ORIGINAL ARTICLE

BERJ ⬡ BERA

The education experiences of young people experiencing child criminal and sexual exploitation

Jenny Lloyd 🔵

Department of Sociology, Durham University, Durham, UK

Correspondence
Jenny Lloyd, Department of Sociology, Durham University, 32 Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HN, UK.
Email: jenny.a.lloyd@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

School exclusion forms part of the processes that can increase young people's risk of offending and involvement in exploitation and harm. However, little is known about the education experiences of young people impacted by harm, such as child sexual and criminal exploitation. This paper presents findings from a survey with 17 children's and families' social care departments in England and Wales to understand the education experiences of children open to social care for extra-familial harm. The research was undertaken at a time of significant pressure on schools and teachers to improve academic performance. The findings evidence that 45% of young people were in mainstream settings, 85% of young people had experienced some form of exclusion and this differed across gender, disability and ethnicity. Finally, the reasons for exclusion were strongly associated with young people's experiences of exploitation and harm. Two theories of containment are used to understand school exclusion: psychosocial and geopolitical. I argue that exclusionary school practices spatially contain the perceived 'threat' young people impacted by extra-familial harm pose to wider school populations, to emotionally contain professional anxieties about exploitation and violence, in the absence of appropriate educational and safeguarding system responses.

KEYWORDS

child criminal exploitation, child sexual exploitation, containment, extra-familial harm, school exclusion

Key insights

What is the main issue that the paper addresses?

This paper explores the education experiences of young people impacted by violence, such as sexual and criminal exploitation and serious violence across England and Wales. Analysis focuses specifically on the educational placements, types of exclusion and reasons for exclusion these young people faced.

What are the main insights that the paper provides?

The majority of young people facing extra-familial harm had experienced school exclusion. Social workers and educators did not have systems in place to address the welfare needs of these young people. Instead, exclusion was used to contain anxiety about the risks of extra-familial harm and the children impacted by it.

BACKGROUND

Little is known about the school experiences of children and young people impacted by child criminal and sexual exploitation. These types of harm constitute forms of extra-familial harm (the term used throughout). Extra-familial harm is a form of violence and abuse that impacts young people in their communities. It includes harm such as child sexual exploitation, child criminal exploitation (CCE), youth violence and other forms of harm that can happen between peers and older adults in places like schools, neighbourhoods and online. While the term 'extra-familial harm' is particularly British, used to distinguish this harm from more 'traditional' forms of child abuse happening within families (intra-familial abuse), it is an issue of global concern (Kardefelt-Winther & Maternowska, 2020; Pinheiro, 2006; United Nations, 2023). Young people experiencing extra-familial harm face some of the most significant forms of violence, including fatal violence and sexual assaults. In recent years in the United Kingdom, policymakers, safeguarding professionals and public interest have prompted a range of policy and practice advances promoting the idea that extra-familial harm is a form of child abuse requiring a child welfare approach (HM Government, 2018b). Until this point it had been traditionally addressed as a youth justice issue. While viewing harm and abuse of young people as a welfare issue, irrespective of where the harm occurs, might sound common sense, in the United Kingdom the traditional safeguarding and child protection system was built to address harm within families; either harm by parents or a lack of 'control' by parents to stop harm happening (Firmin, 2020). Therefore, when harm happens in communities, by other children (who are often victims themselves), the UK child protection system is ill-equipped to respond (Firmin, 2017). In short, social workers and the systems they use are not designed to address harm happening in schools or other contexts beyond the home. This is combined with an education system in the United Kingdom that can draw on exclusionary approaches to tackling behaviour. Considering research has evidenced strong links between exclusion and increased risk to extra-familial violence and abuse (Arnez & Condry, 2021), it is possible that current education responses to behaviour may increase risks to extra-familial harm but do not have the appropriate child welfare responses to tackle it. However, while it is important to recognise the links between exclusion and extra-familial harm (Arnez & Condry, 2021), there is a lack of causal evidence (Timpson, 2019). Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge the complexity of this issue.

