructivist), the critical realist perspective can be regarded as ‘value-cognizant; conscious of the values of human systems and of researchers’ (Krauss, 2005, p. 761). As such, it neatly encompasses what could be considered the ‘emancipatory aims’ of the study, embracing research characteristics such as recording and promoting the perspectives of participants, advocacy and upholding the principles of social justice (Creswell, 2009; Robson, 2011). Embedding the design of the study within the critical realist paradigm therefore allows for a deeper understanding of the experiential nature of permanent exclusion as related to the satisfaction of BPNs, whilst hopefully developing an evidence base drawn from scientific theory that may benefit key stakeholders.

### 3.3.3. Adopting a qualitative methodology

As mentioned above, adopting a critical realist research paradigm allows the researcher to employ the use of quantitative, qualitative or mixed-method approaches (Krauss, 2005; Robson, 2011). It was important that the methods led to a data corpus sufficiently able to answer the research questions posed in line with the aims of the study.

As stated above (2.3.1), the majority of SDT research is empirically grounded and quantitative in nature. As such, initial considerations were given to the adoption of a quantitative methodology. Direct communication was made with
one of the originators of SDT, Professor Richard M. Ryan, in order to request additional literature and ascertain if any pre-existing research tools would be suitable. A family of scales called the Basic Psychological Need Scales have been developed to measure BPN satisfaction in everyday life and across various domains, e.g. work, interpersonal relationships (Ryan & Deci, 2012). The researcher considered adapting one of these scales for use in the current study, in order to measure the BPN satisfaction of the participants. However, given that the participants had already been excluded from school, it would not be possible to ascertain a baseline measure of their BPN satisfaction before attending the PRU. Furthermore, such quantitative measures would not explore the role of social-contextual factors, or effectively explore the experiences, views and perceptions of participants from the ‘first-person perspective’ (Ashworth, 2003, p. 9).

Following this initial consideration of an alternative methodology and latterly, the formulation of the study’s exploratory aims, it was apparent that a qualitative research design would be most appropriate. Firstly, it would allow for a greater focus on the perspectives of the participants, on how they interpret and understand the experience of being excluded from school – an insight into a minority-held experience. Secondly, it would allow for an exploration of how participants construct meaning from their present school experience, and their lives outside of school, and in what ways their understanding of these events supported or thwarted the satisfaction of their BPN. Thirdly, it was hoped that in accessing the participants’ unique and rich understanding of school and school processes, it would lead to concrete examples of best practice that could inform the future work of professionals and practitioners (Pomeroy, 1999). Finally, it was thought a qualitative approach would allow the researcher to truly listen to the voices of this group; only then could one hope to promote them. As Ashworth (2003) states:

‘...it is only qualitative research that has a proper awareness of the diverse experiences of individuals – and will, in particular, provide a hearing for the voices of the excluded.’

(p. 24)
Further details of the qualitative data collection methods employed are given in section 3.4.3.

3.3.3.1. The role of the researcher

In adopting a qualitative methodology, it was important to reflect on the present context in which the research was being carried out, along with the current position and previous experiences of the researcher to establish any factors that could potentially bias the research process at any stage.

This research was undertaken in the context of the researcher being a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) at the University of East London (UEL), whilst simultaneously working for a Local Education Authority (LEA) Educational Psychology Service (EPS). The study reported in this thesis should therefore be viewed as practitioner-research, reflecting a piece of work that has responded to the needs and requirements of the different stakeholders involved, alongside practical considerations.

The researcher declared their research interests at the time of interview for post, which happened to be aligned with a developmental priority of the LEA (that of reducing school exclusions). The project was further discussed with the Principal Educational Psychologist (PEP) following the acceptance of a bursary-funded position within the EPS. Although the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) selected for the study was not one of the researcher’s allocated schools, its allocated EP was able to offer assistance in making initial contact with school staff. From this point, the researcher was able to arrange an initial meeting with the Inclusion Manager and PRU Principal to discuss the purpose and potential implications of the research.

In considering the design and research methods employed in the study, the researcher reflected on the potential tensions and conflicts of interest involved in conducting research within the area that they were working. Being a student and working for the local authority required the researcher to simultaneously represent both UEL and the EPS, often acting as researcher
and practitioner concurrently. Throughout the planning, design and implementation of the research, the following considerations were made:

- The impact of research involvement on future relationships between the EPS and the PRU;
- The impact of research involvement on traded services between the EPS and PRU, including service-user expectations;
- The possible effect of the research on on-going Educational Psychologist (EP) involvement with CYP attending the PRU;
- Whether future research involvement with the PRU, e.g. feeding back results to school staff, meeting with participants, would ‘blur’ with existing service delivery, e.g. training responsibilities.

As such, the clear communication of aims, roles and responsibilities was essential to separate the coexisting aspects of the researcher’s role. This is expanded on further in section 3.4.2.

The researcher also maintained an awareness of how their previous experiences working in a PRU could potentially influence both their working with staff and CYP at the implementation stage, and their interpretation of data at the data analysis stage. Noted as reflections in their Research Diary, the researcher recorded any thoughts or contemplations that occurred in relation to their previous role. For example, any comparisons made between aspects of their previous working environment with the PRU selected for the study, were noted as thought processes that could potentially bias the study; one of various measures employed to ensure methodological transparency.

3.4. Methodology
Once a research design was established that was in line with the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position, and supported the aims of the study, practical considerations were undertaken regarding the methodology employed. With the aim of describing the process of enquiry in its broadest sense, the following sections cover these considerations and the resulting
methods used, from participant recruitment and ethical issues, to data collection and data analysis. This is presented in chronological order, with techniques and procedures introduced, explained and critiqued at the corresponding stage in the research process.

3.4.1. Research context, population and sample
The research context was a secondary Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in South London. It was a co-educational provision with 80 pupil places for 11 to 16 year-olds and a Behaviour and Education Support Team (BEST) on site. The unit included a science lab, food technology classrooms and a multi-media suite; and all classrooms were equipped with high-tech whiteboards, projectors and audio systems. Given the critical realist stance of the researcher (and the relativist epistemological perspective adopted within this), and the small-scale nature of the study, it was not relevant whether the context was representative of other PRUs in London or the UK. The importance of the context lay in how it was experienced and perceived by the participants sampled from the research population.

The research population for this study was permanently excluded secondary age (11-16 years old) CYP. In the academic year 2010/11, this group made up 0.13 per cent of the total UK school population (inclusive of maintained primary, state-funded secondary and special schools) (DfE, 2012b). Sixty-six per cent of permanently excluded CYP in this year were considered to have Special Educational Needs (SEN). If randomly sampled, the difficulties experienced by this group may have meant that although selected, they were unable to participate fully due to their difficulties. In line with the adopted qualitative methodology, a purposive (non-probability) sampling procedure was used in order to ‘acquire in-depth information from those who [were] in a position to give it’ (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 115). As such, the primary aim of the sampling process was not to ensure representativeness or comparability in its selection of settings and participants, but to identify and select individuals that best exhibited the characteristics or phenomena of interest (i.e. CYP who had experienced permanent exclusion from school), who were also willing and able to participate (Maxwell, 2012).
The researcher aimed to interview between six and eight CYP. This was due to the exploratory nature of the study, the time constraints placed on the research process and potential difficulties in access and recruitment. The recruited participants were 7 CYP (3 boys, 4 girls) aged between 12 and 16 years old from South London. The make up of the sample was not representative of the PRU population, which had a boy to girl ratio of 5:1. This is discussed further in 5.4.2. The participants were sought and recruited on the grounds that they were on role at the selected secondary PRU, had attended for at least six weeks (equivalent to half a school term) and were considered to have a good attendance record by school records. This was to ensure that all participants attended the same PRU, that they had attended long enough to experience being in the school and understood basic procedures and policies e.g. the daily timetable, consequences for bad behaviour etc., and that they were likely to be present on data collection days. Given the focus of the investigation, there was a potential source of bias in this requirement, in so far as the students with good attendance were more likely to be positively engaged in their school experience and having their BPNs satisfied. This is considered further in 5.4.3.

Initially, students were identified by the PRU’s Inclusion Manager and invited to attend a 20-minute introductory meeting with the researcher. Following an explanation of the study’s background, purpose and plan for data collection, the CYP were invited to ask questions or raise any concerns. Information guides and consent forms were handed out at this stage, which the CYP were required to return signed by a parent/carer if they wished to participate (further information is included in section 3.4.2.1). Ten completed participant and parent/carer consent forms were returned (4 boys, 6 girls); three CYP did not participate (see Table 3.1 for reasons). Prior to the recruitment process, practical considerations were made in respect of encouraging participation.

3.4.1.1. Encouraging participation
As a theory of motivation, SDT sits in contrast to behaviourist approaches that encourage the use of rewards, reinforcers and consequences as means of
motivating or controlling behaviour (Ryan & Brown, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2009). Instead, SDT argues that motivation can be encouraged with the right social conditions and supports for BPNs (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Therefore, in keeping with the theoretical basis of the research, it was important that the students felt intrinsically motivated to participate and not persuaded by the promise of an external reward, e.g. a retail voucher. Furthermore, in line with SDT research, it was hoped that intrinsically motivated participants would be more interested, emotionally invested and exhibit greater effort (Deci & Ryan, 1985), which in turn would yield a rich data corpus. The recruitment process was therefore designed to support the BPNs of potential participants, with the aim of motivating and encouraging their participation in the research.

The Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (Appendix 3.i), with its informal design, use of colloquial language and inclusion of personal information (and photograph), was designed to support the need for Relatedness. Whilst it contained all the relevant information, accessible language was used and explanations were kept as clear and concise as possible. This aimed to make potential participants feel able to both understand and participate in the study, supporting the need for Competence. Finally, Autonomy was supported by making it clear that it was the choice of the CYP to participate, and that they could withdraw from the study at any stage. This was further supported by the reassurance that their contributions would be anonymised and their participation confidential.

### Table 3.1. Reasons for non-participation of initially consenting CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Reference</th>
<th>Reason for non-participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Attendance – CYP was absent on all of the agreed interview dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Withdrawal of consent – reason not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Attendance/study leave – CYP was absent on two interview dates and missed remaining dates due to study leave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation was also encouraged through contact with staff and parents/carers. A *Research Information Guide for Staff* (Appendix 3.ii) and a *Parent/carer Information Sheet and Consent Form* (Appendix 3.iii) were developed to inform these groups about the study, provide a means to contact the researcher with any queries and gather informed consent prior to the start of data collection. This was one of a number of ethical considerations that needed to be made before the study could commence.

### 3.4.2. Ethical issues

Ethical dilemmas that arise in social research are context-specific, but commonly include a commitment to participants’ rights and respect for participants; a commitment to knowledge (the right for others to know); a commitment to the promotion of respect for social science; and protecting the researcher (Robson, 2011). The British Psychological Society’s (BPS) *Code of Ethics and Conduct* (2009) and the Health Professions Council’s (HPC) *Guidance on Conduct and Ethics for Students* (2009) offer further considerations, including the need to debrief participants and maintain an awareness of the ‘unintended weight’ of statements when uttered by a psychologist (BPS, 2009, p. 20). As such, an alertness to potential and existing ethical issues was maintained throughout the research process, from the early stages of the study’s conception to its writing up. A research proposal, information guides and consent forms were submitted to UEL’s Research Ethics Committee (REC) for approval before embarking on the research. Approval was awarded before the research venue was approached (Appendix 3.v). The following sections outline the key ethical considerations that were made throughout the research design process.

#### 3.4.2.1. Informed consent

Prior to the recruitment of participants, informed consent was sought from the PRU’s Principal following an introductory meeting (Appendix 3.iv). Following the 20-minute introductory meetings with the identified students (see section 3.4.1), they were each given a *Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form* (Appendix 3.i) to read and sign if willing to participate. Identified
students were also given a *Parent/carer Information Sheet and Consent Form* (Appendix 3.iii) to take home for their parents/carers to sign if willing to give consent. Upon returning the signed forms, they were eligible to participate in the study. Copies of signed forms are not included in the appendices for reasons of anonymity as agreed with the participants and their parents/carers.

Although all information guides and consent forms were submitted to UEL’s REC for approval before use with participants and consenting adults, limitations in respect of these documents came to the researcher’s attention at a later stage. This is discussed further in section 5.4.2.

**3.4.2.2. Working with vulnerable children and young people**

Additional ethical considerations need to be made when working with vulnerable CYP (Robson, 2011). An initial one-hour meeting was arranged with the PRU’s Inclusion Manager to discuss the research aims and procedures in detail. As all potential participants had received recent involvement from the local Educational Psychology Service (EPS) (including parent/carer consent), the inclusion manager was able to provide extensive background information to the researcher, including living arrangements/care status, records of drug use, additional language use, current friendships/disputes within the school setting and current academic levels.

It was important to ascertain from the information provided, that potential participants would be able to fully understand that their participation could involve talking about difficult or negative experiences, and that their participation did not have the potential to exacerbate any problems or difficulties they were experiencing at the time. For example, one potential participant identified was in the process of becoming a Looked After Child (LAC). It was decided that this CYP would not take part due to part of the interview focusing on life outside of school and the potential emotional distress it may have caused. All participants were informed that I had received the above background information during the initial 20-minute introductory meeting.
As stated earlier (1.5), accessing the perspectives of these CYP can be viewed as challenging. Due to their excluded nature, and the educational difficulties they face, they are often labelled as ‘hard to reach’ or ‘hard to find’ (Macnab, Visser, & Daniels, 2007). Furthermore, gatekeepers (PRU Principal and/or Inclusion Manager) or parents/carers refuse to allow access to vulnerable groups of participants (Robson, 2011). In contrast, these difficulties were not experienced; school staff and participants were both willing and able to cooperate and participate.

3.4.2.3. Confidentiality, anonymity, withdrawal and data management

Participants were made aware in the initial 20-minute meetings, through the introduction statement at the beginning of the interview (Appendix 3.vi) and through the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (Appendix 3.i) and that all recorded information would be confidential in so far that it would be anonymised before print or distribution and therefore not traceable to the individual concerned. Parents/carers and staff were made aware of this in the Parent/carer Information Sheet and Consent Form (Appendix 3.iii) and the Research Information Guide for Staff (Appendix 3.ii). It was also made clear in the Participant Information Sheet (Appendix 3.i), Research Information Guide for Staff (Appendix 3.ii), Parent/carer Information Sheet (Appendix 3.iii) and in the introduction statement (Appendix 3.vi) that if the information provided by the participant raised concerns about a situation whereby someone may be at risk, then this anonymity might be broken. If this were to occur, local council policy guidelines would be followed, alongside guidance from BPS (2009) and the HPC (2009).

Participants were given multiple opportunities to reconsider their involvement in the study, and if necessary withdraw their involvement at any stage. The introductory statement (Appendix 3.vi) stated that the participant could ‘stop the interview at any time’ and it was made clear to participants in the Participant Consent Form (Appendix 3.i) that they could withdraw from the study at any point. If they were to withdraw their involvement in the study following the data collection stage, the researcher reserved the right to use their anonymised data in the study. The necessity to state a time limit on the
withdrawal of information was related to the data management and storage methods employed and are considered further below. This approach is acknowledged in the literature on research design, methodology and ethics (BPS, 2010; Creswell, 2009; Robson, 2011). However, the wording used to communicate this arrangement in the information sheets and consent forms was arguably unclear and this is considered further in 5.4.2 when discussing the ethical limitations of the study.

Following data collection, the data was immediately anonymised, transcribed and stored on an encrypted hard drive. Once anonymised, each transcript was untraceable to the individual participant. It was therefore not possible for the individual to withdraw their contribution after this point. Participants understood and consented to the fact that any withdrawal would have to be made before the end of the data collection stage. Participants and parents/carers were verbally informed of how the data would be managed: that the data would exist in encrypted digital audio files (MP3) prior to transcription and destroyed once transcribed; and that transcripts would exist as encrypted word files (in .MP3 or .DOC format) for up to three years before being destroyed. The specific timings relating to data storage did not appear in the information guides or consent forms and could therefore also be considered an ethical limitation to the study. This is discussed further in 5.4.2.

3.4.2.4. Assessment and management of risk
A risk assessment was carried out in conjunction with the PRU’s Inclusion Manager, in order to consider potential risks to all involved at the data collection stage. This included an assessment of the following factors:

- The building - safety issues within the physical environment;
- My property/equipment - care of personal valuables and borrowed equipment;
- Well-being - risks to physical or psychological health of researcher or participants;
• People and environment - consideration of how to respond to verbal or physical abuse from participants;
• Lone working – how to summon help if necessary; whether or not to be accompanied.

It was concluded that the risk to the psychological and physical health of the participants and the researcher was low, and that in the unlikely case of difficulty and distress, procedures would be followed in line with school policy; this conclusion was further supported by the Researcher Risk-Assessment Checklist included in UEL’s REC approval documents (Appendix 3.v). Still, debriefing was carried out in line with BPS Code of ethics and conduct (BPS, 2009) to ensure in order to inform them of the outcomes and nature of the research, to identify any unforeseen harm, discomfort, or misconceptions, and in order to arrange for assistance if needed. This was arranged via a debriefing statement and the opportunity to ask questions at the end of interview (Appendix 3.vi), the knowledge that participants could raise any concerns with and contact the researcher through the PRU’s Inclusion Manager and the further opportunity to talk with the researcher when they returned to hand out participation certificates.

3.4.3. Data collection
Another key methodological consideration was choosing an appropriate method of data collection. In order to hear, record and ultimately convey the voices, perspectives and opinions of the participants, the data collected would need to be rich, representative and as indicative of their ‘lived reality’ as possible (Robson, 2011). The chosen method would need to be both appealing and accessible to participants to ensure full engagement and the retrieval of rich, relevant information. Furthermore, in line with the study’s exploratory aims, inductive approach and the researcher’s critical realist position, it would need to effectively explore the perceived role and importance of BPN satisfaction across variety of contexts. As such, the researcher chose to employ the use of individual Semi-Structured Interviews (SSIs).
3.4.3.1. Interviews

In essence, an interview or ‘inter-view’ (Kvale, 1996, as cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 349) is an interchange of views between two people. As a research method, it acknowledges the importance of human interaction for knowledge production and emphasises ‘the social situatedness of research data’ (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 349). Indeed, Robson (2011) suggests that ‘to find out what they [people] do in private...what they think, feel and/or believe, use interviews...’ (p. 232). Frey and Oishi (1995) provide a practical definition, describing an interview as ‘a purposeful conversation in which one person asks prepared questions (interviewer) and another answers them (respondent)’ (p. 1). The socially interactive nature of the method means that far from just being a tool to collect data about life, the interview is part of life itself; its human embeddedness is irremovable from the process (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

Research into the effect of interview techniques on CYP’s responses to questions has found that the style and the wording of questioning can affect responses and accuracy positively and negatively (Krähenbühl & Blades, 2006). Others have noted the threat to the authenticity of interviews with CYP due to the ‘differential in power relations between adults and children’ (Davis, 2007, p. 170), with the more powerful position of adults in society complicating the interaction between the interviewer and respondent.

The validity of interview data has been further explored by Houtkoop-Streenstra (2000), who suggests that interview results should be viewed as ‘products of the contingencies of the interview situation, and not, as is usually assumed, the unmediated expressions of respondents’ real opinions’ (p. vii). Hammersly (2003) adds to this critique, suggesting that:

‘Social and educational researchers, like the mass media and their audiences, have become obsessed with the idea of interviews as a means of discovering and revealing secret personal realities behind public facades.’

(p. 119)
Gubrium and Holstein (2002) agree, suggesting that the voice that emerges in an interview is ‘not an experientially authentic truth. It is itself a methodically constructed social product that emerges from its reflexive communicative practices’ (p. 11).

However, although the above concerns regarding validity and authenticity would provide a strong critique in the empirical realm, within the critical realist paradigm, experiences are considered empirical and therefore hold substantial validity (Bhaskar, 2008). Additionally, the critical realist view of validity, which is more appropriate for practice-based or ‘real world’ research, allows the recollection of lived experiences to be viewed as an authentic reality (in the present moment) for that individual. Validity is ensured as long as the participant experiences the expression of their previous experiences as their own.

Providing the participants felt sufficiently comfortable and able to openly reflect on their experiences, the data gathered would therefore reflect their realities as remembered. Within critical realist thought, these remembered realities are viewed as authentic experiences in the present and are therefore measurable. However, whilst the information given may hold validity for each individual participant within the confounds of the study, the critical realist researcher accepts that in being perceived by both the participant and the researcher, it is both value and theory-laden. From the critical realist perspective, it is the combination of the expressed values of the participants and the theory of the researcher that creates the potential for change (Maxwell, 2012).

As such, in order to fulfil the aims of this study, the use of interview was considered the most effective way of a) accessing and promoting the voice of the CYP and b) gathering a rich enough data set to effectively explore a wide range of participant experiences. However, it was important that the interviews were conducted in a way that supported the CYP in exploring their understanding of their experiences, and that the interview process was
structured in a way that recognised, valued and respected the lived realities of the participants as understood by the participants. Central to this, was ensuring that the CYP felt comfortable and competent enough in the interview situation to express themselves fully, both providing a rich data *corpus* for the researcher and utilising the benefits of working with a psychologist (Boyle, 2007). Indeed, the potential therapeutic effect of the interview, in giving the CYP a space to reflect and give ‘their side of the story’, should not be overlooked (Gersch & Nolan, 1994).

It was also important that the internal validity of the technique was bolstered through the development of unbiased questions and the ‘elimination of interpersonal cues which lead interviewees to respond in a particular way’ (Robson, 2011, p. 282). The former point is discussed further in 3.4.3.3; the latter point was addressed through the use of neutral body language, e.g. unassuming facial expressions, relaxed physical posture; the use of non-judgemental and unbiased tone of voice and intonation. The researcher recorded reflections on their interpersonal behaviour following each interview via the use of memoing; key points, including any behavioural adaptations needed, were recorded in the researchers *Research Diary*. Furthermore, careful consideration was also given to what the interview data could and could not provide, and how far inferences could be made upon its analysis (Hammersley, 2003); it was important for the researcher to remain exploratory in their approach and not lean towards causal inferences. A third party researcher was used to review inferences and interpretations made (see 3.4.4.3). Further limitations to data analysis are considered in 5.4.3.

### 3.4.3.2. Semi-Structured Interviews

In line with previous research attempting to access the voices of permanently excluded CYP (Pomeroy, 1999; Munn & Lloyd, 2005), Semi-Structured Interviews (SSIs) were used as a qualitative data collection tool. Robson (2011) provides the following description:

‘The interviewer has an interview guide that serves as a checklist of topics to be covered and a default wording and order for the questions,
but the wording and order are often substantially modified based on the flow of the interview, and additional unplanned questions are asked to follow up on what the interviewee says.

(p. 280)

The semi-structured format of the interview aided the data collection process in a number of ways, including: allowing for a relaxed conversation-like interaction to occur between the interviewer (researcher) and respondent (participant); allowing the interviewer to follow topics/areas of interest raised by the respondent, arguably leading to data of qualitative importance; making participation appealing through its apparent accessibility and informality; and the supporting of the participants’ BPNs. With reference to latter point, if the process supported the BPN of participants, leading to feelings of Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness, it was likely that engagement in the interview would increase, along with the richness of the data (Davis, 2007). This further demonstrates how SDT, whilst informing the theoretical basis of the study, also underpinned its design and methodology.

The interviews were conducted in a small meeting room next to the staff room. It was well lit by natural light, contained two soft chairs and a small coffee table. There was a quiet residential street outside the window and minimal visual distractions on the inside walls. Participants were interviewed, on average, for approximately 45 minutes, although there was substantial variation in the length of each interview depending on the amount the CYP was able or inclined to say in relation to each question asked. The shortest interview lasted a time of 41:02 and the longest 1:07:37. Each interview was introduced and ended in the same way with ‘Introduction’ and ‘Debriefing’ statements read by the interviewer to the respondent (Appendix 3.vi).

3.4.3.3. SSI schedule development

A Semi-Structured Interview (SSI) schedule was designed to gather data related to the participants BPNs (Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness), with each question designed to elicit information concerning a particular BPN within a given context (Appendix 3.vii). It was important for the researcher to
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acknowledge both the vulnerable nature of the participants and the sensitivity of the topic area when designing the questions they would be asked. It was the researcher’s view that the questions asked should, as far as possible, contribute to the participant’s positive experience of the research process. Shaw, Brady and Davey (2011) suggest the use of de-personalised questions, drawings, puppets or providing scenarios as a prompt for discussion when addressing very sensitive or traumatic issues. However, they acknowledge that ‘for some studies it may be necessary to ask CYP directly about their own experiences, in which case this needs to be approached sensitively’ (Shaw et al., 2011, p. 21). Due to the age of the participants (11-16) and methodological design of the study, it was decided that the CYP would be asked directly about their experience. Research in the area of sensitive interviewing has consistently pointed to the importance of language use when interviewing children about sensitive or personal experiences (Alderson & Morrow, 2011). It was particularly important that language was used in a way that empowered rather than marginalised participants.

With this in mind, and in line with the theoretical underpinnings of the study, the questions were therefore designed to support the BPN of the participants. For example, the use of the phrase ‘Can you tell me…’ as opposed to ‘Tell me…’ was designed to support the need for Autonomy. The CYP is likely to experience the answering of this question as something they have greater control and choice over, rather than an instruction or direction that they are required to adhere to. Each section began with a ‘Can you tell me…’ question; questions that could be perceived as more direct featured later in the schedule and tended to focus on strengths or positive experiences. All questions used graded language that was easy to understand with the aim of supporting the need for Competence. Finally, questions relating to the Outside of School (OoS) context were considered to be the most personal and therefore the most sensitive. These were placed towards the end of the SSI schedule with the view that the CYP may feel more comfortable by this stage of the interview and therefore more likely willing and able to talk about these topics.
Piloting is considered a valuable technique in research and can be incorporated into the study itself (Robson, 2011). The SSI schedule was piloted in the first interview in order to learn from the participant's responses and possibly improve its design. It was retained due to the success of the interview itself and the richness of the data obtained. However, in subsequent interviews questions were not necessarily asked in the order they were written, and the exact language used was also changed. This would occur for one or more of the following reasons:

1. To enable the building of rapport
2. To foster sustained engagement with the interview material
3. To enable a better understanding of the question
4. Due to personal circumstances affecting the respondent at the time that were known to the interviewer and discussed with the CYP beforehand

Some questions were broad enough to allow the participant to respond in a variety of ways, e.g. ‘Can you tell me about your time at (school)?’ Others were more specific, e.g. ‘What were you good at, at (school)? How do you know this?’ If it was felt that the participant could provide more information, then prompt/probe questions were used. These included:

- ‘Can you tell me more about that?’
- ‘How did that feel?’
- ‘Can you explain that to me?’
- ‘How do you feel about that now?’

Additional questions were also added during the interviews, independent of the schedule. For example, ‘How much freedom did you get in (school)?’, ‘Who chooses what you learn here?’, ‘Do you ever get to choose?’, were all asked due to their relevance in the conversation, e.g. the interviewer constructing a question based on a previous response or comment from the respondent. The interactive and unpredictable nature of the SSIs led to the
potential for rich data that was interesting and pertinent to the lives of the participants.

3.4.3.4. Recording and memoing

At first it was thought that the act of recording the interviews might jeopardise their informal nature and reduce the willingness of participants to take part or ‘open-up’ fully. In reality, however, this did not discourage participation and all participants seem comfortable with, and not distracted by, the presence of recording equipment. Indeed, CYP, often referred to as ‘digital natives’, are arguably used to the presence and utilisation of technology-based activities in their everyday lives, particularly the use of video and audio recording on mobile phones or other devices (Bennett & Maton, 2010). The interviews were recorded using an audio recorder application on a mobile phone, a common recording format they were likely to have seen before. The device was positioned on the coffee table in front of the participant and recording was started and stopped before and after the introduction and debriefing statements respectively. Recording continued throughout unplanned interruptions, e.g. from staff or the school tannoy system. The resulting recordings therefore exist as true audio representations of the interviews as they occurred.

Each recording was supplemented by memoing, which was recorded on an Interview Session Summary Sheet (Appendix 3.viii). The purpose of this was to capture any new views, ideas or intuitions the researcher may have experienced during the session, along with any notable behavioural observations on the part of the respondent, e.g. restlessness, apparent discomfort, or any remarkable occurrences, e.g. interruptions, ambiguous sounds, not picked up by the audio recording. It was also used to record any implications for further data collection and the data analysis process.

3.4.4. Data analysis

It is often observed that the main difficulty with qualitative data is its analysis (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Robson, 2011). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) partly attribute this to the fact that ‘... there are
frequently multiple interpretations to be made of qualitative data’, further commenting ‘...that is their glory and their headache!’ (p. 461). Additionally, unlike quantitative data analysis, the analysis of qualitative data has ‘no clear and universally accepted set of conventions’ (Robson, 2011, p. 466).

However, there are a number of routes one can take to the analysis of such data, depending on how the data is made up and what questions one is trying to answer (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As such, it was important that the method chosen abided by the principle of fitness for purpose (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). In order to do this, the researcher needed to be clear about what they wanted the data analysis to achieve, and be guided in their choice accordingly. Given that qualitative data analysis approaches are often wedded to particular frameworks such as IPA (Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis) or grounded theory (Braun & Clarke, 2006), it was important that the method chosen could be used with the theoretical framework behind the current study, i.e. the application of SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000) as a means of exploring first-person perspectives. In short, it would require a contextualist (critical realist) method, which could report experiences, meanings and the reality of participants whilst acknowledging the impact and import of context.

The researcher opted to use Thematic Analysis (TA).

3.4.4.1. Thematic Analysis

Thematic Analysis (TA) can be used as a realist, constructionist or contextualist method qualitative data analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Robson, 2011). Braun and Clarke (2006) provide clear guidelines for those wanting to conduct TA, advocating it as a ‘useful and flexible method’ (p. 77). In an attempt to demarcate and define TA, they break the overall process of analysis down into six separate phases to be followed linearly or discursively as required by the data or the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These phases were adapted for the current study (see Table 3.2).
Phase | Description of the process
--- | ---
1. Familiarising yourself with your data: | Transcribing data verbatim in secretarial style; reading and re-reading the data; noting down initial ideas.
2. Generating initial codes: | Coding interesting features of the data under the codes Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness; collating data relevant to each code in a systematic fashion across the data set.
3. Identifying themes and sub-themes: | Collating codes into themes and sub-themes within the codes Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness; gathering all data relevant to each theme and distinguishing between semantic and latent pieces of information.
4. Reviewing themes and sub-themes: | Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.
5. Defining and naming themes: | On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme and sub-theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6. Reporting the findings: | The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples; final analysis of selected extracts; relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature; producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

Table 3.2. Phases of Thematic Analysis (adapted from Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 87)

TA can be used inductively, where codes and themes emerge upon analytical interaction with the data, or deductively whereby the analysis starts with pre-existing codes (Robson, 2011). King (2004) advocates this approach under the term ‘template analysis’, suggesting that pre-defined or a priori codes be used based on the theoretical position of the research. In this way, prior engagement with the literature can arguably enhance the researchers analytical abilities, by sensitising them to aspects of the data that may have otherwise been missed (Tuckett, 2005). However, Robson (2011) makes the following point:

‘At a practical level it can be argued that such preconceptions can bias you toward some aspects of the data, perhaps leading you ignoring other potentially important themes.’

(p. 475)
Due to the critical realist and theory-led nature of the study, the researcher decided to adopt an alternative approach that combined both a deductive and inductive use of TA. The analysis began deductively with predetermined codes (*Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness*); upon further interaction with the data, themes and sub-themes emerged inductively. Despite the process being initially determined and guided by the theoretical concepts of SDT, TA was predominantly used inductively, to explore the experiences and constructed meanings of the participants. Further detailing of this process is in the proceeding sections, covering phases 1-6 of the TA process.

### 3.4.4.2. Thematic Analysis – Phases 1 and 2

1. *Familiarising yourself with your data*

Having conducted the interviews, the researcher approached the analysis with some prior knowledge of the data. The process of transcription further immersed the researcher in the data, with all recorded verbal data transcribed verbatim as orthographic transcripts. This resulted in one transcription per interview conducted (*n*=7), each taking between three and four hours to transcribe and consisting of between 5,883 and 11,836 words. Transcripts were fronted with a transcription front sheet containing the participant reference, interview and transcription information and any additional comments. An example interview transcript is included in Appendix 3.ix, and all interview transcripts are included on the *Supplementary Appendices CD* in PDF format (CD Appendix 3.xii-3.xviii).

Following this, the transcripts were checked back against the original recordings, and active repeated reading enabled further engagement in the data. Initial notes were made during this stage, as were potential extracts for coding. The reading and re-reading of transcripts was time consuming but, upon reflection, a necessary step in developing a thorough understanding of the data set.
2. Generating codes
The initial coding was carried out using ‘TAMS Analyzer’ (Weinstein, 2012), an open source, qualitative research tool for Macintosh computers. The seven individual transcripts were coded for the predetermined codes of Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness, as related to the SDT literature (Deci & Ryan, 2000), within each context (Mainstream, Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), Outside of School (OoS)) (see Table 3.3). Autonomy included extracts relating to the perceived source of the participants’ behaviour, Competence included extracts relating to the participants' perceived sense of personal confidence and efficacy and Relatedness included extracts referring to the participants’ sense of connection to and belonging with others. A third party researcher was called upon at this stage in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. The third-party researcher was a senior lecturer, experienced in conducting psychological research to doctoral level and a member of the BPS. Their involvement included the reading of individual passages and engaging in discussion to determine the justification for each passage’s inclusion within a particular code. As a result of this process, twelve passages were excluded from the selection, resulting in a total of 399 coded data extracts.

The data extracts were compiled into nine ‘Context/BPN’ tables (or ‘Code Books’), one for each initial code (see Appendix 3.X for example section of a ‘Context/BPN’ table or ‘Code Book’). Within each table, each extract was given a reference consisting of the initials of the code, for example, the first extract from the Mainstream/Autonomy table was coded MA01, the second MA02 and so on. Some extracts were ‘double’ or ‘triple coded’, i.e. they included content that was considered relevant to more than one code, and as such appeared in multiple ‘Context/BPN’ tables. All the tables (169 pages) were printed in preparation for the proceeding stage of analysis.

3.4.4.3. Thematic Analysis – Phases 3 and 4
3. Identifying themes and sub-themes
The individual extracts were then cut out of their corresponding ‘Context/BPN’ tables and collated into initial themes using a system of colour-coded envelopes. Extracts that appeared to fit under more than one identified
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code (Context/BPN)</th>
<th>Data extracts (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Autonomy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Competence</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Relatedness</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Autonomy</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Competence</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Relatedness</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Autonomy</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Competence</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Relatedness</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of extracts</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Number of data extracts per code

theme were reprinted and included in both.

Furthermore, extracts that also appeared to fit under more than one code that had been missed, and not ‘double’ or ‘triple coded’ at the previous stage, were included at this point. In fact, the continual inclusion and exclusion of extracts within codes, themes and subthemes continued throughout the process of data analysis. Table 3.4 compares the number of initial themes identified at this stage with the final number for each code. A process of continuous review and refinement reduced the final number of themes identified.

4. **Reviewing themes and sub-themes**

The extracts were then mounted on A1-sized card to create nine theme boards (one for each code) (see Appendix 3.Xi for photographic evidence). This process enabled further review and refinement of themes, the identification of sub-themes and the drawing of thematic links across contexts.

Following this, thematic-evidence maps were drawn from each theme board, illustrating the link between each theme, their corresponding subthemes and the coded extract(s) (the data evidence for each theme). These were completed using MindNode© (IdeasOnCanvas, 2012), a mind mapping
Table 3.4. Comparison of number of initial and final themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code (Context/BPN)</th>
<th>Initial themes (n)</th>
<th>Final themes (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Autonomy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Competence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Relatedness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total themes per context</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Autonomy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Competence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Relatedness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total themes per context</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Autonomy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Competence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Relatedness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total themes per context</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

application for Macintosh computers (Appendices 4.i – 4.ix contain thematic-evidence maps for each code). These maps were combined to form detailed thematic maps by context (Mainstream, PRU, OoS), which were later used to address sub-research questions 1, 2 & 3. Due to their size and detailed form, these maps are not included in the printed appendices, but are instead available to view in PDF format on the enclosed *Supplementary Appendices CD* (CD Appendix 4.x-4.xii).

A third-party researcher was again called upon at this stage to review the contents of the thematic-evidence maps, including the codes, themes, sub-themes and data extracts. Table 3.5 contains the inter-rated agreement percentages for each of these. The percentages refer to the extent to which the third-party agreed with the researcher as to the data extracts contained within particular sub-themes, the sub-themes within particular themes and the themes within the codes. Any disagreements between the third-party and the researcher were discussed and an eventual agreement reached.
### Table 3.5. Results of inter-rater analysis review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Data extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Autonomy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Competence</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream/Relatedness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Autonomy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Competence</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU/Relatedness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Autonomy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Competence</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoS/Relatedness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average agreement (%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.4.4. Thematic Analysis – Phases 5 and 6

5. Defining and naming themes

A further analysis of the thematic-evidence maps was carried out in order to progress from description to interpretation (Braun & Clarke, 2006), enabling the final definition and naming of the themes. This involved distinguishing between themes that had already been identified at the latent level, and those that had been identified based on the surface meaning of the data that needed further interpretation. For example, the theme ‘Self-esteem’ within the code ‘Mainstream/Competence’ was evidenced by data that contained underlying ideas alluding to the concept of self-esteem, but not the word itself. This was therefore considered a latent theme. Other themes such as ‘Family Relations’ or ‘Staff Relations’ were considered semantic themes as they referred to data with explicit mention of those topics and had been identified based on no further analysis beyond what the participant had said (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data extracts behind these themes were therefore re-analysed to determine any further significance in what the participant had said. This ensured that each coded extract could be labelled as a latent or semantic contributor to the theme, enabling the researcher to be specific about the level of interpretation applied to each emerging theme.
6. Reporting the findings
Patterns found in both the semantic and latent themes across the three contexts were further interpreted to theorise their significance. The broader meaning of these patterns and the subsequent implications for the findings of the current study were considered in relation to the literature (Patton, 1990, as cited in Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84). The overall findings were then reported.

In order to support the reporting of the findings, the thematic-evidence maps mentioned above (Appendix 4.i – 4.xii), along with vivid extracts from the data, were referenced in order to ‘tell the complicated story of the data’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 93). The findings are reported in Chapter Four.

3.5. Chapter summary
This chapter has presented the research design and methodology employed in the current study. Firstly, the research rationale was explained (3.2) with reference to the research aims (3.2.1), and research questions (3.2.2). Secondly, the resulting design considerations were discussed (3.3) in terms of ontology and epistemology (3.3.1), the adopted critical realist research paradigm (3.3.2), qualitative methodology (3.3.2.1) and the role of the researcher within it (3.3.3.1).

Following this, the methodology was explained in terms of the research population and sample (3.4.1), along with the necessary ethical considerations undertaken (3.4.2). Finally, the research methods employed in data collection (3.4.3) and analysis (3.4.4) were described, in order to provide a transparent and replicable detailing of the journey from data collection to the findings. These are reported in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS
4.1. Overview of chapter

This chapter details the research findings in relation to the questions posed:

Main Research Question

‘What role does Basic Psychological Need satisfaction play in the experience of permanent exclusion from school?’

Sub-questions

1) ‘How did the children and young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence And Relatedness?’

2) ‘How does the children and young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence And Relatedness?’

3) ‘How do the children and young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence And Relatedness?’

Identified themes and sub-themes within the contexts of Mainstream, Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) and Outside of School (OoS), are presented in relation to Sub-questions 1 (4.2), 2 (4.3) & 3 (4.4) respectively. Data extracts (cited as participant/transcript reference followed by line number e.g. ‘M1, 19-22’) are included to support the prevalence and relevance of the themes within the data sets, and conclusions are drawn as to what extent Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) were supported or thwarted within the three contexts. Further consideration of the findings is then given in relation to the Main Research Question (4.5), considering the evidence available to support BPN satisfaction as a factor in school engagement and permanent exclusion as an outcome. The chapter is then summarised (4.6).

4.2. Findings related to Sub-question 1

These findings are presented in relation to the following sub-question:

'How did the young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

The following subsections present the way in which the CYP’s mainstream experiences, as recollected by them in the interviews, supported or thwarted their need for Autonomy (4.2.1), Competence (4.2.2) and Relatedness (4.2.3). The findings are then summarised (4.2.4).
4.2.1. Supports and limitations for autonomy in mainstream

The data revealed limited perceived interpersonal and environmental supports for *Autonomy* within this context; multiple limitations were identified. The findings are reported under the headings of the themes identified: *Choice* and *Punishments*. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.i.

‘Choice’

The participants’ perceived lack of volition extended from the initial choice of secondary school, to the activities and tasks completed within it, to their eventual removal from it. In describing his general views of the school, *M1* said:

‘*M1*: Um, I didn’t really like it cos...I felt like cos of the building they were at...I felt like I was still in primary school. Didn’t get to play no football, like I didn’t like the whole environment of the school...it just felt uncomfortable. And I didn’t want to go to that school.’

(M1, 19-22)

For most participants, it was seemingly important to exercise choice in terms of their behaviour, despite it often leading to further restrictions in *Autonomy*. For example, participants perceived a sense of volition in whether to talk in lessons, whether to follow instructions, whether to bunk school, whether to be late or, as in the following example, when to get permanently excluded:

‘*MW*: OK...what was the thing that happened that meant you were finally permanently excluded?

*M1*: I don’t remember.

*MW*: So was it lots of small things rather than one big thing that did it?

*M1*: Yeah they said I was on my last warning or something. But me like I chose to cos I wanted to...I didn’t want to go to that school.’

*MW*: OK, so when they said you were on your last warning, how did that make you feel?

*M1*: I felt relieved. I didn’t really care. I just wanted to get out of the school.’

(M1, 349-362)
Chapter Four – Findings

*M1* describes his permanent exclusion as a personal choice, as a reaction to being made to attend a school he did not want to attend. It is impossible to fathom whether or not *M1* ‘chose’ to be permanently excluded. The important point here is how in hindsight, he is viewing it as such, ‘...I chose to cos I wanted to’, suggesting a need to view his past self as an autonomous being.

This apparent need for a sense of *Autonomy* is further exemplified by the following example. Here, *F6* describes how she would approach the requirement to be in school at a particular time by choosing when to arrive:

‘*MW: OK, so when you woke up the morning, and you had to go to PP, how did that make you feel?*

*F6*: Er...everyday I was late cos I didn’t really wanna go.

*MW*: So why would you be late, did you wake up late?

*F6*: I’d wake up late then get up and just go and watch TV then when the programme finished I’ll get up and start...go up and get ready yeah and then go.

*MW*: OK, how late were you?

*F6*: Sometimes I get to school at like 10 O’clock, sometimes break time, yeah that late.’

(F6, 297-311)

‘*Punishments*’

Although the absence of allowed or ‘legitimate’ choices perceived by the CYP is unlikely to explain these self-governing behaviours per se, the evidence of further perceived limitations to *Autonomy* within the theme *Punishments* might shed further light. The participants were clear in their view of the attempted external regulation of their behaviour by staff:

‘*MW: Can you remember any reward systems they had, or punishment systems?*

*M3*: No... I can remember the punishments.

*MW*: What were they like?
M3: They were boring. Basically, what they do they stick you in a like a room for the whole day, with some work you’re gonna do...there was no point.’

(M3, 232-240)

F5 similarly referred to the punishments used as ‘just unnecessary and boring’ (F5, 293), and in the following exchange went on to explain why she thought the school adopted the approach it did:

‘MW: Do you think they (punishments) make students behave?
F5: No, because they end up just kicking out the students because they don’t work.
MW: And do you think that is a good thing to happen?
F5: No. The school only does it because they’re under pressure.
MW: Who are they under pressure from?
F5: From the borough...so...like OFSTED.’

(F5, 295-306)

Interestingly, F5’s hypothesis, that increased pressure on teachers can lead to an increase in controlling teaching behaviours is well supported by Self-Determination Theory (SDT) research (Deci, Spiegel, Ryan, Koestner, & Kauffman, 1982; Flink, Boggiano, & Barrett, 1990; Ryan & Brown, 2005). This is discussed further in Chapter Five, when considering the implications of the study for mainstream teaching practice (5.5.2.1).

The majority of punishments referred to by the participants fell under the Sub-theme ‘Physical Restrictions’ and consisted of the following:

- Being sent out of class
- Detention
- Fixed-term internal exclusion
- Fixed-term external exclusion
- Permanent Exclusion
Although the participants reported these being used as consequences following a behavioural event, in recalling the events leading up to his permanent exclusion from mainstream school, M3 referred to a particular behavioural event as being a result of a perceived physical restriction:

‘M3: It was, it was a hot day right, so I took off my blazer and cos I didn’t want to put it back on, and I blanked the head teacher, walked off and went in the science room. Right and he said I’m going to the...what did he call it again?...it’s like a referral unit thing upstairs and I was like ‘I’m not going’. So he moved everyone out of the class that was in...so like I was the only one in there until like...they were telling me off right...and I’m like claustrophobic so they closed the door...cos I was screaming and shouting so I flipped out and smashed the windows so...’

(M3, 42-49)

M3’s understanding of this pivotal event (leading to his permanent exclusion) seems to be ‘bookended’ by two perceived limitations to his Autonomy. Firstly, the attempted external control by staff over the wearing of his blazer and secondly, the perceived physical restriction exemplified by the word ‘claustrophobic’. The use of the word ‘so’ in the phrase ‘so I flipped out and smashed the windows’ suggests a perceived explanatory or causal link between these limitations and the behaviour that followed.

SDT highlights the benefits of Autonomy-supportive over controlling interpersonal and environmental contexts within educational settings (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). Controlling contexts like those perceived and described by the participants are likely to lead to reduced interest, value and effort towards achievement. Furthermore, students are more likely to disown responsibility for negative outcomes, blaming others such as the teacher (Ryan & Connell, 1989). This is discussed further in Chapter Five, within a further consideration of Autonomy-supporting versus -thwarting learning contexts (5.3.1).

4.2.2. Supports and limitations for competence in mainstream
The data revealed both supports and limitations for Competence in this context, within the themes ‘Personal’, ‘Interpersonal’ and ‘Environmental’. The
ways in which the CYP's feelings of Competence were supported and limited will be considered under each theme. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.ii.

‘Personal’
Within the subtheme ‘Strengths’, participants expressed a perception of their own skills, abilities and qualities within the mainstream setting. Participants were able to list mainstream subjects they considered themselves good at. F5 went beyond this however, providing a richer description of her approach to learning compared to her peers:

‘F5: ...I, I just, I don’t have a problem cos at the end of the day I didn’t go school to make friends, I didn’t go to school to think about what other students would think of me. If I put my hand up, I’m doing it for myself, not for other students to look at me and say ‘oh she needs help’. All I care about is results, it’s a lesson and you’re learning. That means, a teacher is meant to explain something to you, I don’t go there because I know all the stuff already, I went there to learn so I have to put my hand up to learn something.’

(F5, 407-414)

F5 demonstrates awareness of her personal strengths, attributing them directly to an internal locus of control through the repeated use of the pronoun ‘I’.

Participants were less likely to attribute the cause of any limitation to their Competence to themselves. As we shall see, they were more prone to attribute personal difficulties and lack of Competence to external and interpersonal factors. However, under the subtheme ‘Criticisms’, F1 attributed her difficulties to an internal cause:

‘F1: I can’t blame it on the teachers because it was me. It was me why I got kicked out, it was me why I am here. It’s me, it’s my actions that have brought me to this place...so it was just...yeah it was me.’

(F1, 231-233)
Despite initially viewing her own behaviour as the key causal mechanism leading to her permanent exclusion, she later acknowledged the impact of others on this:

‘F1 ‘the reason why I got kicked out mostly like, part of it because when my friends had arguments, I would go to defend them’

(F1, 238-239).

‘Interpersonal’

When asked to explain how they knew they were good at something, participants referred to environmental factors (considered below) or to interpersonal factors such as learning support or verbal praise received from staff and peers. Most participants were able to recall receiving verbal praise in their mainstream provision. F6 provided an insight into how her perception of her abilities, and therefore her feelings of Competence may have been effected by this:

‘F6: I was good at English...no...I was alright at English.

MW: How do you know that?

F6: Cos my teacher used to tell me.

MW: Did any other teachers tell you that you were good at other lessons?

F6: Yeah they said I’m alright, but not...excellent...but alright, I was alright.’

(F6, 132-140)

Despite receiving some form of verbal praise or feedback (the details of which are unclear), F6’s understanding from it was that ‘I was alright’. She initially says ‘I was good’, but then says ‘I was alright’. It is possible that opposed to ‘good’ or ‘excellent’, being ‘alright’ is an apt or comfortable way to view oneself, having been permanently excluded from school. This extract also raises questions as to the extent to which F6 has internalised the views of adults in authority and how much her understanding of her abilities is seen through their eyes. This is discussed further in the following chapter, when
considering the impact of Competence satisfaction on the individual’s view of the self (5.3.2).

Not all participants recalled receiving verbal praise from staff: M2: ‘No, cos I didn’t do work’ (M2, 203) and M1: ‘No I didn’t get praised...for nothing’ (M1, 951). The former comment (M2) demonstrated a somewhat commercial understanding of praise, a system in which you must earn praise (through doing work) before you receive it. It follows that in such a system those able to earn praise or verbal rewards get ahead, through the satisfaction of the BPN for Competence. An alternative understanding of this situation, i.e. M2 did not (or could not) do the work because he was not praised or verbally rewarded (and therefore motivated), highlights a need for a more pre-emptive approach to the use of praise. For example, if a CYP’s need for Competence is unconditionally supported, they may be more emotionally equipped and motivated to complete the work, receive further supports (positive praise) and continue to progress.

M1 later recalled being praised in art but not in any other subjects. He explained his understanding of why this was:

‘M1: ...I think they just...I think they didn’t have time...like...so many students...they can’t concentrate on one student. They have to like think about everyone else. So, cos there’s so much students, they didn’t like see it.’

(M1, 192-199)

As well as suggesting reasons why this type of support may have been limited, participants explained the importance of it:

‘F5: Because some students take it personal when they don’t see the teacher congratulate them...and then...