Schools and teachers are operating in a climate of ever-increasing pressure to increase academic performance (Skinner et al., 2021), in a context of reduced resources for schools (Adams, 2016) and quite simply, many teachers feel unsupported to address the challenges that negative behaviour can have in the classroom (Gov.uk, 2019). This paper looks at the education experiences of young people experiencing extra-familial harm open to children's social care. I argue that, in the absence of appropriate safeguarding and education systems designed to address this form of harm, school exclusion is used to emotionally contain the anxiety that child exploitation and violence provoke for professionals, by utilising spatial strategies of containment, exclusion and bordering to stop the perceived 'threat' of violence that particular young people are perceived to pose to wider school communities. The aim of this paper is not to individualise the issue of extra-familial harm to teachers or social workers but to examine the systems and contexts that may result in particular exclusionary practices.

School exclusion and extra-familial harm

School exclusion is when a child is removed, either temporarily or permanently, from a school. Temporary exclusion includes suspension (referred to as fixed-period exclusion in this paper) and permanent exclusion. In addition to these formal exclusion processes are a range of 'hidden' or 'grey' exclusions (Gill et al., 2017, p. 1); practices whereby children are prevented from attending school but this is not recorded in official exclusion data (Done et al., 2021). Power and Taylor (2020) emphasise the need to broaden definitions of exclusionary practices to include those where children are removed from the mainstream classroom but remain in the school building, for example through the use of isolation units. *Managed moves* are another mechanism designed to reduce exclusion rates but remove students from the physical space of the school. Managed moves involve the 'voluntary' transfer of a student to another school (Messeter & Soni, 2018).

Research into school exclusion reflects a picture of changing policy landscapes, education structures and systemic biases. In the United Kingdom there is significant variation between the exclusion data of different nations, with England having a rising rate relative to Scotland and Wales' reductions (Billingham & Gillon, 2024; Cole et al., 2019; McCluskey et al., 2019; Tseliou et al., 2024). Pressures for schools to improve educational attainment of students sit at odds with narratives that promote inclusive learning environments, resulting in the exclusion of children seen to negatively impact the school's performance (Gazeley, 2010). Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) are seven times more likely to be excluded than children without disabilities. Black Caribbean boys and girls and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children are disproportionately excluded more than White students, and boys are permanently excluded three times more than girls (Graham et al., 2019). Children with social care involvement are seen to be excluded substantially more than those without (Jay et al., 2023).

School exclusion can have significant impacts on young people and their families: including poor mental health, physical health, homelessness and unemployment (Pirrie et al., 2011). In relation to extra-familial harm specifically, these consequences produce vulnerabilities that create the conditions for further exploitation and interpersonal harm. Multiple studies have identified links between school exclusion and increased risk of youth offending (Berridge et al., 2001; HM Government, 2018a), increased vulnerability to youth violence and criminal exploitation via 'county lines' (Arnez & Condry, 2021; Williams & Finlay, 2019), knife possession (Ministry of Justice, 2018) and increased risk of becoming both a 'perpetrator' or victim of crime (Timpson, 2019). Although many researchers and policymakers are keen to emphasise the correlation between school exclusion and exploitation and offending, they do not evidence a causal link (Timpson, 2019). Substantial evidence suggests a relationship

between being outside of school and becoming more vulnerable to being a victim of criminal exploitation and other forms of extra-familial harm (Just for Law Kids, 2020).

School exclusion itself only describes a partial picture of what is happening. When children are excluded (whether permanently, temporarily or via 'hidden' processes), their very physical existence and where they are allowed to be is called into question. All forms of exclusion require the movement, containment or formation of boundaries that permit or limit children's movements in certain places. In some instances children will be moved to alternative education providers such as Pupil Referral Units, sent home or provided with differing arrangements that prevent them being physically within the school grounds (Done & Knowler, 2021; Done et al., 2021; Power & Taylor, 2020). Yet some have noted a relationship between the places children are sent and their experiences of extra-familial harm. For example, an increased risk of CCE in alternative provision (National Crime Agency, 2018), with increased exposure to violence and negative peer influence (Just for Law Kids, 2020). While some literature describes rather condemning outcomes for young people in alternative provision (Commission on Young Lives, 2022), it is clear that many young people's experiences of extra-familial harm begin in mainstream settings, and it is their experience of exploitation and harm that can lead to their exclusion (Just for Law Kids, 2020).