MW: How does that make them feel?

F5: ...I don’t know....They might feel that the teacher hasn’t acknowledged their behaviour...their good behaviour, so they start acting bad...to get their attention, but yeah.’

(F5, 191-200)
She went on to suggest ways in which feelings of *Competence* can be better supported:

*F5:* Like, if they need help do extra classes. If not, have more support system in the class or students, because one TA or one person ain’t gonna really help. Sometimes you have none. Erm, don’t force them, don’t force on them that much. Like be easy with them like...you know don’t force them like cos some people sometimes they say ‘read out, read out’ and the teachers are proper you know persuading them to read out and they know the children can’t read...’

(F5, 360-366)

*F5* referred to both interpersonal factors, e.g. ‘don’t force them’ and systemic or environmental factors, e.g. ‘if they need help, do extra classes’. Similarly, although alluding to his own feelings of *Competence* in mainstream, *M1* provided the following succinct suggestion: ‘They could have tried...tried to encourage me to be better.’ (M1, 376-380).

*M2* recalled receiving such interpersonal supports from staff, but perceived it impacting negatively on the way he was viewed by other students:

‘*M2:* ...they think I’m dumb as well, they proper think I’m dumb. I was probably like one of the brightest in my year and like they didn’t know that. Like, people’s first judgement of me is just that I’m just dumb, but they like [kisses teeth]...that’s what I’m saying like first impressions... cos when I started getting cos like one of the teachers they noticed how bright I was and I started getting to...like I had my own tutor. Cos I was doing like, when I was in Year 7, I was doing Year 9 work, in Maths. And I was doing work with Mr. D and then he would just like take me out of my lessons and then like he would work with me at a higher level. And then, like, this was people in my year. I got on with some of them, but most of them thought of me as like this dumb, like this dumb kid that just didn’t go to lessons and that. Like yeah. And like my brother was at the school as well so he knew what I was capable of as well.’

(M2, 412-429)

This indicates the importance of what others thought of them, suggesting that receiving supports for *Competence* from staff could be perceived by the CYP as impacting negatively on their relationships with peers. Peer relations are
considered further below when considering supports and limitations for Relatedness in the mainstream setting (4.2.3).

‘Environmental’

Environmental supports for Competence consisted of feedback from the task or from the grade received, as well as rewards in the form of certificates, trips and badges:

‘F3: But like, I used to get like, what’s it call like, I think they’re like badges or something like that. Yeah like on Fridays or Thursdays when we do assembly, and they’ll announce a person from the form and I like used to get some sometimes...’

(F3, 86-89)

Despite featuring in the data, most participants were not compelled to talk about these things at length, but provided a limited account in direct response to a question from the researcher:

‘F6: ...they used to go to Thorpe Park, and like my punishment is not going. They used to do that every year. I haven’t been on, I never went on none of the trips. Cos...my behaviour and I didn’t deserve it.’

(F6, 180-183)

It became apparent that although participants were aware of the espoused function of such feedback and rewards, the latent effect was instead to limit their feelings of Competence and exclude them from their peers, e.g. ‘They used to do that...I never went...I didn’t deserve it’. Despite the participants identifying these elements as supports (rewards) at the semantic level, a latent level of analysis suggests the supports offered by the mainstream environment were ineffectual for this group, acting more as limitations when combined with the other difficulties they experienced.

At the semantic level, participants indicated an awareness of one key limiting environmental factor: the lesson style. In the following exchange, M3 indicated
an understanding of his personal learning style and whether it was supported by the lessons in his mainstream school:

_MW: Did you ever do any activities where you were able to get up out of your desk and move around the room?_

_M3: Not all the time. Some of the time but not all. Cos I, I can’t sit still for that long. Cos like you get different types of learners like visual learner, audio learner and practical. I’m more of the practical side._

_MW: Hmm, so do you think that (previous provision) catered for a practical learner?_

_M3: [shakes his head]_

_MW: What kind of learner do you think they mainly..._

_M3: I think that was...visual or audio.’_

(M3, 118-131)

_F6 also commented about the nature of the lessons in her previous school:_

_‘F6: I don’t, I don’t think it’s a really good school...I don’t think so._

_MW: What do you think they could do to be better?_

_F6: Like...instead of like, they can do, in their lessons they can do practical things, not only just sit there and we copy out what you write...yeah and stuff like that._

(F6, 1267-1275)

Despite supports for Competence existing in all three of the themes explored in this section, the findings evidence a range of limiting factors including personal criticism, a lack of support from staff including the effective use of positive praise and rewards, and finally the lesson style.

4.2.3. Supports and limitations for relatedness in mainstream

The data revealed inadequate support and significant limitations for perceived Relatedness in this context. This is evidenced by both the quantity and richness of the data behind the identified themes Staff relations, Peer relations and Connectedness. The extent to which the BPN for Relatedness was supported or thwarted in this context will be considered under each of
Staff relations

Within the subtheme Teachers, participants used a range of adjectives to describe the teachers in their previous provisions. These included: ‘annoying’, ‘boring’, ‘moody’, ‘insulting’, ‘sneaky’, ‘racist’, ‘bossy’, ‘strict’, ‘unfair’, ‘deceiving’, ‘stuck-up’ and ‘like the police’. Some participants stated simply that they ‘didn’t like them’ or that they didn’t get on with them. M2 was asked why he thought that was:

‘M2: Cos they made a first impression of me.

MW: What do you mean by that, can you tell me more?

M2: They just judged me from the first time that they met me.’

(M2, 326-330)

This sense that certain teachers disliked them was common throughout the responses of participants, with F3 adding: ‘Especially my deputy head, he just never liked me and neither did the head teacher (F3, 199-200). Participants, when expressing their resentment towards being permanently excluded, commonly directed it at senior members of school staff who they seemingly held responsible for their eventual permanent exclusion. There was a sense of having been treated unfairly or persecuted during the events leading up to their departure. F3 explained:

‘F3: They could have worked a bit more with me. Cos most of the people that got kicked out yeah...they...before they got kicked out they would manage move them to another school so like they’ll be in a school for a couple of weeks and if they’re bad in that school then they permanently kick them out. But they never did that with me and they did that with everyone who has been kicked out of that school and they never did that with me... I thought they were racist, that’s why I think they’re racist.’

(F3, 1225-1236)

M3 expressed a similar dissatisfaction with the way his exclusion was managed, which also resulted in possible limitations to the sense of Relatedness he felt towards staff:

those headings. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.iii.
‘M3: ... I like only did one thing bad and they wanna exclude me for that and some of them had done like worse than what I done. They wanna exclude me and not the other person. So they give the other person the chance to come back in, but they don’t give me.’

(M3, 350-353)

It also appeared that the interpersonal manner in which such conflicts were managed also limited this:

‘MW: ... the teacher is shouting at you and pointing their finger at you, how would that make you feel?

F5: Angry, I just wanted to get their fingers out my face.

MW: Why would it make you feel angry?

F5: Because she shouldn’t be putting her fingers in my face.

MW: Why not?

F5: Because she’s just a teacher...she’s not army, she’s not a army trainer. She’s just a teacher so...she, she’s just pushing, she’s just pushing the button a bit too much. They like to shout and point their fingers too much, talk calmly. Cos if it was very small children they couldn’t point their fingers in their faces, but cos we’re a bit older and they wanna see us get in trouble, they purposefully do stuff so we can get angry.

MW: You think they wanted you to get in trouble?

F5: Yeah, and all the staff yeah cos all we need to teach cos obviously that’s their staff members...that’s their colleagues, so they all believe their colleagues over the students. So that’s what annoying me as well.’

(F5, 624-646)

Nevertheless, some participants were able to identify positive aspects of their previous relationships with teachers: F1: ‘The teachers they were nice...they were fair’ (203-205); F3: ‘Erm...I kinda liked my P.E. teacher but she had a bit too much of an attitude...yeah she was calm....’ (314-315). In talking about the teachers working in the referral centre in her mainstream school, F5 explained why she thought their approach to behaviour management was more successful:
‘F5: Yeah, cos they would say, like if they were telling you off they would talk to you...have a little joke, but then they would be telling you that you need to behave at the same time...like they will make it more fun to talk and say yeah I’ll behave miss. Whereas teachers who shout at me, I’ll say don’t tell me what to do. But if you tell me to behave and you’re, and we’re laughing and joking, I’ll say yeah I promise I’ll behave. But when teachers are pointing their fingers at me and their saying they’re gonna, they’re threatening to call the head teacher like the head teachers gonna come and hit me on head, my leg or something, I don’t like it and they, and teachers they like confrontation...’

(F5, 611-619)

The findings suggest that participants felt a greater sense of Relatedness towards support staff (teaching assistants, learning mentors etc.), who were viewed as ‘alright’, ‘funny’, ‘friendly’, ‘understanding’ and ‘easier on you’. This was not true for all participants however, as the following extract indicates:

‘F3: yeah, I remember there was a woman yeah and she was a teaching assistant and her name was Miss X (staff name), and I used to take the piss out of her name and she just used to be rude to me...yeah and she was so evil I thought she was an evil witch. I just never liked her.’

(F3, 306-309)

Peer relations
The findings suggest a propensity for most participants to recall peer relations as negative. Here, F5 recounts the difficulties experienced with other CYP:

‘F5: …I didn’t like most of them.

MW: What was the difference between the ones that you liked and the ones that you didn’t like?

F5: Um...other ones were like...boring, they talked a lot about people and they just didn’t have really a good life really. Like they all they did was sit there and talk about people in the playground.

MW: What’s wrong with talking about other people?

F5: Because you’re badmouthing other people. And who wants to be friends with someone who badmouths other people? That same person could badmouth you behind your back.

MW: And what would be wrong with that?

F5: It would start arguments, which is why I don’t like them.’

(F5, 61-78)
F5 depicted her peers as ‘boring’ and as those who would ‘badmouth’ you behind your back. In distancing herself from them in this way, she positioned herself as opposing these traits, and revealed a possible sense of mistrust and a lack of relatedness in the phrase: ‘That same person could badmouth you behind your back.’

Additional supporting data extracts were grouped under the following subthemes:

- Bullying
- Physical confrontations
- Problems with fellow girls
- Verbal confrontations
- Lack of relationships
- Criticisms: didn’t get on; rude; negative influence; thought they were better

It was therefore possible to infer that the participants experienced difficulty establishing and maintaining positive relationships with their peers. Other example extracts included:

- **M1**: ‘I didn’t really know everyone so I felt uncomfortable there’ (M1, 282-283);
- **M2**: ‘Because I just beat them up. I don’t get on well with strangers’ (M2, 342);
- **F1**: ‘...I was excluded many times for like bullying...’ (F1, 128-129)

### 4.2.4. Summary of findings related to Sub-question 1

‘How did the young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

**Autonomy** – The theme *Choice* revealed both a need for participants to experience a sense of volition over their behaviour. This persisted despite acknowledging that this would often lead to further restrictions to *Autonomy* in the form of punishments. These restrictions emerged within the theme
Punishments, under the subtheme Physical Restrictions. Additional limitations to experienced Autonomy were indicated in the CYP’s choice of mainstream provision and the tasks completed there. Perceived supports for Autonomy within this context came from the individual themselves, as opposed to interpersonal or environmental factors.

Competence – Supports and limitations for Competence emerged within the themes Individual, Interpersonal and Environmental. The most salient findings surrounded the import of interpersonal supports for Competence with participants suggesting ways in which mainstream schools could better support this. Participants suggested a high level of individual difference in their ability to support their need for Competence from within themselves, and revealed the detrimental effect of some environmental factors designed to support this need, e.g. reward systems.

Relatedness – The data suggested participants perceived inadequate support and significant limitations for Relatedness. The themes Staff Relations and Peer Relations indicated a lack of connectedness felt towards others characterised by a lack of trust and an inability to form and maintain positive relationships. Participants attributed the cause of these difficulties to others and themselves.

A detailed thematic map for the context ‘Mainstream’ was drawn as a descriptive account of the data as related to each BPN within the context as a whole. Due to its size and complexity, it is included on the Supplementary Appendices CD in PDF format (CD Appendix 4.x). A simplified version including only codes, themes and sub-themes is provided in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1. Thematic map of mainstream context
4.3. Findings related to Sub-question 2

These findings are presented in relation to the following sub-question:

‘How does the young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

The following subsections will present the way in which the CYP’s experience of their current provision (PRU), as recalled by them in the interviews, supported or thwarted their need for Autonomy (4.3.1), Competence (4.3.2) and Relatedness (4.3.3). The findings are then summarised (4.3.4).

4.3.1. Supports and limitations for autonomy in PRU

The data revealed a number of perceived environmental and interpersonal supports for Autonomy in this context. Although perceived limitations were similar in form to those in the mainstream setting, they were less salient due to the impact of positive relationships with staff. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.iv.

Choice

Participants alluded to experiencing a sense of volition in relation to work experience and vocational courses available to them at the PRU, both in the selection of opportunities and the activities contained within. F6 stated how ‘they just give us a lot of opportunity to do stuff...like if I wanna do work experience they’ll give you the support you need’ (659-660), and M3 and F5 talked at length about the courses provided by the PRU. As will be shown, their descriptions reveal various opportunities to experience feelings of Autonomy beyond choosing the activities themselves:

‘M3: Yeah we’re doing a project with them, we’re doing a festival with them...it’s make, basically it’s like I wanna look a like a Glastonbury one...yeah so we’re making it look like a Glastonbury.’

(M3, 563-565)
Chapter Four – Findings

Here, M3 demonstrates a sense of perceived control over the end result of the learning process. He wants it to be a particular way ‘so’ they are going to make it that way. He goes on to explain how he is the site manager for the festival and lists some of the responsibilities he has: ‘...where the stage goes, where the stalls goes, make sure everything run, make sure everything’s here, all the food’s ready’ (M3, 587-588). He goes on to talk about a film that he is making, explaining how he is yet to film it as ‘I’m still doing my plan’ (M3, 641). Involving young people in the planning as well as the completion of academic tasks is in line with constituents of Autonomy-supportive teaching (Tsai, Kunter, Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Ryan, 2008). Such approaches are later considered further in terms of the potential practical implications for schools (see 5.5.2.1 & 5.5.2.2).

In terms of curriculum-based learning experiences, participants’ responses did not indicate a perceived limited choice in relation to what was taught and the teaching methods employed. Participants reported not being able to choose to go anywhere on the school site, but saw this as in line with their mainstream experience. F1 suggested that students would bend the rules:

‘MW: ...How much freedom do you get in CP? Can you walk around if you want to, and go where you want?

F1: You can’t but we do. We take advantage. You see cos we’re not a mainstream school we think well ‘we might as well give up’...that’s what we think, like ‘we’re not going anywhere we might as well give up’. Even though erm freedom is limited anywhere, here we take advantage of it. We go to a point where we’re not supposed to, and yeah...I don’t know.’

(F1, 449-456)

Interestingly, she attributes this rule breaking to an overt sense of disaffection (‘we might as well give up’), at the same time suggesting that they (the students) ‘take advantage’. Although she does not specify what they are taking advantage of, it could be suggested that she is alluding to an environment that provides an increased sense of freedom and choice through the less severe or less consistently administered punishments.
Punishments
As in the results reported for the mainstream setting, the students reported the majority of punishments experienced to be those involving some kind of restriction to physical Autonomy, e.g. detention, internal exclusion or fixed-term exclusion. The only other reported punishment was a phone call home to parents. Whilst there was a generally expressed view that the punishments used were similar to those at their previous schools, participants were of the view that staff were somehow ‘easier on you’, as the following extract shows:

‘M2: Same as at...like they’re easier on you like they’re not as hard because they don’t want, they don’t want to you feel like it’s another secondary school and you’re going through the same stuff. They want you to feel like, they want you to ease into it more like they give you more chances and that.’

(M2, 542-545)

This view is supported by M1 in his description of the referral (internal exclusion) centre: ‘Yeah you can do your work and still you can talk to people and at break you can sit there and hang around on the computer.’ (519-520). There is a clear appreciation of the practices that could be interpreted as ‘Autonomy-supporting’. However, F1 expressed an alternative view of the punishment systems employed:

‘F1: Yeah...in this school you have to attend your detentions or you can’t get your phone to go home. So you have to attend it...because if you don’t attend your detention then you can’t get your phone...it’s good.’

(F1, 396-400)

Despite describing a school policy that could be interpreted as Autonomy-thwarting, she goes on to express her approval. This view, which appeared at odds with those of her peers, suggests that F1 was better able to internalise and therefore appreciate the school’s procedures in this regard. How internalised these external contingencies were is considered further in section 5.3.1, when the author discusses the SDT concept of Internalization (Deci & Ryan, 2000) in relation to Autonomy support.
Whilst the school rules may be similar to those enforced in mainstream, the participants presented a more positive view of the both the choices afforded and the punishments received. Whilst these rules could be interpreted as Autonomy-thwarting, they did not appear to be perceived as such. SDT suggests that the Relatedness can mediate the extent to which people feel autonomous over their actions. The extent to which the Relatedness participants perceived with staff can be a mediating factor on this is considered further in Chapter Five (5.3.3).

4.3.2. Supports and limitations for competence in PRU

The data revealed a number of perceived supports and limitations for Competence in this context, identified within the themes Personal, Interpersonal and Environmental. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.v.

**Personal**

Personal factors effecting perceived Competence in the PRU context emerged within the subthemes Strengths and Criticisms. Whilst talking about their experiences at the PRU and their hopes for the future, participants widely referred to their strengths in the form of personal skills and abilities, often making use of the construct ‘potential’. For example:

‘F1: Hmm yeah, I would like to go back to [mainstream] school because I believe that I have matured. I believe that I have the ability and potential to excel and just to make a better chance and people always doubt me like ‘no you’re gonna be this, you’re gonna be that’, so if I go back to school and I change and I become someone they won’t believe it. I just want to shock people, the ones that doubt me.’

(F1, 309-314)

F1 begins by justifying her want to go back to mainstream school by suggesting a change has occurred (‘I have matured’). This is backed up by two beliefs (‘I have the ability and potential to excel’). Then, this seemingly self-orientated extract becomes increasingly about other people and how F1
believes they perceive her (‘no you’re gonna be this, you’re gonna be that’). Her desire to return to mainstream is then further justified by the interpersonal aim: ‘to shock people…that doubt me’ (314).

Negative views identified within the subtheme Criticisms were also linked to interpersonal factors such as how they were viewed by others outside of the PRU context. This is considered further in section 4.4.3 with regard to peer relations in the Outside of School (OoS) context.

**Interpersonal**

Participants made no reference to any perceived interpersonal limitations to Competence within the PRU context. Perceived interpersonal supports for Competence appeared most salient in the form of individual attention and help received from staff, alongside the provision of verbal praise. *M1* explained:

> ‘...cos there’s less people in the class, the teachers can praise you for doing your work good. They can give you more attention and help you with your work.’

*(M1, 431-433)*

In the following exchange, *F6* explained what the verbal praise consisted of and how it made her feel:

> ‘F6: Like keep up the good work and that...excellent...all that.
> 
> *MW:* When you get positive feedback, how does that make you feel?
> 
> *F6*: Proud.
> 
> *MW:* Any other lessons where that happens?
> 
> *F6*: Yeah it happens in all lessons but those (English and ICT) are the most. The ones I really like going to and that.’

*(F6, 482-491)*

She also suggested that the lessons she receives the most praise in are the lessons she liked going to the most. Whilst the data is unable to reveal this as a causal relationship, it is worth noting the apparent correlation. The impact of
perceived Competence on motivation is well documented by SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Environmental
Participants suggested environmental supports for Competence in the form of vocational courses, the class sizes, the lessons, the feedback they received from the work they completed and rewards for effort and good behaviour.

Although not stated in explicit terms, in the following extract F5 alluded to feelings of Competence experienced by completing vocational courses:

F5: "...so that's why I'm glad I got the projects (vocational courses). Now I can go back to normal school and I can say 'yeah I did film producing, yeah I've did an Art exhibit, two Art exhibits, yeah I did GCSEs already, yep..." I've basically done everything I want to do here..."

(F5, 1048-1051)

F1 talked about the smaller class sizes:

‘F1: …it’s like a mainstream school but the classes are just smaller and when you have a smaller class the teachers pay more attention to you. Maybe that’s what people like, they like more attention...maybe that’s why they’re bad, but I don’t see it as that.‘

(F1, 332-335)

Furthermore, there existed the view that the PRU was a ‘good school’ in that it provided a curriculum sufficient for pupils to feel competent in comparison to their mainstream peers: ‘F1: even though it’s not a mainstream school they still provide you with education, people still get their work done...’ (299-301). F6 went further:

F6: It’s really...er... really good school for when kids get kicked out. Well the only good school that does GCSEs and that.

MW: OK, if I said describe CP using one word, what word would you use for it?

F6: Amazing.’

(F6, 833-839)
Environmental limitations to perceived Competence were expressed in terms of the academic level of the classwork completed and the subjects on offer:

‘F5: …the lessons here are normal but they’re boring cos I learnt them in Year 7, like I’m in Year 9 and I’m doing Year 7 work so...

MW: What’s wrong with that?

F5: I’m going back. When I go to my new school now I’m gonna be way, way back and I’m going to have to be catching up with all the students.’

(F5, 918-925)

Additionally, some participants expressed a perception that the PRU was ‘not a proper school’ (F5, 842) and that ‘I’m bad cos I come here’ (F3, 607), perhaps evidenced by their understanding of what those outside of the PRU thought of the school. For example:

‘F5: …who wants to graduate from a PRU as...it’s alright here, it’s like a normal school, get along with staff, but it’s not what people see it as outside. If you, people look in and they think ‘oh Jesus Christ, they come from a PRU. Ah they, bad, they probably shoot each other everyday, they probably stab each other, they probably jump over tables and bang each other in the face and that’...but I just don’t like the school overall because it’s not a school, it’s a PRU.’

(F5, 867-876)

Despite the potential for the exclusive and distinctive nature of the PRU to impact on the CYP’s feelings of Competence, the findings reported in this subsection generally suggest a variety of ways in which perceived feelings of Competence are supported by personal, interpersonal and environmental factors within the PRU context.

4.3.3. Supports and limitations for relatedness in PRU

The data revealed a number of perceived supports and limitations for Relatedness in this context. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes Staff relations, Peer relations, Connectedness and Belonging. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.vi.
Staff relations

Participants’ descriptions of their relationships with PRU staff were overwhelmingly positive. These included: ‘fun’, ‘normal’, ‘caring’, ‘chilled’ (relaxed), ‘understanding’, ‘trusting’, ‘easy to talk to’, ‘patient’, ‘friendly’, ‘we get on’, ‘like family’, ‘close’, ‘like parents’, ‘like a friend’, ‘calm’, and ‘on the level’ (without imposed authority or power). We can infer from these descriptors that participants generally viewed the staff in a positive light and that their sense of Relatedness was supported in this sense.

However, one participant criticised the apparent softer approach to behaviour management:

‘F3: They are too soft. I think they’re really soft and moist and yeah just soft...you can tell them to shut up and I swear you’ll probably only get a detention, that’s nothing, at a mainstream school I wouldn’t even try to tell a teacher...I would probably think about it but I would be too scared to do it yeah...but now like, I can just do it here, if I wanted to just tell a teacher to shut up, even though that’s bad yeah.’

(F3, 624-629)

The data therefore suggested an approach to behaviour management that differs from the mainstream context, with teachers dealing with bad behaviour ‘...the same as the TAs that were there (mainstream)’ (M3, 757). It also suggested a blurring of the perceived roles of teachers and teaching assistants, with M3 stating: ‘They’re all the same...it’s like one big family’ (846-859). The CYP seemed to appreciate the closer relationships with the staff that this afforded:

‘M3: ...they don’t talk to you like they’re teachers, they talk to you like, like they’re someone from your family or someone close.’

(M3, 778-779)

The importance of the quality of student-teacher relationships is later discussed further in relation to the BPN Relatedness (5.3.3) and in terms of practical implications for schools (see 5.5.2.1).
Peer relations

The data suggests that the establishment and maintenance of relationships with peers within this context was both complex and difficult for participants. The data depicted a group who whilst able to identify with their peers, appeared disparate, fragmented and often lonely. One participant spoke positively of their peers, saying that ‘I get on with nearly everyone here’ (M2, 440), but the majority of responses indicated negative or non-existent relationships.

Participants described their peers as: ‘scary’, ‘wild’ and ‘weird’, stating that they ‘don’t trust’ them and that they were a ‘bad influence’. F5 provides an account of her relationships with other students:

‘F5: At the start, at the start you argue with everyone cos obviously you don’t know who’s that and who’s that and don’t know how’s everyone’s personalities, but I, as now, I know I can see through certain people...can see what they’re like, know who to talk to, know who not to talk to...who to trust, who not to trust, I don’t trust none of them to be honest...um...keep yourself to yourself you know...I haven’t made a effort to know anyone here properly cos I don’t wanna know anyone in a PRU.

MW: Why not?

F5: Because I don’t trust them.

MW: Why not?

F5: Because they all seem a bit weird. They’ve all been excluded for one reason so there’s no need to be friends with people like that if I’m going to move on, I need someone positive not someone who’s excluded with me cos I’ll just a...Like if they’re a drug dealer, hanging round with a drug dealer’s not going to help is it?’