Whatever the cause or impact of school exclusion, such processes revolve around the removal of individuals from places. Daniels et al. (2019) note that the current English policy context seeks to individualise the issue of exclusion through a focus on behaviour rather than the structures and systems of education and social policy. Despite many of the factors that lead to exclusion being beyond a young person's control, exclusion and other interventions can lead to increased individual surveillance (McAra & McVie, 2007) and the loosening of social structures and ties to pro-social peers (Berridge et al., 2001). School exclusion can be seen as part of wider 'civic exclusions' that marginalise certain groups through increased control, emphasis on individual accountability (Carlen et al., 1994, p. 95) and the removal of unwanted groups from mainstream society—particularly racially minoritised groups, and in school, those with SEND who may 'threaten' attainment figures (Done et al., 2021; Gazeley, 2010). Such measures, seen as part of the 'carceral state', include broader mechanisms of detention and borders such as those applied to immigrants (Meiners, 2011, p. 547), and are part of wider policy decisions focused on containment. But they also offer, as explored in this paper, emotional containment—part of the theoretical focus of this paper.

Containment

This paper brings together two different theories of containment: the psychoanalytic theory of emotional containment developed by Bion (1963) and the geopolitical theory of containment (Kennan & Lukacs, 1997). Bion's (1963) theory of the container/contained describes the relationship between a preverbal infant and their mother. Through a process of 'reverie', the mother processes the difficult feelings the infant may have, by holding and returning these feelings in a more tolerable manner (Lefevre et al., 2024). Emotional containment therefore offers a route by which emotions are experienced, managed, denied, avoided and passed on (Lawlor & Webb, 2009). Using this theory in practice settings, Menzies Lyth (1988) explored what can happen in organisations when emotions are not contained. Researching in a hospital, she noted how negative emotions experienced by professionals (in her case nurses), without appropriate containment, resulted in defensive organisational practices against anxiety. What this means is that when faced with the pain, anxiety and fear caused by encountering patients facing death, professionals created ways to defend themselves against experiencing these emotions. Practices such as depersonalising patients, fragmenting relationships, routinising practices (such as folding laundry) and inappropriate allocation

of responsibility all acted as ways to distance professionals from the anxiety the work pro-voked, limiting their ability to directly address the source of the anxiety (Ruch, 2020). Applied within the context of child protection settings, where anxieties related to stress, risk, death and performance may be high, and opportunities for emotional support and containment may be low, research has shown that these emotions can become amplified and projected (Cooper & Lees, 2018; Lees et al., 2013).

The geopolitical theory of containment refers to the economic, political and military tactics originally developed by American diplomat George F. Kennan in the 1940s in an attempt to limit the expansion of Soviet communism globally (Kennan & Lukacs, 1997). Applying con-tainment in a geographical sense offers a way to explore the spatially contingent, political and relational nature of containment and the various spatial practices that are bound up with these processes—including mobility, bordering, hiding and exclusion. Applied in relation to immigration, Mountz et al. (2013) explores how containment offers a way to understand de-tainment as a means to regulate mobility that is rooted in racialised and classed depictions of people. They show how mobility, containment, bordering and exclusion are spatial prac-tices used to control people and objects that paradoxically exclude people from space while also fixing them within space. Within schools, geographers have explored how the spatial strategy of containment is applied through processes of school exclusion whereby 'at-risk' students are moved physically away from peers and the wider school community (Nairn & Higgins, 2011). Through doing so, children are contained in places to prevent them 'causing trouble', while simultaneously their identities as 'troublemakers' (p. 185) are amplified by being situated spatially away from others. Teasley (2013) uses the theory of containment to explore the experiences of Roma students. They describe containment as:

> Dominant-group structural and cultural practices aimed at dominating other groups or members thereof by marginalizing, neglecting, denying, isolating, re-stricting, and thus 'containing' them, and any aspects of their identities or ways of life perceived as 'undesirable'. (Teasley, 2013, p. 30)

They describe how policies of school containment segregate students from school com-munities underpinned by racialised, classed and gendered politics that legitimise some, while disempowering and oppressing others.

In drawing on both theories of containment this paper explores emotional and spatialised practices of containment. These offer a way to conceptualise practices and policies of con-tainment that are utilised by social work and educational practitioners but that have real-life implications for students and young people impacted by them.

METHODOLOGY

The findings presented in this paper are drawn from a survey conducted with 17 children's social care departments in England and Wales over an 18-month period from June 2022. The research asked: What are the education experiences of young people impacted by extra-familial harm in England and Wales?

Method

The research involved two methods: a survey and a follow-up interview. This paper presents data from the survey only. The aim of the survey was to collect information about the edu-cation experiences of young people open to children's social care for concerns related to

extra-familial harm. A representative from each local authority was asked to gather data on behalf of their authority. This required them to access the minutes of the first extra-familial harm panel held in November 2022, and then, using the list of names of children discussed in this meeting, collect anonymous data to answer a range of questions based on these children. Extra-familial harm panels are multi-agency meetings used in some (but not all) social care departments that are often chaired by social care and the police to discuss and risk manage 'high-risk' cases where children are experiencing extra-familial harm. Over recent years the focus of these panels has been on child sexual exploitation, but this has been broadened in some areas to include CCE and serious violence.

The survey questions focused on three areas:

- The panel—meeting name, frequency, chairing, types of harm discussed, meeting date and number of cases.
- The children—demographics, age, gender, ethnicity, disability, education health and care plan (EHCP) status, social care status, educational placement (at the time of the meeting), previous exclusions at any time before the meeting, reasons for exclusions, impact on safeguarding and if the harm happened before or after the exclusion.
- How participants accessed the information.

In most cases the participants were the chairs of these meetings. To collate the information for the survey, they used a combination of drawing information from their own social care recording system and contacting education colleagues or social work practitioners.

Inclusion criteria and participants

To learn about the education experiences of young people impacted by extra-familial harm, an inclusion criterion was developed that balanced addressing the research question while ensuring the research was practically feasible for those participating in the survey. The survey collected data on:

- Children open to children's social care for concerns related to extra-familial harm.
- Children discussed at the first extra-familial harm panel held in November 2022.

The focus of this research was to identify young people who were experiencing extra-familial harm and were open to children's social care, rather than asking schools to identify children they thought might be impacted by extra-familial harm. This meant that children identified in the survey had reached a threshold of being *in need* or at risk of *significant harm* as defined by law (). However, due to variations in how extra-familial harm is recorded in social care systems, selecting cases of extra-familial harm can be challenging. As such, I asked for participating authorities to use the list of children discussed at an extra-familial harm panel.

Participants were asked to choose the first panel meeting held in November 2022. This date was close enough to when the data collection commenced (February 2023) to ensure that workers could remember the children if necessary, and far enough away from school holidays. Fifteen participating authorities held extra-familial harm panels, however, two did not. In these authorities, participants were able to generate a report of cases at the time and selected the first cases based on what was feasible. This sampling strategy was chosen to prevent workers hand picking cases. Due to variations in frequency of meetings and number of cases discussed, there were variations in the number of children included in the survey between sites (2 to 14). However, as the focus was not on prevalence, this was not considered a limitation.

Potential participating social care departments were contacted via the Contextual Safeguarding mailing list, the Local Area Interest Group (a collection of over 70 authorities implementing Contextual Safeguarding), over Twitter and via word of mouth. Thirty-six different authorities responded positively, initially resulting in 17 authorities participating in the survey. Participating authorities included 14 from England and three from Wales. Five London boroughs participated and three large rural areas. Across England there was participation from the north-west, north-east, midlands, south and south-west. In Wales, all authorities were from South Wales. Four authorities had worked closely with the Contextual Safeguarding team previously but the majority had not.

Analysis

The survey analysis involved descriptive statistics. Survey data were provided during an online meeting where I directly entered the data into an Excel spreadsheet during the call. Survey questions were 'open' rather than requiring participants to fit pre-defined categories. For example, ethnicity data were recorded as defined by the participants' own database, as was social care status. Data analysis was undertaken in three stages. First, after data from all sites had been collected, the data were cleaned.

Second, where appropriate, data were grouped into smaller categories to facilitate analysis. Ethnicity data, of which there were originally 18 different recorded ethnicities, were grouped according to whether children were from a 'racially minoritised' or a 'non-racially minoritised' group. The terminology used to describe social care status varied across England and Wales and between individual authorities. The 10 original categories used for social care status were grouped into seven different options which reflected similar thresholds. This process was also followed for the educational placement types (18 were grouped into 8 possible options) and exclusions (16 became 8). The 'reasons for exclusion' were provided as free-text written accounts. I read each account and created a selection of 'codes' to categorise the reasons for the exclusion. This resulted in 13 different codes (outlined in the findings).