(F5, 836-861)

At the beginning of the extract, F5 suggests that more arguments occurred when she first arrived at the PRU during a period of getting to know the other students, almost as a means of self-protection. She talks about establishing who talk to and who to trust, before concluding that ‘I don’t trust none of them to be honest’ and ‘I don’t wanna know anyone in a PRU’. She goes on to justify this view by claiming she needs a positive influence in order to move
on. Perhaps weary of the influence of the other students, she is unable or unwilling to identify with them, describing them as ‘weird’. It is unclear from this extract whether her view has been influenced by the thoughts and opinions of family and friends outside of the PRU context. Her perception of the other students nevertheless seems to impact on her relationships with them.

_F3_ presents a similar view, saying:

‘_F3_: ...this is a PRU so everyone is bad, so your friends will always be bad. It ain’t really good to pick up friends from here.’

(F3, 674-676)

_F1_ suggests a temporary nature to the relationships she has developed:

‘_MW_: ...so would you say your friendships are important to you?

_F1_: Um, now it’s not because in a few years time I’m not going to know any of these people...’

(F1, 246-247)

This apparent distancing may suggest an unwillingness to accept their personal realities as students in a PRU. As suggested by _F5_ earlier, the small, unique and select nature of the PRU perhaps implies a greater commonality amongst its students. If your peers suggest or confirm an undesirable identity potentially applicable to yourself, is it more advantageous to shun them and the associations and connotations they convey and impart? This is discussed further in the following chapter, in relation to the need for _Relatedness_ (5.3.3) and in relation to possible effect of power imbalances and social desirability in the interview setting (5.4.2).

In contrast to this perspective, other students presented a greater sense of shared identity. For example, _M1_ explains how: ‘I can like more relate to them...cos...we’re in the same position, in the same school...got kicked out of school. I can more relate to them’ (M1, 643-644). However, he then goes on to describe some of the problems experienced with his peers, summarised as:
‘Disagreements, arguments, fighting’ (M1, 662). Indeed, most participants cited verbal and physical confrontations when talking about their relationships with others, or alluded to a lack of relationships with other students all together.

Connectedness and Belonging
When analysed at the latent level, the participants’ comments about the positive and negative aspects of their relationships with staff and peers also revealed the extent to which they felt a sense of connectedness and belonging within this context. Whilst the examples above demonstrate a connectedness with other students, but a lack of belonging, the existence of both was indicated when participants spoke about the staff:

‘M2: They know how it is for like kids like us. Cos I know a lot of the TAs here have experienced a similar thing as us when they’ve been like kicked out of schools and that so they can relate. And so then they know how to speak to you and that, so you just, you just get on with the teachers better here. So you work, it’s like a, it’s like a family. Cos you can just like, most of the TAs here you can just tell them anything, and just get on with them.’

(M2, 447-453)

This extract suggests both a sense of connectedness, in that he may perceive staff have had a similar experience to him, and belonging in the comment ‘it’s like a family’.

As mentioned earlier (4.3.1), the positive relationships developed between students and staff are likely to mediate the way the participants accept and adhere to school rules and behaviour management techniques. According to SDT, ‘Autonomy develops most effectively in situations where children and teenagers feel a sense of Relatedness and closeness to, rather than disaffiliation from, significant adults’ (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991, p. 340). The interplay between the needs for Autonomy and Relatedness is discussed in the following chapter (5.3.3) and consider further with regard to future research implications (5.5.1).
4.3.4. Summary of findings related to Sub-question 2

‘How does the young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

**Autonomy** – The theme *Choice* revealed a sense of volition in relation to work experience and vocational course opportunities provided by the PRU. Restricted freedoms were viewed as similar to their mainstream experience. Within the theme *Punishments*, participants reported a similar approach to behaviour management to that of their mainstream provisions. However, in contrast, they presented as more accepting of the consequences, viewing the methods as more effective.

**Competence** - Supports and limitations for *Competence* emerged within the themes *Personal, Interpersonal and Environmental*. Participant reported a number of interpersonal supports for *Competence*, citing no interpersonal limitations. Environmental supports for *Competence* were reported including vocational courses, the class sizes, the lessons and rewards. Perceived environmental limitations emerged, including the academic level of the work completed and the number of subjects on offer.

**Relatedness** – The findings suggested both supports and limitations within the themes *Staff relations, Peer relations and Connectedness and Belonging*. Despite identifying (connecting) with their peers, participants suggested a lack of belonging. Relationships with staff were perceived as positive leading to feelings of both connectedness and belonging.

A detailed thematic map for the context ‘PRU’ (the participants’ current provision) was drawn as a descriptive account of the data as related to each BPN within the context as a whole. Due to its size and complexity, it is included on the *Supplementary Appendices CD* in PDF format (CD Appendix 4.xi). A simplified version including only codes, themes and sub-themes is provided in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2. Thematic map of PRU context
4.4. Findings related to Sub-question 3
These findings are presented in relation to the following sub-question:
‘How do the young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

The following subsections present the way in which the CYP’s experiences Outside of School (OoS), as described by them in the interviews, supported or thwarted their need for Autonomy (4.4.1), Competence (4.4.2) and Relatedness (4.4.3). The findings are then summarised (4.4.4).

4.4.1. Supports and limitations for autonomy OoS
The data revealed a number of perceived social-contextual supports and limitations for Autonomy in this context. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes: Parental Control and Choice. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.vii.

**Parental Control**
Two subthemes were identified within this theme: Punishments and Physical Freedom. Within the subtheme Punishments, participants talked about the ways in which the parents would deal with bad behaviour. F3 spoke of two possible scenarios:

‘F3: If I’m bad, I know yeah obviously. If I did something really bad and I want to go somewhere, I know not to just ask my mum and my dad cos they’ll just say no because I was bad. But, if like the teacher calls my mum to complain about me when I do something naughty yeah, she probably might let me out, it depends how she feels.’

(F3, 867-871)

She expressed a perceived difference in the way her parents would respond to bad behaviour they had witnessed or experienced, compared to that reported by the school. She also suggests that allowing or not allowing her out (‘grounding’) was the way her parents would deal with bad behaviour and that this was dependent on how her mother was feeling at the time.
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F5 negated the effectiveness of grounding as an effective means of punishment, saying:

‘F5: ...she would just shout. She shouts and that. Grounding doesn’t really do anything.

MW: Why not?

F5: Cos I just, cos I have my TV and comp...my laptop up in there. So I would be glad to be grounded to my bedroom cos I’d just stay there and sleep and play on my computer.’

(F5, 1457-1464)

There is a sense that by eschewing the attempts to control her behaviour she would regain a perceived sense of Autonomy. She would be ‘glad’ to spend time in her room engaging in chosen activities of her own volition.

For others however, the amount of perceived physical freedom was seemingly important. Within the subtheme Physical Freedom, participants expressed the importance of being allowed to go shopping, to parties, to a restaurant or to the houses of friends. The amount of perceived freedom they were given varied considerably between participants, although most participants reported parents requesting knowledge of their whereabouts and whom they were with, alongside specifying a time by which they had to return. Other ways in which parental control was maintained, included reminding their child to answer their phone and only allowing them to visit areas of London with family members nearby. Whilst restrictions to physical freedom (‘grounding’) was cited as a punishment to bad behaviour (see above), some participants reported often not being allowed to go out due to other reasons:

‘F5: ...or she might be complicated and say “no, you’ve been out, you go out everyday”...Cos she says that...’children shouldn’t be on the road all the time”. She says that “children should be at home”.’

(F5, 1261-1268)
F5’s suggestion that her mother ‘might be complicated’, implies a perceived changeability in whether her mother will or will not let her go out. The remainder of the extract suggests that this decision may be justified by her mother’s views (and perhaps feelings at the time) and not necessarily based on an appraisal of F5’s behaviour.

In contrast to this, some participants reported a lack of parental control and an increase in the amount of physical freedom afforded overtime. Consider the following exchange with M2:

‘MW: ...Imagine you got back at I don’t know 10:30-11, what would happen then?

M2: Nothing, nothing I would just come in.

MW: And that would be alright?

M2: [nods his head]...When I was like, like 11 and younger it was kind of like 8-9 and I had to be in bed by like 9:30. But now I’ve just got, now I just do what I want really.

MW: When did that change?

M2: When my brother...my brother, when my brother took control of the house. Because my mum’s not in control of the house.’

(M2, 882-900)

M2’s situation is considered further in section 4.4.3 in relation to supports and limitations for Relatedness in the OoS context.

Choice

When talking about their lives OoS, participants expressed both a sense of, and a need for, volition in the choices they made in a variety of areas. These areas emerged as the subthemes: What school, Spare time, Beliefs and Life goals.

Throughout the stages of the interview, it was common for participants to express dismay at the decisions made by others around their school placement. As reported in section 4.2.1, M1 linked the fact that he did not choose to go to his mainstream school with the way he behaved whilst there,
claiming that he ‘chose’ to be excluded because of this. He complained that it was his Dad’s decision and that ‘I didn’t want to go to that school’ (21-22). It was also important for participants to feel a sense of control and choice around what they did with their spare time:

‘F1: ...on my phone, play PlayStation, watch TV, on the computer...hmm.

MW: OK, what do you like about doing those things?

F1: I don’t know, just peaceful. My mum always says, “pick up a book and learn”, but it’s not something that I’m into.’

(F1, 626-631)

F5 also suggested a resistance to parental suggestions as to how to spend her time:

‘F5: My mum’s gonna...was trying to sign me to go and do a project. She said I need to go and do something with my life on weekend. But I said, “No, weekend is for you to chill”.’

(F5, 1303-1305)

F5 goes on to further assert an independence of mind, this time in relation to her religious beliefs and whether or not she should attend church:

‘MW: Do you feel like you should go to church?

F5: No, because...I’m different, and I don’t think I should believe, I, I don’t feel I should go church because my parents go church, I think I should lead a path of my own...going church is an option.’

(F5, 1360-1367)

Finally, participants alluded to an appreciation of their need for Autonomy by talking about future orientated life goals:

‘M1: I think you can do anything if you put your mind to it...if you’re from the bottom you have to work even harder like to build yourself up like, get your voice heard. But like you have to have the determination to get what you want, to drive yourself to your goal...I want to become an inventor of
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something...I want to make something that will make people’s lives better...like...I don’t know.’

(M1, 1293-1311)

Such goals are viewed by SDT as ‘Intrinsic Aspirations’ (Kasser & Ryan, 1996) and their relationship with BPN satisfaction, and in particular Autonomy, will be discussed further in section 5.3.1.

4.4.2. Supports and limitations for competence OoS

As in the previous two contexts, the data revealed a number of perceived supports and limitations for Competence in this context, identified within the themes Personal, Interpersonal and Environmental. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.viii.

Personal

Personal supports for feelings of Competence were revealed through the participants’ reference to skills and abilities employed in activities and past times. Whether playing computer games, cooking, playing football, shopping, partying, making friends or ‘being loud on the bus’, all the participants were able to identify activities or situations outside of school that appeared to lead to them experiencing feelings of Competence.

The data suggested that whilst participants may have had a personal perception that they are good at something, it was constructed and validated by evidence from interpersonal and environmental sources. For example, M2 spoke at length about playing computer games online with a group of other CYP, concluding that ‘I’m like the third best’ (733-734). Asked how he knew this, he replied:

‘M2: ...you just look like you can look at the scoreboard, who’s got the most scores, who’s got the most deaths and all that. And you just know who’s better.’

(M2, 740-742)
Despite this personal support for Competence (knowing he is good at something) stemming from environmental substantiation (viewing the scoreboard), by stating ‘I’m like the third best’ M2 shows this knowledge to be a personal resource that when drawn upon can support feelings of Competence. Participants also demonstrated personal limitations to feelings of Competence in the form of personal criticism. Consider the following extract from F3:

‘F3: ...I was rude. My outside...basically it was because of my outside of school behaviour, but I was being excluded because like if I do something naughty or bad, I was doing it in school uniform...so then they just used to exclude me for the things I used to do outside of school.’

(F3, 43-47)

She goes on to say how she ‘...had outside school behaviour problems...that’s why I got kicked out of school’ (617-618), presenting a negative self-concept that internalises the cause and culpability of her temporary and permanent exclusions from school to within herself. She has seemingly retained this self-critical understanding of the difficulties she faced, and is therefore able to reconstruct them as in the extract above. Whilst she does not directly attribute this understanding to interpersonal and environmental factors, it is difficult to envisage how else this view was constructed.

Interpersonal

Interpersonal supports and limitations for Competence were identified within the subthemes Rewards, Verbal praise and Support. Participants reported being bought material goods as rewards and receiving them through organisations they were members of, e.g. badges at Cadets. In line with physical freedom being restricted as a punishment (see 4.4.1), participants also reported the allowance of physical freedom being used as a reward:

‘M3: If I ask my dad, “Can I go to SXXXXX (local high street)”, he’ll say...“Er...go on then, you’ve been good”. That’s like a reward basically.’

(M3, 1203-1204)
Despite the potential for this to support feelings of Competence within M3, particularly if the parent were in reality to use the words ‘you’ve been good’, the detrimental effects of extrinsic rewards such as this (and those mentioned above) on perceived Competence are well documented within SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2002). The data is inconclusive in determining which function (supporting or thwarting) was served by the rewards reported. Further information would be needed in terms of the regularity of their use, how explicitly they were used and whether their use was accompanied by supports for Autonomy and Relatedness; all of which is beyond the scope of this study.

In contrast to the parental use of rewards, it is likely that verbal praise received by participants OoS served to increase feelings of Competence. Consider the following from F5:

‘F5: ...I am good at it (cooking) cos I cook by myself, and I give my family some and they like it...They say it tastes nice.

MW: How does that make you feel when they say it tastes nice?

F5: It makes me feel alright. Just to...know that I can cook better than them.’

(F5, 172-182)

It was apparent from other participants that such praise was not always a part of lives outside of school, the absence of which could be considered a limiting factor:

MW: Ok. I am just trying to work out how your dad would show you that he was pleased...

M1: He wouldn’t do anything.

MW: If you were good at something, would he tell you that you were good at it?

M1: No.

(M1, 953-959)
However, within the subtheme Support, participants revealed that interpersonal supports for Competence were available in addition to that provided by verbal praise. *M1* talked about the interpersonal support he received from his Grandma:

‘*M1*: [She is a] more comfortable person to be around. [She] praises you if you do something good and she’ll help me out. She’ll like, she’ll like look after me properly. She actually cares.’

(M1, 969-971)

Other interpersonal supports for Competence were reported in terms of family members or friends assisting participants with homework.

**Environmental**

Reported environmental supports for Competence included feedback from the task or activity they were completing, e.g. computers games as in the example above (p.112). Participants also referred to perceived supports and limitations as related to a more general sense of how they saw life and the opportunities it afforded:

‘*M3*: ...basically, my family ain’t that rich and I’m trying to make it somewhere. There’s always a chance though...just try, just try your hardest...Yeah that’s what I would say to like the other children. Take any courses you can, take the chance, cos it’s hard to find a job out there...so.’

(M3, 1347-1359)

Here, *M3* suggests that how rich somebody is may limit feelings of Competence, along with potential difficulties in finding employment. At the same time, he alludes to the concept of ‘social mobility’, agreeing that there is ‘a ladder for the kids that ain’t brought up with rich families and all of that. There’s a ladder for them.’ (1346-1347). This suggests a perception that society possesses sufficient environmental supports for Competence to make this a reality.
4.4.3. Supports and limitations for relatedness OoS

The data revealed a number of perceived supports and limitations for Relatedness in this context. The findings are reported under the subheadings of the identified themes: Family relations, Peer relations, Other relations, Connectedness and Belonging. For further details of the themes and subthemes identified see Appendix 4.ix.

*Family relations*

This theme contained the following subthemes: Parents/carers, Siblings and Extended family. Within these, participants described both positive and negative aspects of the family relations, suggesting both supports and limitations within this context. F5 described a positive aspect of her relationship with her mother:

’F5: Yeah and she hugs and squeezes me and it’s annoying...and I’m like “it’s only meant to be a two second hug, not ten second or ten minutes.”

MW: OK, why do you think she does that?

F5: Because she’s proud...she couldn’t stop hugging my sister the other day.’

(F5, 1498-1507)

However, as demonstrated in the following exchange with M1, unconstructive parental relations were also perceived by participants to have a direct impact on outcomes within the school environment:

’MW: You mentioned your dad before, and how he wanted you to go to PP (Previous Provision). When you got into trouble at PP, how did your dad react to that?

M1: He used to shout at me and stuff like that. And don’t think that helped, I think it made it worse like. It would just make me angry. So when I went to school, I kind of like channelled the anger. If anyone did anything I didn’t like then I kind of took it out on them.’

(M1, 851-857)
M2 talked about complex family relationships that had developed due to his mother being an alcoholic, with his brother taking ‘control of the house’ (899-900). He also talked about how his brother would deal with bad behaviour:

‘M2: Obviously yeah if I like. Obviously if I do something bad my brother will give me a tump (thump).

MW: He’ll give you a what?

M2: A tump.

MW: You mean he’ll hit you?

M2: [nods his head]...Like a little brother, like a brother would do like if you’ve done something wrong and you knew you shouldn’t be doing that, he’d be like ‘why are you doing that?’ and he’d just punch me.’

(M2, 851-866)

He went on to explain how his brother was ‘the stable one in the house’ (910-911); given the difficulties his mother was facing at the time. M2’s use of the words ‘obviously’ and ‘like a brother would do’ could be interpreted as an attempt to normalise the behaviour of his brother towards him. If so, for whom is he attempting to do this, the researcher or himself? What is clear is how his sense of Relatedness was likely to be thwarted by the family relations reported. All participants who spoke of extended family relations talked about them in positive terms.

Peer relations

Peer relations outside of school were predominantly presented as positive. Participants alluded to the importance of making friends and the positive aspects of their friendships. However, F1 hinted at the impact that attending a PRU could have on relationships outside of school:

‘F1: ...people say I’ve changed as a person. But I don’t...

MW: Who says that?

F1: Erm just like people that I used to know, like my friends...in the other school like...

MW: What do they mean by that? Changed in what way?
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F1: I don’t know, my mum even thinks I’ve changed at home...so...

MW: What does she say?

F1: I don’t...I’m getting more rude, rude and talking back, she says she don’t understand where I’ve got this from.’

(F1, 557-575)

Other relations
Participants held established relationships in a number of other contexts outside of the family and peer contexts, for example within churches, clubs (youth clubs and Army Cadets) and amongst family friends. It was apparent that these settings provided the CYP with positive role models who they could relate to in a positive way. M1 talked about the people he spends time with at church and explained why they were different to people in other parts of his life:

‘M1: They’re like more religious like. Like they don’t do as much things as...I don’t know it’s...I think they’re kind of goody goodies or something...I think they’re just scared of life, scared of everything.

MW: ...Do you enjoy going?

M1: Yeah most of the time.

MW: Why do you enjoy it?

M1: I feel it’s a comfortable environment. My family is there.’

(M1, 1250-1273)

Connectedness and Belonging
When analysed at the latent level, the participants’ comments about the positive and negative aspects of their relationships with people outside of school revealed the extent to which they felt a sense of connectedness and belonging within this context.
It was apparent that participants maintained a sense of connectedness through online computer games and social networking services such as Twitter, Blackberry Messenger (BBM) and Facebook. M2 talked about the online computer game ‘clan’ of which he was a member:

‘MW: OK and are they (the members of the clan) all from London, are they all from round here?

M2: Erm...one of them is from Yorkshire and one of them is from Cornwall and then four of us live on the same estate. Liam ‘mirror-reaps’ and ‘mirror-murks’ and mirror-shadows’ and me live on the same estate...The guy in Cornwall, Declan, he just started it up and he’s really, he’s one of them guys that’s really easy to get along with he just jokes a lot, and then like obviously we was like “are you starting a clan?”, and then we just joint and then that was it.’

(M2, 769-781)

In this extract M2 expresses a sense of connectedness with others he has not necessarily met in person, who live hundreds of miles away. He also conveys a sense of belongingness in being part of ‘a clan’. When asked why he liked playing games online he replied, ‘it’s better than being out on the road...because there is no danger’ (M2, 681-685). Suggesting both a lack of physical connectedness with the outside world, and an awareness of a possible risk to that connectedness, i.e. ‘danger’, this adds further weight to the importance of his online relationships.

However, other participants revealed doubts about the sense of belonging and connectedness they experienced through online mediums. F6 expressed her concerns about the way other young people may use social networking services:

‘F6: ...if I like someone then I wouldn’t tell them on BBM. I’d rather tell them face-to-face, cos they can munch it...erm...

MW: What do you mean by that?

F6: Like, screen munch...screen grabber...like print screen...other people could see it.’

(F6, 895-912)
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F6 conveys a mistrust of others, suggesting that people may copy something she posts online to show others. These insecurities appear to stem from an awareness of the ways in which such services are used. F3 provides further insight into online etiquette (or ‘netiquette’) claiming that she is ‘just on Facebook to watch (look at) people’s pictures’ (1107-1109). Further discussion of the impact of technology on the supporting and thwarting of the BPN Relatedness can be found in section 5.3.3.

In talking about their aspirations, participants expressed a connectedness to wider society, e.g. ‘that’s what I would like to say to the other children...take the chance’ (M3, 1358-1359); ‘I want to make something that will make people’s lives better’ (M1, 1310-1311). In the following extract, M2 expresses a connectedness to his local community:

‘M2: Erm...it can be down to area that you live, how your home life is, what, what people you affiliate yourself with, and like I have grown up in a nice area, Waterloo is a nice area and like if you mix with the right people. There’s obviously like some people that you...you don’t want to get involved with...most of them are just nice people.’

(M2, 1012-1016)

At the beginning of the extract he also shows an awareness of the impact of social factors on the life of the individual, but also placing importance on affiliation and the choices made by the individual in this regard.

4.4.4. Summary of findings related to Sub-question 3

‘How do the young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

**Autonomy** – Interpersonal supports and limitations were identified within the themes *Parental Control* and *Choice*. Limitations to *Autonomy* were experienced through punishment for bad behaviour and restrictions to physical freedom. Supports for *Autonomy* originated from participants
reframing punishments to suit their wishes, e.g. ‘grounding’ seen favourably as watching TV in their bedroom. Alternatively, greater Autonomy was experienced due to complex family situations leading to less parental involvement and therefore less control.

**Competence** – Supports and limitations for Competence emerged within the themes Personal, Interpersonal and Environmental. Most salient was the impact of positive and negative self-concepts as personally supporting or limiting factors. The existence of verbal praise was seemingly related to the quality of OoS relationships experienced by participants. The use of physical freedom as a reward (along with material and monetary rewards) were noted, although insufficient data was obtained to infer positive or negative impacts of these on BPN satisfaction.

**Relatedness** – The findings suggested both supports and limitations within the themes Family relations, Peer relations, Other relations and Connectedness and Belonging. Whilst reporting positive aspects of family relationships, participants also gave examples of how negative family relations directly impacted on their behaviour at school. Peer relationships OoS were presented as predominantly positive. Online relationships were explored in relation to connectedness and belonging, as were participants’ sense of connectedness to a wider community through church and youth groups.

A detailed thematic map for the context Outside of School (OoS) was drawn as a descriptive account of the data as related to each BPN within the context as a whole. Due to its size and complexity, it is included on the Supplementary Appendices CD in PDF format (CD Appendix 4.xii). A simplified version including only codes, themes and sub-themes is provided in Figure 4.3.

Having reported and considered the research findings in relation to the three sub-questions in preceding sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, they are now considered in relation the main research question.
Figure 4.3. Thematic map of OoS context
4.5. Findings related to Main Research Question

The above reported findings are now considered in relation to the Main Research Question:

‘What role does Basic Psychological Need satisfaction play in the experience of permanent exclusion from school?’

4.5.1. Consideration of BPN satisfaction in Mainstream vs. PRU

The findings presented in 4.2 and 4.3 suggest a qualitative difference in BPN satisfaction, as perceived by the participants, between the Mainstream and PRU contexts. Whilst the reported limitations to Autonomy in terms of school rules and policy were ostensibly consistent across educational contexts, the way the participants perceived these were seemingly mediated by the differences in supports for Competence and Relatedness. As such, it appears that greater supports for Competence and Relatedness in the PRU setting led to participants experiencing greater perceived Autonomy and adhering more consistently to school rules.

Competence was better supported in the PRU setting when compared to mainstream. This was facilitated by smaller class sizes, increased perceived verbal praise and opportunities for vocational courses and work experience. Central to this were effective supports for Relatedness from PRU staff leading to both a sense of connectedness and belonging. This was despite the participants’ apparent difficulties in developing and sustaining positive relationships with their peers. Difficulties with peer relationships were apparent in both contexts, with the CYP’s sense of Relatedness further thwarted in the mainstream context through ineffectual relationships with staff; the latter permeating their responses throughout the interviews.

The findings therefore suggest that BPN satisfaction was central to the differing school experiences reported by participants across contexts, effecting their progress, engagement, behaviour and well-being. The following section will discuss how BPN satisfaction outside of school may also have impacted on this.
4.5.2. Consideration of BPN satisfaction OoS vs. within school contexts
The findings presented in 4.4 suggest both supports and limitations for BPN satisfaction in the OoS context. However, conclusions could not be drawn as to whether participants’ BPNs were predominantly met or not in this context. Additionally, whilst there was evidence to suggest the perceived thwarting of BPNs in the OoS context directly impacted on the within school experience of participants (see M1 extract on p. 124 above), the data set bore insufficient evidence to significantly support this premise in a more general sense. Furthermore, there were apparent differences in the quality of peer relations experienced in the OoS context compared to within school, with OoS peer relations expressed as predominantly positive. However, whilst these were expressed in the data, they were not explained by the data. Possible reasons for this are discussed in Chapter Five in reference to the limitations of the study (5.4).

4.5.3 Summary of findings related to the Main Research Question
The findings suggest a range of ways in which BPN satisfaction may play a role in the quality of an individual’s perceived school experience. A thematic analysis of the data corpus suggested that social-contextual supports or limitations for BPNs appear to relate to the individual’s perceived emotional responses, motivations and behaviours. For example, perceived thwarting of BPNs within the mainstream context was related to emotional responses, motivations and behaviours that arguably contributed to participants’ eventual permanent exclusion from school. By comparison, the data portrayed the PRU context as more BPN-supportive, and suggested indicators of well-being and increased motivation to engage with the curriculum on offer.

The findings from the OoS context suggested both supports and limitations to BPN, and lacked sufficiently salient themes to reliably understand the role of BPN in the CYP’s experience of permanent exclusion. Reasons for this are discussed in Chapter Five in terms of the study’s limitations (5.4). The aforementioned data was nonetheless informative and supportive in answering Sub-question 3 and did not impede on answering the Main Research Question.
4.6. Chapter summary

In this chapter, the qualitative data corpus was reported and considered in relation to each of the research questions posed. Sub-questions 1 (4.2), 2 (4.3) & 3 (4.4) were answered with reference to themes and subthemes supported by data extracted through the process of thematic analysis. The Main Research Question was then considered (4.5) in light of the findings reported in the previous sections.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION
5.1. Overview of chapter
This chapter reiterates the aims of the research (5.2) and provides a discursive comment on the findings (5.3) with regard to each of the Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) proposed by Self-Determination Theory (SDT): *Autonomy* (5.3.1), *Competence* (5.3.2) and *Relatedness* (5.3.3). The limitations of the study are then discussed (5.4), and the potential implications of the research are discussed in terms of future research (5.5.1) and future practice, (5.5.2) with specific reference to school-based (5.5.2.1) and Educational Psychology (EP) –based practice (5.5.2.2). In addition, the author offers some reflections on being both a TEP and researcher, and the impact of this on the process of research (5.6). The chapter ends with a summary (5.7) and some concluding remarks (5.7.1).

5.2. Reiteration of aims
The current study aimed to explore the experiences of permanently excluded children and young people (CYP) across three contexts:

1. Previous mainstream provision
2. Current provision (Pupil Referral Unit; PRU)
3. Outside of School (OoS)

The primary goal of this exploration was to construct an understanding of the experiences of these CYP from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000), and the concept of Basic Psychological Needs (BPNs) (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The study also aimed to listen to and promote the ‘voice of the child’ (Upton & Varma, 1996), in line with the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC; UNICEF, 2012), in particular articles 12 (*Respect for the views of the child*) and 13 (*Freedom of expression*). Furthermore, the study aimed to positively impact on the stakeholders (participants, parents/carers and school staff) through practice-based implications stemming from the findings, for example best-practice training, information sharing and policy influence.

The research aimed to answer the following research questions:
Main Research Question
‘What role does Basic Psychological Need satisfaction play in the experience of permanent exclusion from school?’

Sub-questions
1) ‘How did the children and young people’s experience of mainstream school support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

2) ‘How does the children and young people’s experience of their current provision support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

3) ‘How do the children and young people’s experiences outside of the school setting support or thwart their need for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness?’

5.3. Discursive comment on findings
The findings were reported in Chapter Four in relation to Sub-questions 1, 2 and 3, and then considered in relation to the Main Research Question. With regard to the former, the data suggested that participants perceived greater supports for their BPNs in their current provision (PRU) than in their previous mainstream schools. In the OoS context, participants reported both perceived supports and limitations to their BPNs. There was some evidence that the thwarting of BPNs OoS impacted negatively on the CYP’s school experience. In relation to the Main Research Question, the findings suggest a range of ways in which BPN satisfaction may play a role in the quality of an individual’s perceived school experience, and in turn their emotional responses, motivations and behaviours. The following three subsections discuss, with reference to both the current study and the relevant existing literature, the possible consequences of BPN supports/limitations for the population sampled for the current study.

5.3.1. The role of Autonomy
The findings from the current study suggest that the CYP perceived social-contextual limitations to their Autonomy in the mainstream setting which were associated with them experiencing difficulty integrating and identifying with the external demands and pressures of the school. This is perhaps best exemplified by the participants’ inability to perceive a meaningful rationale in
the requests of staff (see M3 extracts in 4.2.1), and in their apparent need to express a sense of volition over their behaviour and, in some cases, their eventual permanent exclusion, e.g. M1: ‘...I chose to cos I wanted to’. The participants’ perceived limitations to their experienced Autonomy and the difficulties they reported were in line with the SDT research base, the implications of which are well documented and discussed in Chapter Two (2.4) (also see Connell & Wellborn, 1991, cited in Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 73; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Miserandino, 1996; Ryan & Connell, 1989).

Although participants perceived little difference between the behaviour management policies use in mainstream and within the PRU setting, they appeared to experienced a more autonomous form of extrinsic motivation. Central to this is the extent to which the behaviour of the CYP was intrinsically or autonomously motivated as opposed to extrinsically controlled. SDT’s micro theory Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) pertains that people are naturally disposed to integrate their ongoing experiences, assuming they have the necessary nutriments (BPN supports) to do so (Deci & Ryan, 2002). As such, CYP are more likely internalise and integrate non-autonomous (extrinsic) and controlled behaviours when their BPNs are satisfied. Central to this integration is support for the need for Relatedness and Competence, suggesting that the behaviour of the participants in the PRU was mediated by the relationships fostered with staff and the bespoke nature of the curriculum. For example, F1 expressed a positive view of the school’s approach to punishment that seemed at odds with the other participants (4.3.1). From the perspective of SDT, it is likely that she was more able to integrate the expectations of the school into her own value system given the additional time she had been in attendance and the positive relationships with staff she had formed.

Furthermore, participants expressed a sense of volition and control over the vocational courses and work experience opportunities provided, where they were allowed to make their own choices and explorations (e.g. where to go and what to do), initiate and carry out projects (e.g. organising a festival) and have their views listened to and valued throughout. As such, Autonomy was
seemingly supported through existing supports for Competence and Relatedness. The Autonomy-supportive experiences recalled by participants are in line with the ways in which SDT suggests the experience of Autonomy can be supported. These include:

1) Acknowledging people’s inner experiences or ‘taking their perspective’  
2) Providing people with choice  
3) Supporting exploration  
4) Encouraging self-initiation  
5) Providing a meaningful rationale or ‘making it relevant’  

(Deci, 2012)

As mentioned in 4.4.1, SDT suggests such strategies are also more likely to lead towards ‘Intrinsic Aspirations’ (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Kasser & Ryan, 1996). Kasser and Ryan (1996) suggest that the achievement of intrinsically motivated goals in turn leads to greater future BPN satisfaction. Further ways in which self-perpetuating BPN satisfaction can be facilitated through Autonomy-supportive teaching are discussed below when considering the implications for school-based practice (5.5.2.1).

5.3.2. The role of Competence

The findings from the current study suggested that participants experienced Competence at greater levels in the OoS context, when participating in activities that were experienced as intrinsically motivating and undertaken of their own volition (e.g. playing computer games, using social networking websites). The feedback received from such activities appeared to come from both the activity itself and interpersonal feedback from others. In the school setting, the predominant supports for Competence were more closely tied to interpersonal supports, in particular the relationships developed with staff. Verbal feedback in the form of positive praise was identified as supportive in this respect, both in the mainstream and PRU setting. Still, there was an apparent discrepancy between the CYP’s perceived satisfaction of the need for Competence between these contexts, arguably mediated by the quality of the relationships developed with staff.
Still, despite participants suggesting greater supports for Competence in the PRU setting, this was still seemingly hindered by a negative self-concept, a view supported by what the participants perceived the opinions of those outside of the PRU setting to be. In line with research carried out by Lumby (2012), the CYP were seemingly pathologised and disempowered by the ‘subtle signals of their perceived outlier nature’ (p. 275). The following selection of comments from the participants support this premise:

- ‘I never went on none of the trips...I didn’t deserve it’ (F6, 182-183)
- ‘...it was me. It was me why I got kicked out, it was me why I am here. It’s me, it’s my actions that have brought me to this place... it was me.’ (F1, 231-233)
- ‘...they think I’m dumb as well, they proper think I’m dumb...’ (M2, 412-413)
- ‘...they said I’m alright, but not...excellent...but alright, I was alright.’ (F6, 140)
- ‘...this is a PRU so everyone is bad, so your friends will always be bad.’ (F3, 674)

Here, their voices do not talk of disengagement, or allude to disaffection. Nor do they refer to rifts in relationships or criticisms of lessons. Here they depict the detrimental psychological effects of being permanently excluded from school; they infer injured notions of themselves, their capabilities and their self-esteem. This tendency to individualise the difficulties they face is in line with existing research in this area (Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999). Key to repairing the damage done and boosting feelings of Competence are the quality of the relationships formed with staff and the extent to which these operate within an Autonomy-supportive environment. This will be discussed further below when considering the implications for school-based practice (5.2.2.1).

5.3.3. The role of Relatedness
The findings suggest that participants in the current study experienced a greater satisfaction of the need for *Relatedness* in the PRU and OoS settings, with regard to their relationships with staff and friends/family respectively. The negative aspects of their relationships with both staff and peers within the mainstream setting appeared central to the accumulation of negative events and circumstances leading up their eventual permanent exclusion. The difficulties experienced by participants did not occur in isolation; most of the negative experiences recalled by participants involved verbal or physical confrontations with others as the trigger for an event, its escalation or its conclusion.

Furthermore, these relationships were dynamic and interactive processes. As such, disagreements appeared to lead to a thwarting of the need for *Relatedness* in both people involved with ‘knock-on’ effects (e.g. the holding of grudges, preferential treatment, restricted *Autonomy* through punishment). To illustrate the point, when the BPN for *Competence* or *Autonomy* is thwarted by the behaviour of another individual, that individual is likely to experience the thwarting of those needs also. The thwarting of *Relatedness* as a result of conflict potentially affects all involved with detrimental effects. Hence there is an argument for measuring BPN satisfaction in both staff and students following conflict situations. This will be discussed further in section 5.5.1 when considering the implications for future research.

Where participants felt more related to staff in both school settings, it appeared to support a greater internalisation of the requirements of school, alongside a greater experience of *Autonomy*. This was more apparent in the PRU context where staff were described in the following ways: ‘fun’, ‘normal’, ‘caring’, ‘chilled’ (relaxed), ‘understanding’, ‘trusting’, ‘easy to talk to’, ‘patient’, ‘friendly’, ‘we get on’, ‘like family’, ‘close’, ‘like parents’, ‘like a friend’, ‘calm’, and ‘on the level’ (without imposed authority or power). In viewing the staff as ‘on the level’ and perceiving them to have had similar experiences to them, the CYP were more inclined to assimilate and regulate their behaviour in line with the rules and regulations of the school. Describing the staff as ‘like a family’ and ‘close’, it was clear that the quality of these relationships
contributed to feelings of both connectedness and belonging, in line with SDT's definition of *Relatedness*.

On the other hand, participants felt less related to their peers, with some CYP perceiving difficulties involving other students as the main reason for their permanent exclusion. In the PRU setting, the CYP still articulated a distance between their fellow students and themselves, but in terms of the other students being ‘bad’ or ‘weird’, as somehow different to them. One interpretation of this could be that they wanted to portray themselves as different, in order to protect feelings of *Competence*. To identify with and feel related to their peers would be to publicly acknowledge their own difficulties. The interview setting may have amplified the salience of such an effect, with the students perhaps keen to impress the interviewer or project a certain representation of themselves, e.g. tougher, more individual and dissimilar to their peers. This is discussed further when considering the limitations of the study (5.4) and the implications for future research (5.5.1).

In the OoS context the participants expressed a supporting of the need for *Relatedness* in terms of their relations with family, friends, organisations/clubs and in terms of their local communities. Online activities such as social networking and online computer gaming were seemingly popular with all the participants as a means of socialising with others. Participants expressed a preference for the social experiences provided by these technologies; with one participant claiming ‘it's better than being out on the road...because there is no danger’ (M2, 681-685). Still, they were seemingly aware of the risks to their *Relatedness* and *Competence* posed by these tools, with a participant citing ‘screen munching’ - the ability for someone to steal a picture of you online and repost it without you knowing, as something to be wary of. Nevertheless, the use of social media technology was seemingly integral to the satisfaction of the need for *Relatedness* in the OoS context. There is a need for research to explore this further in terms of how teaching staff relate to young people, who as ‘digital natives’ (Bennett & Maton, 2010) are arguably both more adept at and reliant on the use of these technologies in
their everyday lives. This is discussed further in terms of the implications for future research, specifically from an SDT perspective (5.5.1).

5.3.4. Concluding comments on findings

The application of SDT and specifically the concept of BPNs have provided a means of interpreting and understanding the qualitative experiences of permanent exclusion as recalled by participants. From this perspective, the reactions, emotions, motivations and behaviours of the CYP can be seen as inseparable from the social-context in which they were experienced, and the functional significance of particular social-contextual factors, e.g. the school rules and expectations or their interactions with others, unique to the individual. As such, the findings suggest circumstances in which the CYP experienced their BPNs to be both supported and thwarted in a multitude of ways. However, the findings do not go beyond this to assert definitive and/or specific causal relationships between the thwarting of BPNs in the mainstream setting, and permanent exclusion as an outcome. Indeed it was never the aim of the study to explain why permanent exclusions occur.

In contrast, by simultaneously acknowledging both the subjective and constructed components of the participants’ realities, alongside their arguably underrepresented and vulnerable nature, the findings of the current study may serve a number of functions that go beyond that of causal explanation. These include:

- Promoting the ‘voice of the child’ in line with Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC; UNICEF, 2012);
- Feeding back findings to staff and students at the PRU;
- Contributing to a growing knowledge base from which theoretical models and future hypotheses can be formed;
- Providing an exploratory foundation from which alternatively designed future research practice in this area can develop;
- Impacting on future EP and school-based practice through training.
Whilst the latter two points are considered below (see sections 5.5.1 & 5.5.2 respectively), the others are addressed below as a means of concluding this section.

*Promoting the ‘voice of the child’*

Recent years have seen increasing interest in the experiences and perceptions of children. According to Tangen (2008):

‘Children are no longer viewed primarily as “becomings”, but as “beings”, whose ideas, experiences, choices and relationships are interesting in their own right. Children, like adults, are “social agents”, who make sense of their experiences.’

(p. 157)

Whilst some of this interest is politically and economically motivated, with children increasingly viewed as active consumers, the attention paid to the voice of the child in social science research is arguably less cynical. The current study aimed to recognise, respect and relay the experiences of permanently excluded CYP who have a right to be heard (UNICEF, 2012). The researcher acknowledges the extent to which their own personal beliefs, values and experiences led to issues of fairness, equality, social justice and ‘the voice of child’ becoming central to the study.

Essential to this was the capacity to support the CYP in being both willing and able to participate. As such, participation was made as straightforward and appealing as possible through carefully worded information guides and consent forms for participants, parents/carers and staff (Appendices 3.i-3.iii), and through face-to-face introductory meetings. In the interviews, the researcher graded their language and approach, to make the process as supportive of the CYP’s BPN’s as possible.

In being able to tell their side of the story, the CYP were well positioned to express how well they perceived the adults and the social environment, in which they were educated and cared for, had met their needs. Their voices
demonstrated both an appreciation of BPN-supporting experiences and a resentment of situations where they perceived their BPNs to have been thwarted. Through subtle suggestions and overt demands, their words signposted a way forward that would be fed back to staff and peers at the PRU, and hopefully with further scope through additional school-based practical applications (5.5.2.1).

Feeding back findings to staff and students at the PRU
Upon completion of this thesis, the researcher revisited the research venue to feedback the findings to staff and students. As part of this visit and presentation, the following ‘What Works’ table (Table 5.1) was presented. The table contained a list of practical BPN-supporting strategies that were expressed semantically or latently by participants. It was hoped that engaging staff and students in discussions around supporting BPNs and in the implementation of ‘What Works’, the participants that remained on role at the PRU, and their peers, would experience some positive impact from the research. It was also hoped that the PRU staff would benefit from viewing and understanding their interactions with the CYP using the concepts provided by SDT. Further implications for school-based practice are discussed below (5.5.2.1).

Contributing to an existing knowledge base
Despite the aforementioned lack of generalisability and ascertained causal relationships, the current study adds to a growing body of knowledge about the experience of permanent exclusion (Daniels, 2011; Gersch & Nolan, 1994; Gross & McChrystal, 2001; Munn & Lloyd, 2005; Pomeroy, 1999; Solomon & Rogers, 2001). As stated earlier, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge at the time of writing, it is also the first qualitative research study to apply the tenets of SDT to this area of study. The researcher suggests future directions of study based on the findings of the exploratory study (5.5.1). Furthermore, the researcher proposes two opposing outcome models of BPN satisfaction (Appendices 5.i & 5.ii).
Basic Psychological Need (BPN) | Suggested Supporting Strategy (‘What Works’) | 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>“Let me make choices and express myself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>“Tell me exactly what I’m good at and why I’m good at it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>“Care about me and show me that you care”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. ‘What Works’ table of suggested BPN supporting strategies

The first diagram (Appendix 5.i) illustrates the potential outcomes when social and environmental factors successfully support the satisfaction of the CYP’s BPNs. These are:

- Identified / Integrated Regulation Of Behaviour
- Self-Efficacy & Achievement
- Connectedness & Belonging
- Confidence, Well-Being & Aspiration

In line with existing SDT research (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; 2002), the proposed model predicts that these outcomes will in turn assist in further supporting the BPNs of the individual, creating an interactive ‘upward spiralling’ effect. The second diagram (Appendix 5.ii) illustrates the potential outcomes when social and environmental factors instead thwart the satisfaction of the CYP’s BPNs. These are:

- External / Introjected regulation of behaviour
- Disengagement & disaffection
- Reduced connectedness & belonging
- Negative self-concept & reduced well-being
Conversely, these outcomes are likely to assist in further thwarting the BPNs of the individual, creating an interactive ‘downward spiralling’ effect. The proposed model is discussed further in section 5.5.1 in relation to the implications for future research.

### 5.4. Limitations

In discussing the limitations of the current study, it is important that they are considered within the context of the study's aims and adopted research paradigm. In aiming to explore the experiences of permanently excluded CYP from a critical realist perspective, the researcher recognised and valued the subjective and constructed nature of those lived experiences, but at the same time appreciated the utility of applying scientific knowledge to the analytical interpretation and understanding of these experiences from the perspective of SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000, 2002). There will therefore be aspects of the study which, when viewed from the polarised positivist and/or relativist perspectives, may seem limiting to the stated aims or quality of the research. Just as such criticisms may hold value and import within their respective paradigms, the limitations discussed in this section are significant when viewed from the critical realist perspective adopted by the researcher. Ways in which the researcher attempted to avoid possible limiting factors are also considered throughout this section.

#### 5.4.1. Researcher limitations

*Personal experience and interests*

It was important for the researcher to acknowledge and respond to the potential for their personal interest in SDT and their values and beliefs around social justice and inclusion to overly influence the direction and/or outcome of the research. As such, their role required a high level of self-awareness and continued reflexivity was required in order for the researcher to confront and acknowledge the way in which they ‘filtered’ and interpreted both their own and others experiences. Initial reactions to observations or experiences were interrogated and as their capacity for reflexivity increased, they became aware of how their thoughts and feelings were, at times, aligned with those of the
participants, for example noticing that they similarly tended towards challenging expressions of authority and perceived restrictions to autonomy.

The following extract from the researcher’s Research Journal demonstrates a degree of reflection and reflexivity:

‘The more I read about SDT, the more I am interested in its potential applicability within educational settings. Regardless of my own personal interest in the theory, it is imperative that it is applied objectively within my research as a means of exploring and understanding the data as presented by the participants’.

(Research Diary, August 2012)

Further reflections are included in section 5.6, when considering the split role of EP and researcher.

Interview experience
The researcher had limited experience of conducting interviews. The quality of the interviews and the data produced arguably increased as the researcher became more familiar with the Semi-Structured Interview (SSI) technique and the included questions. The researcher became increasingly able to make profitable use of the approach’s flexibility, for example following up interesting responses or noting non-verbal cues that may help understand a verbal response.

Data analysis experience
Despite previous experience in the analysis of qualitative data, the researcher was initially unfamiliar with the process of Thematic Analysis (TA). As such, the period of data analysis took longer than the researcher had planned for in the initial proposed time-scale.

The researcher was aware of the need to search for negative cases as a means of countering researcher bias and where possible completed ‘member
checking’ with participants that were still on role at the PRU following data analysis (n=2) (Robson, 2011).

5.4.2. Ethical limitations
As stated in 3.4.2, ethical approval was sought and gained from UEL’s Research Ethics Committee (REC) before the study began. The application included the submission of a research proposal, along with all information guides and consent forms. Whilst the researcher’s ethics application was approved (Appendix 3.v), there were some concerns that came to the researcher’s attention at a later date. These are considered below.

Potential for misunderstanding
Within the Participant Information Sheet (Appendix 3.i) there was the potential for misunderstanding. Upon reflection, this is likely due to the informal and graded use of language in these materials, aimed at encouraging participation in line with the theoretical underpinnings of SDT (this is explicated further in 3.4.1.1). Firstly, the phrase ‘If you get upset during the activity we will stop the activity straight away and you can choose if you want to carry on’ is included on the second page. As no other potential scenarios in which the CYP may wish to withdraw are suggested, the CYP could have understood this as meaning they could only withdraw from the study if upset. A full verbal explanation and discussion of the study, the information guide and the consent form was given to each potential participant in the initial 20-minute meeting, along with the opportunity to ask any questions they may have had. It was not apparent that any of the participants had interpreted the information in this way. Furthermore, as the consent form stated ‘…I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without disadvantage to myself and without being obliged to give any reason’, each participant was technically informed before consenting to participate. Despite this, the potential for misunderstanding the information guide is apparent and moreover, it should have matched the information on the consent form.

Secondly, the phrase ‘everything I record will remain secret unless it makes me think someone may be at risk’ was initially included on the Participant
Information Sheet (Appendix 3.i). The word ‘secret’ (adjective) was used instead of ‘confidential’ in order to make the information guide accessible and non-threatening as possible and was aimed at encouraging participation in line with the theoretical underpinnings of SDT (this is explicated further in 3.4.1.1). However, the researcher is aware that the concept of promoting ‘secrets’ (noun) with CYP has negative connotations when viewed from the perspective of safeguarding and child protection. The phrasing has therefore been amended to ‘will remain private’ in order to avoid the possibility of misinterpretation whilst maintaining its aims of informality and accessibility.

Withdrawal and data management
As stated in 3.4.2.3 participants were allowed to withdraw from the study at anytime up until to the completion of data collection. Necessary time limits on data withdrawal are acknowledged in the literature on research design and methodology (BPS, 2010; Creswell, 2009; Robson, 2011). The necessity of this time limit was due to practicalities related to data management and data analysis and is explained in 3.4.2.3. However, within the Participant Consent Form (Appendix 3.i) there was a phrase that stated ‘should I withdraw, the researcher reserves the right to use my anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted by the researcher.’ This suggests that data relating to the participant would be used if they had withdrawn before the completion of the data collection. This would not have been the case, and the passage should have instead stated ‘should I withdraw my involvement in the study after the date of the interview, the researcher reserves the right to use my anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted by the researcher.’ Despite the fact that all the information guides and consent forms were approved by UEL’s REC and although no participant actually requested to be withdrawn from the study, this should still be noted as an ethical limitation.

It was noted in 3.4.2.3 that whilst participants and parent/carers were verbally informed, the specific processes and timings relating to data storage were not included in the information guides or consent forms provided to participants and parents/carers. Whilst they were informed in the Participant Consent
Form (Appendix 3.i) and the Parent/carer Consent Form (Appendix 3.iii) that ‘the recorded data will be destroyed once the study has been completed’, and participants were informed of further data management strategies in the debriefing statement (Appendix 3.vi), they were not informed in either the information guides of consent forms of the specific data storage arrangements (explained in 3.4.2.3). This lack of specificity could be considered an ethical limitation to the study.

5.4.3. Limitations to data collection

Sample

The critical realist nature of the study and the relativist epistemological stance of the researcher, meant that it was not essential to sample a large number of participants from the target research population. Although the researcher was able to access a broad and rich array of experiences from the 7 participants (4 female, 3 male), it is their view that additional participants may have increased this further. Despite allowing for a potentially high drop-out rate by inviting more CYP than required (n=10), 30% of consenting participants did not attend (the reasons for which are included in Table 3.2 in Chapter Three). As stated in 3.4.1, the PRU had a boy to girl ration of 5:1. As such, the gender make up of the sample was not representative of the PRU population. Whilst the findings could never be generalised to the wider population, this is a limitation in so far that the findings cannot be generalised beyond the sample to the PRU population.