Finally, pivot tables were used to cross-tabulate data. For the purposes of this paper, three types of education data were analysed against demographic data. This included educational placements, exclusions and reason for exclusion analysed against gender, ethnicity, age and disability. 'Disability' is the term used throughout to reflect the language used by social care recording systems.

Ethics

Ethical approval was granted by the research institution. In addition to this, each participating local authority provided consent for the research to take place and to supply data anonymously. Survey data were provided anonymously and where it was felt individual information may be identifiable, participants had the option to not provide the data or change the category (e.g., a very specific ethnic group might have been categorised into a broader group). The consent process considered the impact of the research, the confidentiality and the right to withdraw.

Limitations

Several limitations are important to note. First, a key focus of the research was on understanding what social work knows and prioritises about children's education experiences,

particularly children impacted by the most significant and harmful forms of extra-familial harm. For this reason, the survey was conducted based on information held by social care systems and focused on children discussed at safeguarding panels. This surfaced many challenges that social work colleagues had in accessing information on education (a finding in itself). While we can be confident that some forms of exclusion (e.g., permanent exclusion) may be recorded, it is likely that the exclusions recorded are an under-representation of the true picture of exclusion. For example, no participants noted the use of internal exclusions by schools and it is difficult to determine many of the hidden forms of exclusion that may be used (Done et al., 2021; Power & Taylor, 2020). Furthermore, as participants were asked to collect data on whether a child had experienced exclusions at any time *before* the panel took place, it is likely that they may not have captured this information before the child was open to children's social care.

Second, the types of information recorded are likely to reflect biases. It was not the focus of the research to find out the 'real' reason for exclusion and as such we are reliant on what and how exclusion information is recorded. For example, 'evidence of harm' (a category used when reason for exclusion data was recoded) refers only to what was interpreted not what may have actually happened, and is likely to be impacted by bias. Furthermore, how participants provided information on the reasons for exclusion varied. In some places these were generic (e.g., disruptive behaviour) whereas others provided reasons based on what they had read in case notes and their own interpretation. As such, terms like 'disruptive behaviour' were used more often, which increased the prevalence of this reason.

Third, to facilitate analysis and highlight trends and patterns, a certain level of categorisation was undertaken with the data (Ross et al., 2020). There are challenges to grouping data, particularly race and ethnicity, that guided the analysis process (Sablan, 2019) so as not to over-simplify or homogenise the issue. The terminology 'racially minoritised' and 'non-racially minoritised' has been used to foreground a focus on power and to critique the dominance of Whiteness (Gabriel, 2020). Finally, the number of participating authorities and 'cases' included in the study are small. They give an initial insight into the relationship between extra-familial harm and education but should not be used to draw wider conclusions. Due to limitations in sample size, analysis was not undertaken to explore the variation between England and Wales at a national level.

FINDINGS

Seventeen children's social care departments provided information on 131 children impacted by extra-familial harm that were open to children's social care. The age of the children and young people included in the survey ranged from 11 to 18, with an average age of 15.03 and a mode of 15. Of the young people included in the survey, 31.29% were female ($n=41$), 67.93% were male ($n=89$) and 0.76% were described as 'other' ($n=1$). Following categorisation of ethnicity, 30.53% of young people were from a racially minoritised group ($n=40$) and 69.46% were from a non-racially minoritised group ($n=91$). Over a fifth (22.90%) of young people were considered to have a disability ($n=30$). All the young people in the survey were impacted by either child sexual exploitation (CSE) (29%) and/or CCE (71%). Additionally, some children were impacted by other forms of harm: gang affiliation (9%); serious youth violence (8%); trafficking (8%); anti-social behaviour (7%); modern slavery (2%); harmful sexual behaviour (2%); and radicalisation (1%). Analysis was undertaken to explore the educational placements, forms of exclusion and reasons for exclusion. It is important to note that almost all participants noted how challenging it was for them (social workers) to access information about the education experiences of children.

Educational placements

In response to the survey question 'What type of educational placement did the young person attend at the time of the panel?', participants provided 18 different educational placement types. These were grouped into eight smaller categories. Educational placements were then analysed by gender, ethnicity, age, disability and harm type. Further analysis was undertaken to calculate the percentage of each group (e.g., gender/ethnicity/disability) as a percentage of the overall sample (i.e., the number of girls for each placement proportionate to the total number of girls included in the sample). Table 1 outlines the educational placements for the whole sample and by gender and harm type (CSE and CCE only).

Analysis revealed that 45% of the young people in the survey were in mainstream settings, with limited variation between boys and girls. The young person described as 'other' gender was electively home educated. A quarter of young people were in alternative provision but more girls (29%) than boys (22%). Nearly double the number of boys were not in education, employment or training (NEET) than girls. No girls were in special educational settings.

When analysed against ethnicity, limited variation was found between educational placement types for ethnicity and the average figures for the whole sample. The number of young people in special educational settings was small ($n=6$), but five of the six were young people from a non-racially minoritised group.

Of the 30 young people with a disability, 27 were in alternative provision ($n=8$), 23% in mainstream ($n=7$), 23% ($n=7$) were NEET, 20% in special education settings ($n=6$) and one young person was employed. When analysed against age, the largest age groups in alternative provision were 14 ($n=8$) and 15-year-olds ($n=12$). A third of 15-year-olds in the sample were in alternative provision and 38% of 14-year-olds. Of the 23 young people described as NEET, 18 were aged 16 or over, meaning that five were missing from education.

When analysed against the type of extra-familial harm a child was experiencing (CCE or CSE), more young people impacted by CSE were in alternative settings than mainstream education (34% vs 22%). This is likely to reflect the gendered differences between harm types. Of the 38 young people perceived to be experiencing CSE, only three were male and more girls than boys were in alternative settings. A fifth of young people impacted by CCE were NEET, compared to 13% of those impacted by CSE.

There were variations in the educational placements used between local authorities that may have impacted the results. The average number of 'cases provided' by sites was 6.89. Sites E and P provided information on 11 and 1 cases. Combined, this represented 21% of all the cases in the survey. In site E, all but one person was in mainstream education and in site P, 11 young people were in mainstream education. Site E was a Welsh site and P was English.

Types of exclusion

Participants were asked to collect data on whether the young person had any prior experiences of exclusion before they were discussed at the meeting. This resulted in 16 types of exclusion that were grouped into eight smaller categories. Of the 131 young people in the survey, 85% had experienced some form of exclusion ($n=112$). It was possible to choose multiple exclusions (one young person had experienced seven types of exclusion) but the survey did not quantify whether multiple forms of the same exclusion were used. The types of exclusion were analysed against gender, ethnicity, disability and harm type. The most prevalent form of exclusion was fixed-period exclusions (41% of young people). A quarter of young people had experienced a managed move to alternative provision and a fifth of young people had been permanently excluded. Table 2 presents an analysis of exclusion type against gender and ethnicity.

TABLE 1 Educational placements by gender and harm type.

Education type	Total	% of girls (as a % of girls in sample)	% of boys (as a % of boys in sample)	CCE (as a % of sample of CCE)	CSE (as a % of sample of CSE)
Mainstream	45% (n=59)	46% (n=19)	45% (n=40)	45% (n=42)	39% (n=15)
Alternative provision	24% (n=32)	29% (n=12)	22% (n=20)	22% (n=20)	34% (n=13)
Not in education, training or employment (NEET)	18% (n=23)	12% (n=5)	20% (n=18)	22% (n=20)	13% (n=5)
Don't know	2% (n=2)	5% (n=2)	0%	0%	5% (n=2)
Dual placement	3% (n=4)	5% (n=2)	2% (n=2)	3% (n=3)	3% (n=1)
Elective home education	3% (n=4)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	2% (n=2)	5% (n=2)
Employed	1%	0%	1% (n=1)	1% (n=1)	0%
Special educational placement	5%	0%	7% (n=6)	5% (n=5)	0%

TABLE 2 Education exclusions by total sample, gender and ethnicity.