As stated in 3.4.1, the participants were sought and recruited on the grounds that they were on role at the selected secondary PRU, had attended for at least six weeks (equivalent to half a school term) and were considered to have a good attendance record by school records. Whilst good school attendance is associated with reliability, it is also related to positive perceptions of school routines and positive peer-staff relations (Hallam & Rogers, 2008). In requiring good attendance, there was the potential for bias in the selecting of participants that were more likely to express positive views of their current provision. This is likely to have effected how representative the sample was of the PRU population. Additional work with staff to recruit less
engaged students with poorer attendance may have provided a degree of protection against this potential bias.

By acknowledging the above limitations, future research could seek to engage a greater number of male participants, and male and female participants with low records of attendance. If successful, this would allow the sample to be more representative of the target population, and potentially elicit a wider range of views and experiences.

*Interviews as a data collection tool*

Interviews are a time consuming method of data collection and require substantial investment on the part of the researcher in relation to developing the SSI schedule, drafting the introduction and debriefing statements, arranging the appointments with the PRU, conducting the introductory meetings, the interviews and the eventual data analysis. Some additional limitations of interviews as a data collection tool are outlined in section 3.4.3.1, but can be summarised here as:

- Threats to the accuracy of responses due to the wording of questions (Krähenbühl & Blades, 2006)
- Threats to data validity due to the socially constructed nature of the information recorded (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000).

Whilst the latter point would be a limitation within a positivist or ‘naïve realist’ perspective in which the researcher believed that words somehow corresponded directly to reality (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002), the constructed nature of the data was acknowledged throughout. The former point was addressed to some extent using a semi-structured interview technique in which the language used and topics covered were graded and altered respectively to suit to the situation and interviewee.

The interviews were also somewhat limited in the depth of information they could gather. For example, whilst suggesting that the young people
experienced difficulties forming and maintaining positive relationships with
their peers, with negative impacts on their sense of Relatedness, the data did
not provide any insight into the causes of these difficulties. It also led to richer
data sets for the Mainstream and PRU contexts compared to OoS. The
questions regarding OoS experiences appeared in the latter third of the SSI
schedule (Appendix 3.vii), the responses to which may have been affected by
‘respondent fatigue’ (Robson, 2011). There may have also been psychosocial
reasons for this discrepancy in the data return, which are discussed below.
Future studies may wish to obtain additional information from other methods,
e.g. self-report questionnaires completed by the CYP and/or interviews with
family/friends OoS, in order to better understand this aspect of their
experience. Data triangulation such as this may have also increased the
rigour and credibility of the study.

Power imbalances and social desirability

Davis (2007) suggests that interviews can also be prone to a ‘differential in
power relations between adults and children’ (p. 170) leading to inauthentic
responses. These biases were addressed to some extent in the SSI
‘Introduction’ statement (Appendix 3.vi) where participants were told ‘there are
no right or wrong answers, and if you don’t want to answer a certain question
then you do not have to’ and that they could ‘stop the interview at any time’.
Nevertheless, the social dynamic between adult-interviewer and child-
interviewee, including their relative unfamiliarity with each other may have led
to socially desirable responses. Furthermore, participants may have recalled
events that portrayed them in a more personally desirable ‘light’ (‘self-serving
bias’) for self-enhancing or –protecting reasons (Sedikides, Campbell,
Reeder, & Elliot, 1998).

The abovementioned unfamiliarity between the interviewer and interviewee
may have also affected the extent to which participants felt comfortable
discussing their experiences in the OoS context. This could have of course
been due to other factors, for example being unwilling to divulge personal,
emotionally sensitive information, or feeling as though they could or should
not ‘talk about other people’s business’. Either way, it was apparent that the
OoS context yielded the least conclusive evidence as to the supporting or thwarting of BPN.

5.4.4. Limitations to data analysis
The researcher acknowledges that the process of deductive Thematic Analysis (TA) was influenced by the theoretical underpinnings of SDT, particularly through its posited BPNs for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness. The researcher also notes that their background, interests, assumptions and aims, was also likely to influence this process. As such, inter-rater reliability checks were used to increase the confirmability of the coding process (see Table 3.6 in section 3.4.4.2).

Using TA in this way enabled the researcher to draw on both what the participants said (the semantic level), as well as infer as to alternate levels of deeper meaning (the latent level) through the lens of SDT. With reference to the possible effect of ‘self-serving bias’ (Sedikides, Campbell, Reeder, & Elliot, 1998) referred to above (5.4.1), it is likely that data analysed at the latent level was less prone to this effect, although extracts interpreted at the semantic level may have been affected. As such, it was important that the researcher did not over-infer and suggest causality or generality from the data. The constructed nature of the data was acknowledged throughout the process of data collection and analysis.

Another possible limitation in using TA to explore individuals’ experiences is the extent to which their story or ‘narrative’ is lost. In grouping together codes, themes and sub-themes, the researcher arguably sacrificed rich experiential data only obtainable by viewing each transcript as a whole. In this respect, it could be suggested that the use of a narrative approach or Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) may have greater uncovered the ‘true’ experiences of those permanently excluded from school. However, both forms of analysis would nevertheless have been novel to the researcher, and furthermore, would not have suitably fit within the critical realist paradigm adopted by the researcher (Robson, 2011).
If the current research study was to be replicated or repeated, the above limitations in terms of the researcher, data collection and data analysis should be considered, along with the suggestions made.

5.5. Implications
The following sections consider the future implications for research and practice in light of the findings as reported and discussed above. As previously mentioned in 5.3.4, the exploratory nature of the study has led to variety of ideas for future study, including the researcher’s hypothesised model of BPN satisfaction (Appendix 5.i & 5.ii). There are also wide ranging implications for school-based practice in terms of supporting CYP’s BPNs and EP-based practice with regard to the identification of BPN-thwarting situations/environments and in facilitating the systemic creation of BPN-supporting environments at a whole school level.

5.5.1. Implications for future research
There are a number of implications for future research in this area. Firstly, the apparent differential between BPN satisfaction in the Mainstream and PRU contexts suggested by the current study points towards a need to measure BPN satisfaction of mainstream students considered to be ‘at risk of exclusion’. This would involve the use of empirical techniques currently applied in SDT research, for example self-report questionnaires. These could measure both BPN satisfaction, but also more specific aspects of their school experience such as perceived-teacher-Autonomy-support; perceived-school performance; engagement and disaffection; intentions to persist versus drop out. The use of triangulated data from observation and teacher-questionnaires would support the robustness of such research in line with the identified need for additional approaches to data collection (Van Ryzin, Gravely, & Roseth, 2009).

Secondly, the current study has also suggested a need to study the specific impact of permanent exclusion and the attendance of alternative provisions (e.g. PRUs) versus ‘managed moves’ (e.g. alternate mainstream placements) on the need for Competence. This could involve both measures of perceived
Competence, self-esteem, self-concept and motivation immediately following exclusion from mainstream, and after prolonged attendance elsewhere.

Thirdly, as stated earlier (5.3.3) there is scope for measuring Relatedness in staff and students following conflict situations in the mainstream setting. Using self-report questionnaires, this would measure the salience of negative interpersonal interactions directly after their occurrence and at a later date as a means of tracking the on-going impact of negative staff-student relations. There is also a need to further explore how to better support positive peer-relations between those permanently excluded. Given the positive staff-student relationships reported by participants, the role of staff in fostering these should also be explored.

Furthermore, findings from the OoS context point towards a need to explore the way in which teaching staff relate to young people, who as ‘digital natives’ (Bennett & Maton, 2010) are increasingly using social networking technologies to seemingly satisfy their BPN for Relatedness. Do generational/cultural differences in communication methods between these groups result in the BPN thwarting situations and relationships?

Finally, the researcher’s hypothesised model of BPN satisfaction (Appendix 5.i & 5.ii) would benefit from empirical study with a view to identifying discrete causative mechanisms within the process of BPN thwarting leading to permanent exclusion as an outcome.

5.5.2. Implications for future practice
The findings of the current study intimate a number of implications for professionals working with those permanently excluded or ‘at risk of exclusion’ from school. Whilst some of these may be dependent on shifts in school, local authority and government policy, the author maintains that there are a number of ‘shifts in thinking’ and practice, easily made, that can have positive impacts on these CYP, their teachers and their mainstream peers.
5.5.2.1. Implications for school-based practice

The qualitative nature of the study meant that implications for practice were able to emerge from the words of the students themselves either overtly or subtly. These are featured in the ‘What Works’ table above (Table 5.2) and will be fed back to staff and students at the research venue. There are also implications for individual teaching practice, training and whole school management.

Autonomy-supportive teaching

Autonomy-supportive teachers lead to students learning in a deeper and more conceptual way, the students enjoy learning more, and they feel more competent and confident about themselves (Deci, 2012). Reeve and Jang (2006) claim that ‘teachers cannot directly give students a sense of Autonomy’ (p. 217), but can instead help create a context in which students can experience and exercise their own Autonomy. The current study fits with existing research in so far as suggesting this is achieved through high quality interpersonal relationships (Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Reeve & Jang, 2006). The findings indicated that these relationships were rich in attunement (the process of sensing and reading students’ states of being; De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997), and supportiveness (an affirmation of, and contribution to, students’ capacity for self-direction; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986).

Within these relationships, CYP benefitted in a variety of ways from teaching behaviours that were more ‘Autonomy-supportive’ than controlling. The positive learning experiences referred to by participants tended to involve teachers that were responsive, supportive, flexible and motivated through interest. These teachers are likely to have acted in ways that identified and nurtured CYP’s inner motivational resources. Research suggests that the former can be done through allowing more time to listen to students; allowing more time for students to speak; and communicating that you have understood their perspective. The latter can be supported through allowing more time for students to work in their own way; using praise as informational feedback; offering encouragement; offering hints; and being responsive to student-generated questions (Reeve & Jang, 2006). It becomes apparent how
Autonomy-supportive strategies can simultaneously support the BPNs for Competence and Relatedness also. Self-efficacy, self-esteem and good relationships are therefore by-products that arguably then feedback into increasing the Autonomy-supportive behaviour of the teacher (Reeve, 2002; Reeve, Jang, Carrell, Barch, & Jeon, 2004; Reeve & Jang, 2006).

In contrast, controlling teacher behaviours are used in order to attain students' compliance with a teacher-prescribed way of thinking, feeling, or behaving. Controlling teachers motivate students by using extrinsic incentives and pressuring language to the point that students' participatory behaviour is regulated by external contingencies and pressuring language, as opposed to their inner motivational resources. As such, there is a need for teachers to develop the use of Autonomy-supportive behaviours and techniques. In order for this to occur, they will need to be supported by their schools and guided towards such practice through their initial teaching training courses.

**Autonomy-supportive schools and training institutions**

In line with perspectives discussing the effects of ‘high stakes testing’ on teachers and students (Ryan & Weinstein, 2009), one of the participants in the current study (F5) expressed a hypothesis that increased pressure and controlling conditions for teachers led to an increase in controlling teaching behaviours. Indeed, there will be systemic factors outside of the control of individual teachers that impact on their ability to be Autonomy-supportive in the classroom. There are also likely to be personal factors (e.g. interpersonal skills, acquired teaching style, training received) that determine this (Reeve, 2002).

Current research suggests that a) a teacher’s style of motivating students in malleable, and b) the theoretical concept of Autonomy-support informs classroom practice (Reeve, 2002). With this in mind, schools are well placed to move towards creating Autonomy-supporting learning environments in a way that is supportive of its staff’s development. Indeed, an eventual aim may be to imbed the supporting of BPN into all areas of a school’s functioning, aiming to support the entire school community regardless of the context.
Imagine a staff meeting that ends with staff feeling more *Autonomous* and *Competent* (about their teaching), whilst feeling more *Related* (to the head teacher!).

To facilitate this, *Autonomy*-supportive teaching practices should therefore be imbedded in the courses offered by teacher training institutions. Although courses do suggest intrinsic motivation is an important classroom aspiration, teachers are more likely to experience training in ‘classroom management’ and ‘behaviour modification techniques’, than the best ways to motivate and engage their students. In this respect there are potential training implications for EPs, which are outlined in the following sub-section.

### 5.5.2.2. Implications for EP practice

#### In service training for schools

As stated above, there are possible training implications for EPs in the facilitating of *Autonomy*-supportive schools. This would involve training schools on recognising distinctions between different types of motivation (autonomous vs. controlled) and between teachers’ ways of motivating CYP (*Autonomy*-supportive vs. controlling). In line with the tenets of SDT, schools should ideally feel autonomously motivated to partake in such training as opposed to it being imposed (e.g. at a local authority level).

#### SDT –based EP services

There are also implications for the way in which EPSs operate in relation to inclusive practice. Drawing on the wide-ranging, rigorous and robust evidence base provided by SDT, the researcher maintains that as ‘inclusive practitioners’ EPs have a duty to support schools in meeting the BPNs of their students; particularly their most vulnerable, disaffected CYP or those ‘at risk of exclusion’. There is a need to raise the profile of SDT as a framework for practice, including the development of SDT based training, assessment and intervention tools.

Indeed the researcher aims to pursue this further through the design and piloting of observation-schedules (measuring *Autonomy*-supportive teacher
behaviours), self-report questionnaires for staff and students to measure BPN satisfaction overtime (e.g. over the first term of Year 7) and a training package for schools to both raise awareness of the concept of BPNs and inform classroom practice. The researcher also suggests there is scope for EPs to raise the profile of Autonomy-supportive teaching in both university- and school-based teacher training courses.

5.6. Reflections on a split role
As mentioned in section 3.3.3.1, the current study was undertaken in the context of the researcher being a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) at the University of East London (UEL), whilst simultaneously working for a local authority Educational Psychology Service (EPS). This section reflects on the process of conducting a piece of ‘practitioner-research’. It includes extracts from the researcher’s Research Diary to illuminate the reflections made.

The following extract illustrates the initial excitement and enthusiasm felt by the researcher towards the project following the granting of ethical approval by UEL:

‘I am pleased to have been given the go ahead by the university. It’s great to be conducting research in an area I am both interested in and passionate about. I feel fortunate to also be combining my interest in SDT’.

(Research Diary, January 2012)

Upon making contact with the research venue using their work email address, the researcher began to consider the possible tensions and conflicts of interest involved in conducting research in the area they were working. They were representing both UEL and their EPS and were concerned that they could end up fulfilling the roles of researcher and practitioner concurrently. As such, the clear communication of aims, roles and responsibilities was essential to separate the coexisting aspects of the researcher’s role.
With regard to the professional development of the researcher, this research has further expanded their knowledge of the range and quality of support provided by PRUs. Whilst recognising the positive impact the staff, the class sizes and adapted curriculum have on attending CYP, it has deepened their professional view that effective alternative provisions should not be an excuse for exclusive practices in mainstream schools. It is the researcher’s view that the findings of the current study go some way in pointing towards a fresh approach to increasing inclusive practice and reducing permanent exclusions.

Finally, the research journey has simultaneously been journey of personal development, and one of which would not have been possible without the continued interpersonal support of the researcher’s partner, family, friends, university tutors, and placement supervisors throughout. In addition to this, the completion of a Research Diary has helped to map this journey, whilst perhaps most importantly serving as a reminder of where it began.

5.7. Chapter summary

Following a reiteration of the aims of the study (5.2), this chapter provided a discursive comment on the findings (5.3) and acknowledged the limitations of the study. The potential implications of the research were then discussed in terms of future research (5.5.1) and future practice in schools (5.5.2.1) and Educational Psychology Services (EPSs) (5.5.2.2). This was followed by some reflections on the split role of EP-researcher (5.6). The thesis is now closed with some concluding remarks from the researcher.

5.7.1. Concluding remarks

‘The proper question is not, “How can people motivate others?” but rather, “How can people create the conditions within which others will motivate themselves?”’

(Deci, 1995, p. 10)

The research reported within this thesis has attempted to contribute to a growing body of knowledge regarding the experience of permanent exclusion from school. In reporting and analysing the voices of permanently excluded
CYP from the perspective of SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000) it provides a means of understanding the functional significance of social-contextual supports and limitations perceived by participants. It is hoped that the findings can inform best practice for professionals and practitioners across educational settings.

Whilst it was a priority for the researcher to share ‘What Works’ with the staff and students at the research venue, there are further implications in terms of future research, delivering targeted training to school staff and how EPSs operate. The research process has also cemented the researcher’s appreciation of SDT as a heuristical framework for practice, particularly informing how staff can prevent, respond to and understand challenging behaviour within educational settings.

The findings of this research, underpinned by the underlying humanistic assumptions of SDT, suggest that it is possible to understand and support the difficulties faced by these CYP, in ways that are respectful, compassionate and ultimately empowering. Hopefully this thesis is a step towards this future, a future likely appreciated by the participants of this study (Figure 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I want to become an inventor of something...I want to make something that will make people’s lives better.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(M1, 1305-1311)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I want to be rich and help other people and give money to other people, cos no one deserves to be in a different class, cos no one would like to be in a different class.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F5, 1658-1660)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“My family ain’t that rich and I’m trying to make it somewhere. There’s always a chance though...just try, just try your hardest... Yeah that’s what I would say to like the other children...take any courses you can, take the chance, cos it’s hard to find a job out there...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(M3, 1347-1359)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Education is the main thing that I need to get what I want in life.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F6, 1264)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1. Some thoughts on the future
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APPENDICES
### 2.i. Detailed record of Strand 1.a systematic search

#### Strand 1.a - Database Search A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>13/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'self-determination theory'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Publication: <em>Educational Psychology, British Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Educational Psychology, Contemporary Educational Psychology, Educational Psychologist</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation, Discard research articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strand 1.a - Database Search B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'basic psychological need*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strand 1.a - Database Search C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Search Terms Used | 'basic psychological need* psychopatholog*'  
|                   | 'self-determination theory psychopatholog*'  |
| Results           | 106      |
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 1985-2013 |
| Results           | 88       |
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Age (school age 5-12 years), Age (adolescence 13-19 years) |
| Results           | 9        |
| Advanced Exclusion Criteria | Discard articles on intervention evaluation |
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Results

**Strand 1.a - Database Search D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘basic psychological need* satisf*’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strand 1.a Electronic Database Total = 9 articles**

**Supplementary Electronic Search**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>16/08/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Engine</td>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory’, basic psychological need* satisf*, ‘basic psychological need* psychopatholog*’, ‘self-determination theory psychopatholog*’, ‘self-determination theory parent*’, basic psychological need*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles/books on intervention evaluation, Discard articles/books with no reference to basic psychological needs: ‘Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hand search of recent volumes of Educational Psychology in Practice and Educational and Child Psychology journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>18/08/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strand 1.a Accumulative Total = 14 articles and book sections**

**PLEASE NOTE:** The asterisks placed after keywords denote that the search will include any word that includes the preceding letters. For example, the word ‘learn*’ could potentially generate articles that contain the words learn, learns, learner, learners, learnt, learned, learnable or learning within them.
**2.ii. Detailed record of Strand 1.b systematic search**

**Strand 1.b - Database Search A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory school’<em>’ ‘basic psychological needs school’</em>’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years) Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation Discard non-research articles Discard articles with no reference to basic psychological needs: ‘autonomy, relatedness and competence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strand 1.b - Database Search B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory learn’<em>’ ‘basic psychological needs learn’</em>’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years) Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation Discard non-research articles Discard articles with no reference to basic psychological needs: ‘autonomy, relatedness and competence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strand 1.b - Database Search C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>14/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory education’ ‘basic psychological needs education’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Discard articles on intervention evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard non-research articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard articles with no reference to basic psychological needs: ‘autonomy, relatedness and competence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strand 1.b - Database Search D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>16/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'self-determination theory permanent* exclu*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'basic psychological needs permanent* exclu*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication date 1985-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strand 1.b - Database Search E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>16/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'self-determination theory school exclu*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'basic psychological needs school exclu*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication date 1985-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discard sports intervention studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strand 1.b - Database Search F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>16/08/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'self-determination theory qualitative research'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'basic psychological needs qualitative research'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Search Terms Used         | 'self-determination theory qualitative research-physical' |
|                          | 'basic psychological needs qualitative research-physical' |
| Results                  | 0        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication date 1985-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strand 1.b Electronic Database Total = 2 articles

Supplementary Electronic Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>16/08/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Engine</td>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>'self-determination theory school exclu*--physical - sports’ 'self determination theory permanent* exclu* -physical - sports’ 'self-determination theory qualitative’ 'basic psychological needs qualitative research’ 'basic psychological needs school exclu** ‘basic psychological needs education’ basic psychological needs learn*’ ‘basic psychological needs school***’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Publication date 1985-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced ExclusionCriteria</td>
<td>Discard articles/books on intervention evaluation Discard articles/books with no reference to basic psychological needs: ‘Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness’ Discard sports intervention studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hand search of recent volumes of *Educational Psychology in Practice* and *Educational and Child Psychology* journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>18/08/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘self-determination theory’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strand 1.b Accumulative Total = 6 articles

**PLEASE NOTE:** The asterisks placed after keywords denote that the search will include any word that includes the preceding letters. For example, the word "learn**" could potentially generate articles that contain the words learn, learns, learner, learners, learnt, learned, learnable or learning within them.
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2.iii. List of articles and book sections included in Strand 1.b.


### 2.iv. Detailed record of Strand 2.a systematic search

#### Strand 2.a - Database Search A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;school exclu*&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years) Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except excluded young people Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strand 2.a - Database Search B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;permanent* exclu*&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years) Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except excluded young people Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strand 2.a Electronic Database Total = 47 articles

#### Supplementary Electronic Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Engine</td>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;permanent* exclu*&quot;, 'school exclu*', 'pupil referral unit', 'Challenging behaviour',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Publication date 2001-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hand search of recent volumes of Educational Psychology in Practice and Educational and Child Psychology journals**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;permanent* exclu*&quot;, 'school exclu*'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strand 2.a Accumulative Total = 96 articles, reports and book sections

PLEASE NOTE: The asterisks placed after keywords denote that the search will include any word that includes the preceding letters. For example, the word 'learn*' could potentially generate articles that contain the words learn, learns, learner, learners, learnt, learned, learnable or learning within them.
## 2.v. Detailed record of Strand 2.b systematic search

### Strand 2.b - Database Search A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;exclu*&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 2001-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years), Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people, Discard articles on intervention evaluation, Discard non-research articles, Discard studies not conducted in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strand 2.b - Database Search B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;permanent* exclu*&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 2001-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years), Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people, Discard articles on intervention evaluation, Discard non-research articles, Discard studies not conducted in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strand 2.b - Database Search C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>&quot;school exclu*&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>4302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Peer Reviewed Journals, Publication date 2001-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Age (school age 5-12 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Age (adolescence 13-19 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advanced Exclusion Criteria | Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people  
Discard articles on intervention evaluation  
Discard non-research articles  
Discard studies not conducted in the UK |
| Results  | 0                             |

#### Strand 2.b - Database Search D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘alternative provision’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Peer Reviewed Journals  
Publication date 2001-2013 |
| Results | 36 |
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Age (school age 5-12 years)  
Age (adolescence 13-19 years) |
| Results | 19 |
| Advanced Exclusion Criteria | Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people  
Discard articles on intervention evaluation  
Discard non-research articles  
Discard studies not conducted in the UK |
| Results | 0 |

#### Strand 2.b - Database Search E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>11/07/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases Searched</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete, PsychArticles, PsychINFO, Educational Research Complete, Teacher Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Terms Used</td>
<td>‘pupil referral unit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Peer Reviewed Journals  
Publication date 2001-2013 |
| Results | 29 |
| Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria | Age (school age 5-12 years)  
Age (adolescence 13-19 years) |
| Results | 7 |
| Advanced Exclusion Criteria | Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people  
Discard articles on intervention evaluation  
Discard non-research articles  
Discard studies not conducted in the UK |
| Results | 1 (1 x duplicate excluded) |

**Strand 2.b Electronic Database Total = 4 articles**
### Supplementary Electronic Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Search Date</strong></th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Engine</strong></td>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Terms Used</strong></td>
<td>permanent* exclu*, school exclu*, pupil referral unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Search Inclusion Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Publication date 2001-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard non-research articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard studies not conducted in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hand search of recent volumes of *Educational Psychology in Practice* and *Educational and Child Psychology* journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Search Date</strong></th>
<th>11/07/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Terms Used</strong></td>
<td>permanent* exclu*, school exclu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Exclusion Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Discard articles on specific groups except permanently excluded young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard articles on intervention evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard non-research articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discard studies not conducted in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strand 2b Accumulative Total = 6 articles**

**PLEASE NOTE:** The asterisks placed after keywords denote that the search will include any word that includes the preceding letters. For example, the word `learn*` could potentially generate articles that contain the words learn, learns, learner, learners, learnt, learned, learnable or learning within them.
2.vi. List of articles reviewed for Strand 2.b


3.i. Participant information sheet and consent form

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
AND CONSENT FORM

Date: 11th May 2012

Dear ______________,

Hi my name is Matt! I grew up and went to school in South London and now I am training to become an Educational Psychologist (someone who tries to help schools get better at working with children and young people). I am now a student over in East London and as part of my training I am doing a project at your centre.

I have worked with children and young people in schools, youth clubs and centres like Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision).

Here's my photo:

I want to talk to you about your time at secondary school and your time here at Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision).

With your help I want to find out:

- What you liked about your old school
- What could have been better
- What you like about Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision)
- What could be better
- What you like about having spare time out of school

With your help, I want to help schools make them better places for children and young people.
WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

1) I will take you out of lessons to meet with you (and your learning mentor/teaching assistant if you want them there) for about 20 minutes. You can ask me about the project and I will give you a permission slip that needs to be signed by your parent/carer.

2) If you want to be involved and your parent/carer says yes then I will meet you again. This time I will take you out of lessons for 45 minutes to talk about your time at secondary school, Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision) and your time outside of school.

3) If we need more time I can come back again. This visit will probably be shorter, but will take a maximum of between 30-45 minutes.

WHAT NOW?

1. If you want to take part, tell your learning mentor, teaching assistant of teacher straight away.

2. If you want to know more before you say yes then you can ask me any questions at our first meeting.

Cheers,

Matt
UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON

Consent to participate in a research study

‘Supported or Thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people’

I have read the information sheet relating to the above research study and have been given a copy to keep. The nature and purposes of the research have been explained to me, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and ask questions about this information. I understand what is being proposed and the procedures in which I will be involved have been explained to me.

I understand that my involvement in this study, and particular data from this research, will remain strictly confidential. Only the researcher(s) involved in the study will have access to identifying data. It has been explained to me what will happen once the research study has been completed.

I hereby freely and fully consent to participate in the study, which has been fully explained to me. Having given this consent I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without disadvantage to myself and without being obliged to give any reason. I also understand that should I withdraw, the researcher reserves the right to use my anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted by the researcher.

Participant’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

.................................................................................................................................................................................................

Participant’s Signature

................................................................................................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

.................................................................................................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Signature

.................................................................................................................................................................................................

Date: ................................
My name is Matt Wilson and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist from the University of East London who is currently employed by xxxxxxx Educational Psychology Service.

The young people you support are being invited to take part in my research study in which I am exploring permanently excluded young peoples’ experiences of school.

The involvement of your students in this research is important, as it will give them an opportunity to explore their experience of education and put forward their perspective.

Their views will go towards a better understanding of how schools can meet the psychological needs of disaffected students to encourage well-being, motivation and optimal development.

It is important that you understand why this research is being carried out and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully and discuss with others if you wish.

**WHY IS THIS RESEARCH BEING DONE?**

This research will attempt to increase the knowledge base around how schools, special schools and support agencies can best support disaffected young people. It is intended that professionals and practitioners involved with educational provision and support in Xxxxxxx will have access to this research. It may also be used for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training (e.g. INSET).

**WHY THESE PARTICULAR YOUNG PEOPLE?**

The young people you support have been chosen because they have been permanently excluded from mainstream school. They can therefore provide a unique contribution to our understanding of what may or may not work for young people in their position and hopefully help other young people in the future.

**WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE?**

The study will involve the participation of between eight and ten young people currently on role at Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision).

I will meet each of them a maximum of three times. The visits will be arranged as follows:
1) I will arrange to meet the young person (and a learning mentor/teaching assistant if they would like them to attend) for a short **20 minute** chat to answer any questions they may have. It will be explained to them that they **must get written permission from their parent/carer to take part**.

2) If the young person is willing to take part then we will arrange a second meeting lasting no more than **45 minutes** to talk about their experiences of school. I will also talk to them about their experiences outside of school, including their family and friendships.

3) It may be necessary to arrange a third visit lasting no more than **45 minutes** if the activities are not completed on the second visit. Although this is unlikely, it is necessary to allow for unforeseen circumstances.

---

**IMPORTANT**

The young person can choose to withdraw from the study at any time.

If the young person becomes distressed at any point during the interview **we will stop the activity straight away** and they can choose whether or not they wish to continue.

I will record the interview activity with a Dictaphone. **All information recorded will remain confidential unless it raises concerns about a situation where someone may be at risk.** If such a situation arises, Xxxxxxxx Council policy and guidelines on confidentiality will be followed.

When writing up my research, **the participants’ real names will not be used to ensure anonymity.** The young person’s responses will not be linked to their name, their previous school, Park Campus or any other personal details.

All Xxxxxxxx Educational Psychologists adhere to strict guidance on conduct and ethics outlined by the British Psychological Society (BPS) and the Health Professionals Council (HPC). Further information can be found on their websites: www.bps.org.uk and www.hpc-uk.org.

---

**FURTHER QUESTIONS / INFORMATION**

Please contact me (Matt Wilson) via email or phone:

mvswilson@xxxxxxxxxxxxx : 079xx xxx xxx

If you have any questions or concerns about how the study has been conducted, please contact the study’s supervisor [Tina Rae, School of Psychology, University of East London, Water Lane, London E15 4LZ. Telephone: +44 20 8223 4363. Email: t.m.rae@uel.ac.uk](mailto:t.m.rae@uel.ac.uk) or [Chair of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Sub-committee: Dr. Mark Finn, School of Psychology, University of East London, Water Lane, London E15 4LZ. (Tel: 020 8223 4493. Email: m.finn@uel.ac.uk)](mailto:m.finn@uel.ac.uk)
UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON

Consent to participate in a research study

‘Supported or Thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people’

I have read the information sheet relating to the above research study and have been given a copy to keep. The nature and purposes of the research have been explained to me, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and ask questions about this information. I understand what is being proposed and the procedures in which I will be involved have been explained to me.

I understand that the involvement of the students in this study, and any data gathered, will remain strictly confidential and that full anonymity of the participants will be ensured. Only the researcher involved in the study will have access to identifying data and I understand that recorded data will be destroyed once the study has been completed.

I hereby freely and fully consent to the selected students from Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision) participating in the study providing they themselves and their parents/carers give informed consent. I understand that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without disadvantage to themselves and without being obliged to give any reason. I also understand that should they withdraw, the researcher reserves the right to use their anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted.

Principal’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

..............................................................................................................................

Principal’s Signature

..............................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

..............................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Signature

..............................................................................................................................

Date: ……………………..……..
3.iii. Parent/carer information sheet and consent form

PARENT/CARER INFORMATION SHEET
AND CONSENT FORM

Date: 15th March 2012
Dear Mr/Mrs/Ms ______________,

My name is Matt Wilson and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist from the University of East London who is currently employed by Xxxxxx Educational Psychology Service.

Your child is being invited to take part in a research study in which I am exploring young people’s experiences of school.

Before you agree to give permission for your child to take part, it is important that you read this information.

WHY IS THIS RESEARCH BEING DONE?

This research will attempt to increase the knowledge base around how schools, special schools and support agencies can best support disaffected young people. It is intended that professionals and practitioners involved with educational provision and support in Xxxxxx will have access to this research. It may also be used for career professional development (CPD) training (e.g. INSET).

WHY THESE PARTICULAR YOUNG PEOPLE?

The students at Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision) have been chosen because they have been permanently excluded from mainstream school. They can therefore provide a unique contribution to our understanding of what may or may not work for young people in their position and hopefully help other young people in the future.

WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE?

The study will involve the participation of between eight and ten students at Xxxx Xxxxxx (Current Provision).

I will meet each of them a maximum of three times. The visits will be arranged as follows:

1) I will arrange to meet with your child (and a learning mentor/teaching assistant if they would like them to attend) for a short 20-minute chat to
answer any questions they may have. It will be explained to them that they must get written permission from their parent/carer to take part.

2) If your child is willing to take part then we will arrange a second meeting lasting no more than 45 minutes to talk about their experiences of school. I will also talk to them about their experiences outside of school, including their family and friendships.

3) It may be necessary to arrange a third visit lasting no more than 45 minutes if the activities are not completed on the second visit. Although this is unlikely, it is necessary to allow for unforeseen circumstances.

**IMPORTANT**

The young person can choose to withdraw from the study at any time.

If your child becomes distressed at any point during the interview we will stop the activity straight away and they can choose whether or not they wish to continue.

I will record the interview activity with a Dictaphone. All information recorded will remain confidential unless it raises concerns about a situation where someone may be at risk. If such a situation arises, Xxxxxxx Council policy and guidelines on confidentiality will be followed.

When writing up my research, the participants’ real names will not be used to ensure anonymity. The young person’s responses will not be linked to their name, their previous school, Park Campus or any other personal details.

All Xxxxxxx Educational Psychologists adhere to strict guidance on conduct and ethics outlined by the British Psychological Society (BPS) and the Health Professionals Council (HPC). Further information can be found on their websites: www.bps.org.uk and www.hpc-uk.org.

**FURTHER QUESTIONS / INFORMATION**

Please contact Xxxxx Xxxx (Inclusion Manager) at Xxxx Xxxxxxx (Current Provision) (Tel:xxxx xxxxxxxx) or myself (Matt Wilson) via email or phone: mvswilson@xxxxxxxxxxxx : 079xx xxx xxx

If you have any questions or concerns about how the study has been conducted, please contact the study’s supervisor [Tina Rae, School of Psychology, University of East London, Water Lane, London E15 4LZ. Telephone: +44 20 8223 4363. Email: t.m.rae@uel.ac.uk](mailto:t.m.rae@uel.ac.uk)

or

Chair of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Sub-committee: Dr. Mark Finn, School of Psychology, University of East London, Water Lane, London E15 4LZ.

(Tel: 020 8223 4493. Email: m.finn@uel.ac.uk)
UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON

Consent to participate in a research study

‘Supported or Thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people’

I have read the information sheet relating to the above research study and have been given a copy to keep. The nature and purposes of the research have been explained to me, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and ask questions about this information. I understand what is being proposed and the procedures in which I will be involved have been explained to me.

I understand that the involvement of my child in this study, and any data gathered, will remain strictly confidential and that full anonymity will be ensured. Only the researcher involved in the study will have access to identifying data and I understand that recorded data will be destroyed once the study has been completed.

I hereby freely and fully consent to my child participating in the study providing they give informed consent. I understand that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without disadvantage to themselves and without being obliged to give any reason. I also understand that should my child withdraw, the researcher reserves the right to use their anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted by the researcher.

Parent/carer’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................

Parent/carer’s Signature

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................

Researcher’s Signature

...........................................................................................................................................................................................................

Date: ..............................
3.iv. Copy of signed consent from PRU Principal

UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON

Consent to participate in a research study

'Supported or thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people'

I have read the information sheet relating to the above research study and have been given a copy to keep. The nature and purposes of the research have been explained to me, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the details and ask questions about this information. I understand what is being proposed and the procedures in which I will be involved have been explained to me.

I understand that the involvement of the students in this study, and any data gathered, will remain strictly confidential and that full anonymity of the participants will be ensured. Only the researcher involved in the study will have access to identifying data and I understand that recorded data will be destroyed once the study has been completed.

I hereby freely and fully consent to the selected students from participating in the study providing they themselves and their parents/carers give informed consent. I understand that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without disadvantage to themselves and without being obliged to give any reason. I also understand that should they withdraw, the researcher reserves the right to use their anonymous data in the write-up of the study and in any further analysis that may be conducted.

Principal’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

Principal’s Signature

Researcher’s Name (BLOCK CAPITALS)

Researcher’s Signature

Date: [Day, Month, Year]
3.v. UEL Ethical approval documents

**ETHICAL PRACTICE CHECKLIST (Professional Doctorates)**

**SUPERVISOR:** Tina Rae  
**ASSESSOR:** Chris Pawson  
**STUDENT:** Matt Wilson  
**DATE (sent to assessor):** 10/01/2012

**Proposed research topic:** ‘Supported or thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people.’

**Course:** Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology

1. Will free and informed consent of participants be obtained? **YES**
2. If there is any deception is it justified? **N/A**
3. Will information obtained remain confidential? **YES /**
4. Will participants be made aware of their right to withdraw at any time? **YES /**
5. Will participants be adequately debriefed?
6. If this study involves observation does it respect participants’ privacy? **NA**
7. If the proposal involves participants whose free and informed consent may be in question (e.g. for reasons of age, mental or emotional incapacity), are they treated ethically? **YES**
8. Is procedure that might cause distress to participants ethical? **NA**
9. If there are inducements to take part in the project is this ethical? **NA**
10. If there are any other ethical issues involved, are they a problem? **NA**

**APPROVED**

**MINOR CONDITIONS:**

**REASONS FOR NON APPROVAL:** NA

Assessor initials: **CP**  
Date: 26/1/12
**RESEARCHER RISK ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST (BSc/MSc/MA)**

**SUPERVISOR:** Tina Rae  
**ASSESSOR:** Chris Pawson  
**STUDENT:** Matt Wilson  
**DATE (sent to assessor):** 10/01/2012

**Proposed research topic:** ‘Supported or thwarted: Basic psychological need satisfaction from the perspective of permanently excluded young people.’

**Course:** Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology

Would the proposed project expose the researcher to any of the following kinds of hazard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. health &amp; safety issues)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve answered YES to any of the above please estimate the chance of the researcher being harmed as:  
HIGH / MED / LOW

**APPROVED**

| YES |

**MINOR CONDITIONS:**

**REASONS FOR NON APPROVAL:** NA

Assessor initials: **CP**  
Date: 26/1/12

Please return the completed checklists by e-mail to the Helpdesk within 1 week.
School of Psychology
Professional Doctorate Programmes

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to confirm that the Professional Doctorate candidate named in the attached ethics approval is conducting research as part of the requirements of the Professional Doctorate programme on which he/she is enrolled.

The Research Ethics Committee of the School of Psychology, University of East London, has approved this candidate’s research ethics application and he/she is therefore covered by the University’s indemnity insurance policy while conducting the research. This policy should normally cover for any untoward event. The University does not offer ‘no fault’ cover, so in the event of an untoward occurrence leading to a claim against the institution, the claimant would be obliged to bring an action against the University and seek compensation through the courts.

As the candidate is a student of the University of East London, the University will act as the sponsor of his/her research. UEL will also fund expenses arising from the research, such as photocopying and postage.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Mark Finn
Chair of the School of Psychology Ethics Sub-Committee
3.vi. SSI introduction and debriefing statements

Introduction
“Hello (name), thanks for meeting with me today. Let me tell you what’s going to happen. I am going to ask you some questions about your experiences at your old school, your experiences outside of school and your experiences here at Park Campus. I want you to answer the questions as fully as you can. It should last about 45 minutes and I will record us on this voice recorder. There are no right or wrong answers, and if you don’t want to answer a certain question then you do not have to. You can stop the interview at anytime. Afterwards, you will have the chance to ask me a few questions if you want to and then you can head back to your lesson/out to break. As you know, I am not the police and I don’t work for your old school, so be as honest as possible. Just remember that although what you tell me will be anonymous and no one will know it was you that said it, if you tell me anything that suggests that you or someone else is at risk, I might have to tell someone. Do you understand that? Is there anything you want to ask me before we start?”

Debrief
“Thank you for talking with me today, you did some excellent thinking and I found it really interesting listening to your answers. Before you go, I want to let you know what will happen to the recording now that we’ve finished. First of all I am going to listen to it and type it out into a word file. Then I am going give the file a number so no one knows that it was you that said what is written down. At the end of my project all the recordings will be deleted. Have you got anything you want to ask me before you go back to class/out to break? Thanks again, bye!”
3.vii. SSI Schedule

Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

Context: Main Stream School

Need: Competence

Q1. Can you tell me about your time at (school)?
Q2. Can you tell me about the lessons?
Q3. What were you good at, at (school)? How do you know this?

Need: Autonomy

Q1. Can you tell me about the rewards and punishments at (school)?
Q2. How did you get help with your work? Can you tell me about it?
Q3. How did you feel going into (school) in the morning?

Need: Relatedness

Q1. Can you tell me about the teachers at (school)?
Q2. Can you tell me about the students at (school)?
Q3. Can you tell me about the other staff members, like teaching assistants and learning mentors?

Context: Current Provision

Need: Competence

Q1. Can you tell me about your time at (school)?
Q2. Can you tell me about the lessons?
Q3. What are you good at here at (school)? How do you know this?

Need: Autonomy

Q1. Can you tell me about the rewards and punishments at (school)?
Q2. How do you get help with your work? Can you tell me about it?
Q3. How did you feel coming into (school) in the morning?
Need: Relatedness

Q1. Can you tell me about the teachers at (school)?
Q2. Can you tell me about the students at (school)?
Q3. Can you tell me about the other staff members, like teaching assistants and learning mentors or anyone else?

Context: Outside of the school setting

Need: Competence

Q1. Can you tell me about your time outside of school? What do you do with your spare time?
Q2. What do you like about (activity/past time)?
Q3. What are you good at outside of school? How do you know this?

Need: Autonomy

Q1. Can you tell me about any rewards and punishments outside of school?
Q2. How do you get help with your schoolwork at home? Can you tell me about it?
Q3. How much freedom do you get to choose what you want to do?

Need: Relatedness

Q1. Can you talk to me about your family?
Q2. Can you tell me about any friends outside of school?
Q3. Can you tell me about anyone else you spend time with outside of school?
3.viii. Example Interview Session Summary Sheet

INTERVIEW SESSION SUMMARY SHEET

PARTICIPANT REFERENCE:
DATE:
INTERVIEW LENGTH / STAGE:
SETTING:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT DATA COLLECTION:

IMPLICATIONS FOR DATA ANALYSIS:
3.ix. Example interview transcript

TRANSCRIPTION FRONT SHEET

PARTICIPANT REFERENCE: M3

INTERVIEW INFORMATION
DATE: 22/06/2012
RECORDING LENGTH: 44:38
SETTING: Meeting room

TRANSCRIPTION INFORMATION
DATE: 13/08/2012
WORD COUNT: 6452
PAGE COUNT: 28

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
None.
[brief given]
[ending questions from brief]
MW: Do you understand that?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Is there anything you want to ask me before we start?
M3: No.

Section 1 – Previous provision

MW: We’re going to start by talking about your old school. The first question is quite general...can you tell me about your time at your old school?
M3: Well...it was alright. It's not much different from here actually.
MW: Can you think of some ways in which it was different?
M3: Erm...I don't know.
MW: What were the lessons like?
M3: The lessons were like, they practically the same.
MW: Were there more people in your class?
M3: Yeah basically there was like more people in the class back there.
MW: And did you have to wear uniform at your old school?
M3: Yeah we had to wear like shirt, tie, jumper, blazer.
MW: What did you think about that?
M3: Didn't like it, that's what I got excluded for.
MW: Oh really. OK. Can you tell me about that?
M3: It was, it was a hot day right, so I took off my blazer and cos I didn’t want to put it back on, and I blanked the head teacher, walked off and went in the science room. Right and he said I'm going to the...what did he call it again?...it's like a referral unit thing upstairs and I was like ‘I'm not going’. So he moved everyone out of the class that was in...so like I was the only one in there until like...they were telling me off right...and I’m like claustrophobic so they closed the door...cos I was screaming and shouting so I flipped out and smashed the windows so...
MW: And that started as result of a uniform dispute?
M3: Uhuh. Yeah.
MW: And had there been any trouble before that?
M3: No.
MW: So that was the first time you were in trouble in school?
M3: Yeah.
MW: And that was enough for them to say he’s going to be excluded now?
M3: Erm yeah. I think that’s taking the mick though...cos ...there’s like loads of other kids in there that done worser than what I done...and they wanna permanently exclude me.
MW: So the teacher that had the confrontation with you...had you had problems with them before or was it the first time?
M3: That was the first time.
MW: Had you met them before?
M3: Yeah.
MW: So they had been teaching you for while then before?
M3: [nods his head]
MW: OK. What did you think of the school generally, did you think it was a good school?
M3: Yeah it was alright.
MW: And you were there until...Year 8?
M3: Yeah.
MW: So did you enjoy going to that school? When you woke in the morning did you think ‘oh I can’t wait to get to school”...or...did you not really want to go?
M3: Not really...not really...basically half and half.
MW: Ok so some days you might have been alright with it?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Alright, so talking a bit more about the lessons, were they enjoyable or were they disruptive or were they loud?

M3: At PP (Previous Provision)?

MW: Yeah at pp.

M3: The lessons were like boring.

MW: Why were they boring?

M3: Cos we kept learning the same thing, so...it just got boring.

MW: Did the lessons involve a lot of writing and a lot of sitting at a desk?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Did you ever do any activities where you were able to get up out desk and move around the room?

M3: Not all the time. Some of the time but not all. Cos I, I can't sit still for that long. Cos like you get different types of learners like visual learner, audio learner and practical. I'm more of the practical side.

MW: Hmm, so do you think that PP catered for a practical learner?

M3: [shakes his head]

MW: What kind of learner do you think they mainly...

M3: I think that was...visual or audio.

MW: So the sort of learner that could maybe sit and listen to the teacher for a long time, to the teacher talking away, or the sort of learner that could read things and answer questions or see things and...

M3: [nods his head]

MW: Yeah? OK. But not so much people who need to get up and move around?

M3: Uuhh.

MW: So what were you good at at PP?

M3: DT.

MW: DT? And how do you know that?

M3: And how do I know that?
MW: Hmm.

M3: Cos I kept getting compliments from the teacher like really positive ones.

MW: Did any other teacher compliment you?

M3: No.

MW: Can you think of any other lessons that you were good at?

M3: I think drama.

MW: Did you enjoy drama?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: What did you enjoy about it?

M3: I just like acting, like cos your friends are there innit, you can act with them. It’s like having a laugh as well.

MW: Do you get to do drama here?

M3: No.

MW: DT?

M3: DT? Yeah.

MW: What are you making in DT?

M3: A rocking chair.

MW: A rocking chair?

M3: Yeah for a five year old.

MW: Wow, that’s so cool, we didn’t get to make anything like that when I was at school, we were always making little things.

M3: I already made a table.

MW: You made a table?

M3: A little bit smaller than this one [points to table].

MW: Like a coffee table?

M3: [nods his head]
MW: And you took it home?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: That's good. That's so good. You said your DT teacher complimented you, can you tell more about that teacher?

M3: The one here?

MW: No the one at PP.

M3: The one at PP?

MW: Yeah can you remember much about them?

M3: No, not really.

MW: But they seemed quite ‘safe’ (friendly) though?

M3: Yeah they were alright.

MW: Alright, anything else you were good at at school, at PP?

M3: Erm...I think Maths.

MW: How do you know that?

M3: Because my levels are quite high, so.

MW: Alright so thinking back to PP and the way they would reward students of punish students. Can you remember any reward systems they had, or punishment systems?

M3: No...I can remember the punishments.

MW: What were they like?

M3: They were boring. Basically, what they do they stick you in a like a room for the whole day, with some work you’re gonna do...there was no point.

MW: So it was like a referral room?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Did they have a detention system as well?

M3: Yeah...I think it was like after school you have to stay like thirty minutes or an hour.
MW: Right, did you have any detentions like that?

M3: No cos they always used to put me in the referral unit.

MW: OK. So the referral unit. You would go there, you would have some work to do, you would sit down, and would they let you out at lunch, break?

M3: No.

MW: So you’re there for the whole day? So it’s a bit like prison...

M3: A bit like that yeah.

MW: ...but in a school. OK, and how much freedom did you get in school?

M3: What in PP?

MW: Yeah...well obviously not very much when you were in the referral centre, but normally how much would you get.

M3: Yeah break, lunch.

MW: And at break and lunch, could you go anywhere? Did they stop you going certain places?

M3: You can’t leave the school premises.

MW: Right...and within the school, could you go anywhere within the school at break time? Could you go down the corridors, go to sit in a classroom...or did they have rules about that?

M3: No, you couldn’t sit in a classroom.

MW: So where did you have to go?

M3: Outside or in the lunch hall.

MW: OK, so if you needed help with your work at PP, how would you get help?

M3: What kind of help?

MW: Say you didn’t understand something and you needed some help.

M3: Put my hand up and ask the teacher.

MW: And would that work?

M3: Yeah.
MW: Yeah? They would come and help you. And we talked a little bit about
this before, about how you felt when you went into school and you said you
had mixed feelings. So sometimes you’d be alright with it and sometimes you
wouldn’t want to go. The times when you wouldn’t want to go, what were the
reasons for that?

M3: Just waking up and knowing you were going to that school...bet it’s gonna
be...not gonna do anything really. Learn the same lessons over and over
again so it got boring so.

MW: And in the lessons, who chose what you were going to learn? Did the
students ever get a chance to choose what topics they did?

M3: No.

MW: Who chose?

M3: Teachers.

MW: Ok, so say the teacher said we’re going to learn about...The Second
World War in History, did they then give you a choice about how you learn
about the Second World War?

M3: [shakes his head]

MW: No, so the teachers decided everything. What you were going to learn
and how you were going to learn it?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: Yeah? Ok. Alright so tell me about these teachers, you talked about the
DT teacher, generally what were they like, were they nice people, were they...

M3: Yeah they were nice people.

MW: So you got on with most of them?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Do you ever feel like the teachers there had it in for you?

M3: How do you mean?

MW: Like the picked on you specifically, rather than other students?

M3: Yeah.

MW: You do feel like that? Why’s that?
M3: Because, I like only did one thing bad and they wanna exclude me for
that and some of them had done like worser than what I done. They wanna
exclude me and not the other person. So they give the other person the
chance to come back in, but they don’t give me.

MW: So do you think that’s quite unfair?

M3: Uuhh.

MW: What do you think they should have done instead?

M3: Done what?

MW: So after you smashed the window, how do think the school should have
dealt with it?

M3: By excluding me…and then gave me another chance.

MW: So excluding you for just a short time then?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Alright, OK. What about the students at that school, what were they llke?

M3: They were funny, you could have a laugh with them. They were alright
yeah.

MW: Did you have any trouble with any of them?

M3: No.

MW: Was there any bullying going on at PP when you were there, that you
noticed?

M3: No.

MW: No? What about people taking the micky out of each other?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: But you wouldn’t call that bullying? Just kind of general...

M3: Mucking about.

MW: …mucking about. OK, so what about the other staff there, not the
teachers, like the teaching assistants, learning mentors, dinner staff, what
were they like?

M3: Hmm…they were all friendly.
MW: Yeah they were all friendly?
M3: U huh.  
MW: And what about the...did you have support staff in your class?
M3: What TAs?
MW: Yeah.
M3: Yeah.
MW: What were they like?
M3: Friendly. They would help you when you get stuck.
MW: Hmm...and would they talk to you like a teacher.
M3: No one-one-one, they would talk to you one-to-one like on a level they will talk to you.
MW: So more like your mate would, or like an older brother or sister would?
M3: Yeah exactly.
MW: Ok. So that's PP done, is there anything else you want to say about PP?
M3: No.

Section 2 – Current provision
MW: Right so now we’re going to talk about here, CP (Current Provision). Can you tell me about your time here at CP, like generally what you think about it?
M3: It’s brilliant.
MW: Why’s it brilliant.
M3: Because I’ve learnt so much here over the years...that erm...I can go somewhere in life.
MW: Say that again?
M3: That I can go somewhere in life.
MW: You can go somewhere...that’s good. What about the lessons here, what are they like?
M3: They’re basically like secondary school.
MW: But with less students?
M3: Yeah less students?
MW: So I guess you probably get more time from the teacher?
M3: Yeah, you get more attention from the teacher.
MW: OK and is that good?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Why is that good, to get more attention?
M3: Cos...if you need help with something, say catching up with other students if you’re behind...they’ll help you catch up.
MW: Any other reasons why having more attention is good?
M3: No.
MW: No? Ok, so how long are the lessons here?
M3: Hour long.
MW: And is that the same as PP?
M3: Yeah.
MW: So they’re the same in that respect, what about the work, is the work harder or easier?
M3: It’s basically the same.
MW: Ok, so you find the work challenging enough, do you think it’s a bit easy sometimes or it’s a bit hard sometimes, or is it generally about the right level for you?
M3: Generally the right level.
MW: If you found something a bit easy what would you do?
M3: Ask the teacher for something harder.
MW: OK, and then they would get you something harder?
M3: [nods his head]
MW: OK, that’s good. So what are you good at here?
M3: DT.

MW: Still good at DT?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Anything else that you’re good at here?

M3: Erm...I’m good at everything.

MW: How do you know that?

M3: Cos you get compliments from all the teachers, it’s not just separate ones it’s all of them.

MW: That’s a really good point. So they compliment you...verbally?

M3: Yeah.

MW: So they tell you ‘ah, you did that really well’?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: Ok.

M3: And that makes you feel proud of what you’ve done and what you’ve achieved.

MW: What about any other reward systems? They verbally tell you, do they give out anything?

M3: Yeah they give out like certificates and we have like a tuck shop and they give out like five pound voucher, two pounds, one pound vouchers and you can buy something like at break, pizza, hotdog.

MW: OK, how do you get a voucher, what do you have to do?

M3: You have to like be good, go to your lessons...erm...be polite, respectful.

MW: Uhuh...and do you get vouchers for doing work as well or is it just for behaviour.

M3: No you get merits as well. And there’s merits, they amount up to a certain amount, you get to go on like a trip.

MW: Oh right, that’s pretty good. Have you been on any trips.

M3: Yeah I’ve been on loads. Basically they’re courses, they’re not trips.

MW: OK, so what courses have you done?
M3: I've done, it's like a health care thing with St. Thomas's, I'm doing my second Arts award for a silver...

MW: Arts award?

M3: ...yeah, I've already done my, I'm still finishing my bronze...and I'm doing some thing at Vauxhall city farm, like working with animals and that, and I'm doing a...do you know the school in...do you know the school XX (school name)?

MW: Yeah.

M3: Yeah we're doing a project with them, we're doing a festival with them...it's make, basically it's like wanna look a like a Glastonbury one...yeah so we're making it look like a Glastonbury.

MW: What, they're going to run it at the school?

M3: Yeah, so basically I'm the site manager, so I've got, I've got the busiest job.

MW: What job?

M3: The busiest job.

MW: What's the busiest job?

M3: The site manager.

MW: Oh you're the site manager?

M3: Yeah.

MW: My god, so the site is the school playing fields, so you've got to decide where the stage goes...

M3: Yeah where the stage goes, where the stalls goes, make sure everything run, make sure everything's here, all the food's ready.

MW: Wow that's an amazing experience...that's the sort of thing that can go on your CV and get you a job doing that sort of thing.

M3: Uuhh.

MW: Because every year there are more and more festivals. When I was your age there was basically Glastonbury, Reading, erm, V-festival, T in the Park, there was probably about, I could probably count them on my hands, the amount of main festivals. Now, there's like fifty to a hundred festivals every summer, because there are so many small ones as well...
M3: Yeah.

MW: ...all across the country. So there are always going to be jobs in festivals. That's the sort of job I would like to do as well. So who arranges...are there going to be bands, DJs, people rapping, who arranges that?

M3: I...don't...know, yeah most probably, no we’re doing...we’ve got these auditions that we’re doing, so we’ve got to go to like, we’ve done XX (school name), cos the festival’s gonna be there we give out audition sheets so it’s an application form...and we’re going to three other schools so they can audition for it.

MW: So who decides, is it a little bit like X-Factor, they audition and...

M3: I don’t know who decides, I think it might be us or it might be the adults, I’m not too sure.

MW: OK, and when is it going to happen?

M3: The 12th of July.

MW: Oh right so quite soon then?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Yeah, oh that will be really good. So that’s another course that you’ve been on. So you’ve done...can you think of any other courses you’ve done?

M3: Yeah my Arts Award.

MW: So what are you doing on that?

M3: It’s like a film project that we have to make our own film...yeah.

MW: What’s your film about?

M3: It’s about a puppet that comes alive.

MW: Oh right. Where did you film it? Have you filmed it yet?

M3: No I haven’t filmed it yet, I’m still doing my plan.

MW: Where are you going to film it?

M3: I’m going to film it er...i think it’s Roskin Park?

MW: So the puppet becomes alive in the park?

M3: Yeah.
MW: Cool and the what happens when you finish the film, will they go on the Internet?

M3: I've got to do...I might out it on the Internet, but I get a DVD of it.

MW: Cool.

M3: There's loads more things I've got to on my Arts Award before I can get the award. So we've got to like plan a cinema, plan tickets, food, refreshments, all of that, the date...so yeah.

MW: So that's a little bit similar to the festival thing in a way, because it's all about planning and organising. They're all really useful skills to have. Good stuff, alright...and the award things that you do, do you know that you're good at them?

M3: Uh?

MW: Are people complimenting you on these award things that you're doing.

M3: Yeah, that's how you know you're like good on them.

MW: Yeah, because they're always tell you?

M3: Yeah.

MW: That's good. What about the rewards and punishments here? So we talked about the merits and award schemes, what about the punishments?

M3: Punishments you get after school detentions in case you get angry and there's a RAP room, basically a referral...sometimes you get to go...

MW: Is that RAP room or REP?

M3: ...RAP.

MW: RAP room, OK.

M3: Yeah sometimes you get to go out for break if you're like...

MW: Does RAP stand for something?

M3: Yeah but I can't remember it.

MW: OK.

M3: Sometimes you go out for break if you're good and you do work and lunch.
MW: Yeah, but most of the time you’ll be there for the whole day?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Right.

M3: You’re there for the whole day, but sometimes you get let out for lunch and break.

MW: Right...can you get permanently excluded from here?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Have you seen that happen to someone?

M3: Yeah.

MW: What did they do?

M3: I think they brought drugs in...I think...I think it is.

MW: And where do you go once you’re permanently excluded from here?

M3: I think you go to ‘Nacro’ but I think they’re changing it now...you have to be sixteen to go there.

MW: OK.

M3: But yeah, they went to ‘Nacro’.

MW: What’s ‘Nacro’, is that Young Offenders...?

M3: No I don’t know what it is.

MW: OK.

M3: I think it’s like college slash school thing.

MW: OK...so how much freedom do you get in this school?

M3: Quite a lot, but your not allowed in the building.

MW: OK, but say you didn’t want to be in a lesson, could you go and walk around the corridors for a bit?

M3: No.

MW: What would happen if you did that?
M3: Teacher would come and talk to you, try and persuade you to go back to your lessons, if you don’t, they give you a detention or make you...and then you do it after school.

MW: And what about the way the teachers deal with you? Say the teacher came to you in the corridor would they deal with you in the same way as a teacher at PP?

M3: No. Basically, they would do the same as the TAs that were there.

MW: OK, so they’re a bit more...

[knock at the door]

MW: Is she coming in? Oh has she gone?

M3: Yeah.

MW: OK so the teachers are more like the TAs in your old school?

M3: Yeah.

MW: OK so they speak to more ‘on the level’, more like your friend...OK. What do you think about that?

M3: It’s alright yeah.

MW: Why?

M3: Because they don’t talk to like they’re teachers, they talk to you like, like they’re someone from your family or someone close.

MW: What about the other students here?

M3: Yeah they’re alright.

MW: Have you ever had any trouble with any of them?

M3: Sometimes.

MW: What’s that been like, serious or...?

M3: Well kind of serious, not serious-serious but kind of yeah.

MW: And how has the trouble been dealt with by the staff? What did they do?

M3: Erm...put you in RAP for a couple of days or exclude you.

MW: Say there is a problem with two students, do they bring them together to talk about it?
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M3: Yeah it’s called RJ I think.

MW: Oh Restorative Justice?

M3: Yeah.

MW: OK, and have you done that before?

M3: No, when I had a problem with a teacher I done it, but not with a student.

MW: What was that like when you had a problem with a teacher, did they get you in a room together?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: And what, what happens?

M3: Talk about it...what happened...yeah.

MW: So there is the teacher, you and then somebody else?

M3: [nods his head]

MW: OK, did that work? Did you come out of it thinking that’s a lot better now?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Alright, and how do you feel coming in to CP when you wake up in the morning?

M3: I feel, I feel happy man cos I’ve got loads of courses to look forward to...goes on my CV, like with PP, they didn’t have any courses I could go on.

MW: Hmm...sounds like your CV is getting full up with all of these things. This is going to go on your CV as well...so you’re just collecting all of these things [laughs].

M3: Well it’s hard to get a job these days so you’ve got to try and get one.

MW: It’s true. Alright, what about the other staff members? If the teachers are like the support staff at PP, what are the support staff like?

M3: They’re all the same.

MW: They’re all the same?

M3: They’re all the same yeah.

MW: So is it...
M3: They can have a laugh, joke with you...yeah.

MW: What about the office staff? The lunch staff?

M3: Everyone.

MW: Everyone...it's like a big...someone, another student said to me it's a bit like, everyone is like a big family.

M3: Yeah that's what I was going to say. It's like one big family.

MW: Hmm...so that's CP done, anything else you want to say about CP?

M3: No.

Section 3 – Life outside of school

MW: No? OK. SO now we’re going to move on to outside of school.

M3: Uuhh.

MW: Can you tell me about your time outside of school, what do you do with spare time?

M3: Sometimes I go to my mates when I’m free. Just go up there, chill out, play P3...er yeah. Or...I...cos I do Cadets as well, so that’s an important thing for me.

MW: OK, is that Air Cadets, Sea Cadets...

M3: No it’s Royal Logistics.

MW: OK.

M3: I go there every Monday and Thursday.

MW: What do you like about that?

M3: I’ve just lived the Army since I was about eleven twelve. And my Granddad grew up in the Army and was in World War Two.

MW: So was mine, yeah both of mine were. Yeah. Is your granddad still around?

M3: No he died of Cancer.

MW: Did you meet him?

M3: No.
MW: So who told you about your granddad?
M3: My mum.
MW: OK. And have you seen photos?
M3: When he was young.
MW: Yeah both my granddads are dead as well but they were in the war as well. OK, so you’re interested in the Army, mum told you about your granddad who was in the Army, any other family in the Army?
M3: [shakes his head]
MW: So your dad’s not in the Army?
M3: No.
MW: So you’ve been going there for quite a while then to Cadets?
M3: I’ve only started there in January.
MW: Oh right, but you’ve had the interest in the Army for long time?
M3: Yeah.
MW: And how’s it been going?
M3: It’s been fine, I love it.
MW: What are the staff like?
M3: The staff are alright.
MW: What do you call them, the officers...?
M3: Sarnt.
MW: Pardon?
M3: Sarnt. If there are like three ‘Vs’ on their chest or on their arm you call them Sarnt, it’s short for Sergeant.
MW: Oh, OK. Sarnt.
M3: And when the top boss comes down you have to call him ‘Sir’, you have to stand to attention so...he’s not that scary.
MW: What happens if you don’t?
M3: You have to get to attention quick.

MW: So are they quite strict?

M3: They’re not that strict, they can be...when they want to.

MW: Yeah...what are the other Cadets like?

M3: They’re alright.

MW: They’re alright. Have you done any trips yet with them?

M3: No I haven’t been to camp yet.

MW: Are you going to?

M3: Yeah.

MW: What this summer?

M3: Yeah maybe, cos I need to get my one star.

MW: What before you can go to camp or you get it when you go on camp.

M3: You get it on camp I think.

MW: Have you done taking a gun apart.

M3: No not yet, you have to go, you have to get a level two star for that.

MW: OK, and then do you actually get to do some shooting at some point?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Cool...OK so would you say that you are good at the things you do, what do you do at Cadets? Say you go on a Monday and Thursday, what do you do?

M3: Basically you go there, wait for everyone to arrive, get on parade, basically stand from like tallest to shortest...and go down the line and say your number and from the right you get your numbers...

MW: Where are you?

M3: I’m the tallest so I have to stand at the end.

MW: I thought you might be. So you’re number one?

M3: Yeah.
MW: Good number.
M3: And then they split you up, they erm...like evens take one place back, front rank take forward and they put you into three ranks...and then they, you right dress and then the right marker, they call the right marker out, the right marker walks forward stops, stands, still, attention, then stands at ease. Then the remainder, you say get on parade so everyone gets on parade.
MW: What does that mean?
M3: Parade?
MW: Yeah.
M3: Basically they march from the other end of the hall all the way down to the other end.
MW: OK so say someone is not doing right will they pick them out?
M3: Yeah, no they say ‘as you were’ so basically back to the beginning, so everyone has to do it.
MW: Do it again until you get it?
M3: Yeah. It’s important because when you’re in a squad you’re copying off of everyone so basically you’re looking to your right and copying off the right person, right person copying off the person...
MW: To the person at the end?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Everyone is following them basically?
M3: [nods his head]
MW: OK.
M3: But I’m not in uniform yet so I don’t have to stand at the front...so.
MW: When will you get your uniform?
M3: In about two weeks.
MW: And is there like a ceremony?
M3: I don’t know.
MW: Will they give it to you?
M3: I’ve never seen that.

MW: Ah OK. So when you get your one star, will you have to go up in front of everyone and they will give that to you?

M3: No I think they gave it to you on camp.

MW: OK, because I used to be in Scouts and we would collect badges.

M3: No, we’re totally different.

MW: What they don’t do badges? What do they do?

M3: We do ranks.

MW: Ranks, OK. So how many ranks are there?

M3: There’s one star, there’s basics or like junior one star, one star, two star, three star, four star...there’s master cadets and that leads up to like colonel and them ones.

MW: So do you think you want to go into the Army?

M3: Maybe yeah. And there’s rifle as well, maybe like lance corporal, corporal, sarnt.

MW: So you can be...your leaders or sergeants or whatever, were they actually in the Army as well?

M3: They probably went through the training, but not into the Army.

MW: So when they’re a Sergeant, they couldn’t say they’re a Sergeant in the Army, they’re a Cadet Sergeant?

M3: Well they can say they’re an Army Sergeant....I, I’m not too sure.

MW: Alright, well thanks for telling me about that, it’s really interesting. Erm...OK so you’re obviously good at Cadets, it’s going well. How do you know that you’re good at Cadets?

M3: Cos, if you’re all doing together and you’re all doing right they don’t say go back so you don’t have to do it again so...so I’m getting it right.

MW: And what about Playstation, how do you know you’re good at that?

M3: Everyone’s good at Playstation.

MW: Everyone? My girlfriend is not good at Playstation.
M3: Except for girls.

MW: And how do you know you’re good at Playstation?

M3: I don’t..

MW: You must know somehow, or you wouldn’t play it if you were rubbish at it. You’d be like ‘I don’t want to do that, it’s rubbish’.

M3: Because I know what I’m doing with the controller...know what buttons to push, what corners to turn.

MW: What games do you play? What games are you playing at the moment?


MW: Which ones?

M3: Oh I forgot what they was called. I don’t know all my games. It’s not mine, it’s at my mate’s house.

MW: Oh OK. Anything else you get up to outside of school that you enjoy doing?

M3: Nah not really.

MW: OK, can you tell me about any rewards and punishments outside of school?

M3: Erm...oh yeah did I tell you about the Jack Petchey I did earlier as well.

MW: Oh you do the Jack Petchey award?

M3: Yeah I won it as well.

MW: So you got some money to spend on something?

M3: Yeah for the school.

MW: What did you buy?

M3: We’re going go-carting or quad biking.

MW: That will be good. And do you get to choose who comes?

M3: Yeah.

MW: So what about rewards and punishments outside of school. Say I don’t know, you’re out late and you get home late, what would happen?
M3: Er...Dad will send you to your room, tell you off.

MW: Who do you live with?

M3: My dad.

MW: So if he sends you to your room, you have to stay there until he...

M3: Tells ya, or talks to ya...like.

MW: He'll come and talk it through.

M3: Huh?

MW: He'll come and talk it through with you?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Do you get any homework from here that you need to do at home?

M3: Sometimes not all the time.

MW: OK, so when you do and you need help with your schoolwork at home, would he help you with it?

M3: Hmm no...yeah if I needed help but I don't.

MW: What about rewards outside of school? So you know miss spoke to your dad and she was like ‘oh he’s lovely boy blah blah blah’, would you be rewarded for doing well at school at home?

M3: Yeah basically...uhuh.

MW: How would that work?

M3: I would get extra pocket money or something.

MW: Alright, how much freedom do you get to do what you want to do outside of school?

M3: How much freedom do I get?

MW: Yeah so you said on Saturday I’m going to up the West End or I’m going to...

M3: No I don’t go that far.

MW: Right.

M3: I don’t go on the far place.
MW: OK. But could you if you wanted to, would you be allowed to?

M3: No, not all the way there. Somewhere closer yeah I like SXXXXXX [name of local place]...yeah. If I ask my dad, ‘can I go to SXXXXXX [name of local place]?’, he’ll say...er...’go on then, you’ve been good’. That’s like a reward basically.

MW: And have you got a phone.

M3: Yeah.

MW: OK. So he can always call you if he needs to.

M3: Call me, yeah.

MW: Alright so the last bit...what’s the time? Oh it’s alright, we’ve got a bit of time it’s twenty-five past eleven.

M3: That’s my break.

MW: We’ve got about five minutes.

M3: That’s my break over then.

MW: Oh well it’s break time now?

M3: Yeah.

MW: Ok well we can arrange it with Miss that you get a break after. Is that alright?

M3: Yeah.

MW: On the subject of family, have you got brothers and sisters?

M3: Yeah two, no three brothers, two sisters.

MW: Wow and who do they live with?

M3: My dad.

MW: Oh so you all live together?

M3: Yeah.

MW: So it’s a busy house then?

M3: [nods his head]
MW: And are you the oldest?
M3: No second.
MW: OK so what does your older sister, brother...
M3: Brother.
MW: ...brother do? Has he finished school?
M3: Hmm...not yet, he’s still in his GCSEs.
MW: And what school does he go to?
M3: ZZ (school name).
MW: And all the others are younger?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Any other family members that you see regularly?
M3: Probably my auntie...that’s it.
MW: Is that your dad’s sister?
M3: Yeah. And my nan.
MW: Your dad’s mum?
M3: Yeah.
MW: OK, and do you get on with your family.
M3: Yeah.
MW: And do you get on with your brothers and sisters?
M3: Uuhh.
MW: All of them?
M3: Uuhh.
MW: Wow. Do they get on with each other?
M3: Sometimes. They get on each others nerves.
MW: How young is the youngest one?
MW: OK, so there's quite a...oh no I suppose there's about a ten year gap between you all.
M3: [nods his head]
MW: What about your friends outside of school?
M3: What about them?
MW: How do you know them?
M3: How do I know them?
MW: Yeah.
M3: I met a couple of them here and he introduced me to his friend and we just got along.
MW: Are you still in touch with anyone from PP?
M3: No.
MW: What about your primary school?
M3: Yeah some of them come here.
MW: Oh really?
M3: Yeah.
MW: Can you tell me about anyone else you spend time with outside of school? You talked about Cadets, what about the people from Cadets, do you see them any other time?
M3: No.
MW: Alright, we're pretty much there. This is just a general question about life and the way you see life. So some people see life as a ladder to climb...
M3: Yeah.
MW: ...to get to the top. Other people see it as split between the people that have and the people that have not, so the people that are born into money and the people that aren't and that’s the way it is and there is no ladder to climb. How do you see it?
M3: There is a ladder for the kids that ain't brought up with rich families and all of that. There's a ladder for them. But basically, my family ain't that rich and
I’m trying to make it somewhere. There’s always a chance though...just try, just try your hardest.

MW: So would you say that you’re on the ladder?

M3: Yeah.

MW: And it sounds to me as though every course you’re doing is enabling you to take the next step

M3: Yeah that’s what I would say to like the other children. Take any courses you can, take the chance, cos it’s hard to find a job out there...so.

MW: Brilliant, well thanks a lot. Cheers. Actually there’s one last thing I have to say to you.

[debrief given]

MW: [ending questions from debrief]

M3: No.

MW: Thanks again. See you later.

M3: See ya.

MW: Oh and I’ll be coming back in to give out certificates, so I’ll see you then.

M3: Oh OK.
### 3.x. Example section of Initial Code Table

**Initial coding by Setting and BPN – MAINSTREAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>BPN</th>
<th>#.</th>
<th>Part. Ref.</th>
<th>Data Extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'M1: Didn’t get to play no football, like I didn’t like the whole environment of the school’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA01</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'M1: And I didn’t want to go to that school.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA02</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'MW: Right. And were you allowed to leave the room?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA03</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1: No you weren’t allowed to leave the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MW: What not for the whole day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1: Stay in there for the whole day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MW: OK. Do you think that is a good punishment to use? Do you think it worked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1: Not really’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA04</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'MW: OK...what was the thing that happened that meant you were finally permanently excluded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1: I don’t remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MW: So was it lots of small things rather than one big thing that did it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M1: Yeah they said I was on my last warning or something. But me like I chose to cos I wanted to…I didn’t want to go to that school.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.xi. Photo evidence of theme boards
4.1. Thematic-evidence map – Mainstream/Autonomy

4.2. Thematic-evidence map – Mainstream/Competence
4.iii. Thematic-evidence map – Mainstream/Relatedness

![Thematic-evidence map – Mainstream/Relatedness](image1)

4.iv. Thematic-evidence map – PRU/Autonomy

![Thematic-evidence map – PRU/Autonomy](image2)
4.v. Thematic-evidence map – PRU/Competence

4.vi. Thematic-evidence map – PRU/Relatedness
4.vii. Thematic-evidence map – OoS/Autonomy

4.viii. Thematic-evidence map – OoS/Competence
4.ix. Thematic-evidence map – OoS/Relatedness
5.i. Proposed social-contextual supports model

![Diagram showing the relationship between Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness and their impact on Identified/Integrated Regulation of Behaviour, Self-Efficacy & Achievement, Connectedness & Belonging, Confidence, Well-Being & Aspiration.](image)

**SOCIAL-CONTEXTUAL SUPPORTS FOR BPNs**

- **Autonomy**
- **Competence**
- **Relatedness**

**Identified / Integrated Regulation of Behaviour**

- Self-Efficacy & Achievement
- Connectedness & Belonging
- Confidence, Well-Being & Aspiration
5.ii. Proposed social-contextual limitations model

![Diagram of social-contextual limitations for BPNs]

- **Autonomy**: External/introjected regulation of behaviour, disengagement & disaffection, reduced connectedness & belonging, negative self-concept & reduced well-being.
- **Competence**: Reduced connectedness & belonging, negative self-concept & reduced well-being.
- **Relatedness**: Reduced connectedness & belonging, negative self-concept & reduced well-being.