Type of exclusion	Breakdown by total sample (n=131)	Female (% of total sample)	Male (% of total sample)	Non-racially minoritised (% of total sample)	Racially minoritised (% of total sample)
Fixed-period exclusion	41% (n=54)	46% (n=19)	39% (n=35)	40% (n=36)	45% (n=18)
Move to alternative provision	25% (n=33)	22% (n=9)	27% (n=24)	29% (n=26)	18% (n=7)
Permanent exclusion	21% (n=28)	12% (n=5)	26% (n=23)	23% (n=21)	18% (n=7)
Reduced timetable	21% (n=28)	27% (n=11)	19% (n=17)	26% (n=24)	10% (n=4)
Don't know	12% (n=16)	17% (n=7)	10% (n=9)	8% (n=7)	23% (n=9)
Other	5% (n=7)	5% (n=2)	6% (n=5)	3% (n=3)	10% (n=4)
Managed move to mainstream	5% (n=6)	2% (n=1)	6% (n=5)	7% (n=6)	0%
Elective home education	2% (n=3)	2% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	3% (n=3)	0%

When analysed against gender, distinctions were found between boys and girls. While girls had experienced slightly more fixed-period exclusions than boys (46% vs 39%), boys had experienced double the number of permanent exclusions than girls and over a quarter of the boys in the sample had experienced permanent exclusion. Girls had been placed on reduced timetables more than boys but less was known about the education experiences of girls than boys.

Some variations were found when exclusion was analysed against ethnicity. Of the young people from a non-racially minoritised group, 23% had experienced permanent exclusion compared to 18% from a racially minoritised group; meanwhile 29% of young people from a non-racially minoritised group had experienced a move to alternative provision whereas 18% of young people from a racially minoritised group had. Some 26% of non-racially minoritised young people had experienced a reduced timetable compared to 10% of racially minoritised young people. For 23% of racially minoritised young people it was not known if they had experienced exclusion compared to 8% of non-racially minoritised young people.

Some variations were found when exclusions were analysed against disability. Young people with a disability had experienced permanent exclusion similarly to young people without a disability; 30% of young people with a disability had experienced a move to alternative provision compared to 24% of those without. A quarter of young people without a disability had been placed on reduced timetables compared to 10% of those with a disability. Slightly more children without a disability had experienced fixed-period exclusions than those with a disability (43% vs 37%).

The forms of exclusion were also analysed against the type of harm young people experienced. Of the permanent exclusions ($n = 28$), 82% were for young people experiencing CCE and 18% were for those experiencing CSE. A quarter (25%) of young people experiencing CCE had experienced permanent exclusion, double that of young people experiencing CSE (13%).

Reasons for exclusion

Survey participants provided qualitative accounts of why young people had been excluded. These were then coded into a possible 13 different reasons (it was possible for each account to be coded across multiple codes) and analysed against gender, ethnicity, disability and harm type. Table 3 presents findings against gender, ethnicity and disability.

The sample size in the survey is low and as such cross-tabulation analysis for some 'reasons' resulted in very small numbers when analysed against gender, ethnicity and disability. However, some patterns did emerge. 'Disruptive behaviour' was the most prevalent reason given for exclusions. This was also the case when analysed specifically for permanent exclusion, fixed-period exclusions, move to alternative provision and reduced timetable.

It is difficult to determine the types of behaviour that were described as 'disruptive' as this was a standardised term used in education recording. Boys were given the reason 'disruptive behaviour' twice as often as girls and children without a disability were given this reason more than those with a disability (29% vs 20%). The second most prevalent reason for an exclusion was 'not known', but this reason was provided much more for girls than boys and more for racially minoritised young people than non-racially minoritised. 'Attendance and punctuality' was the third most given reason for exclusion (although never independently of other factors in all but one instance). Extracts from the qualitative accounts recorded as 'attendance and punctuality' included (with some demographics provided in brackets):

TABLE 3 Reasons for exclusion against gender, ethnicity and disability.

Reason for exclusion	Number of children in sample	% of total sample					
		Female	Male	Non-racially minoritised	Racially minoritised	No disability	Disability
Disruptive behaviour	35	17% (n=7)	31% (n=28)	27% (n=25)	25% (n=10)	29% (n=29)	20.00% (n=6)
Not known	27	37% (n=15)	13% (n=12)	18% (n=16)	28% (n=11)	21% (n=21)	20% (n=6)
Attendance and punctuality	22	12% (n=5)	19% (n=17)	16% (n=15)	18% (n=7)	20% (n=20)	7% (n=2)
Threat of violence/abuse to an adult	20	7% (n=3)	19% (n=17)	18% (n=16)	10% (n=4)	12% (n=12)	27% (n=8)
Threat of violence towards a student	17	5% (n=2)	17% (n=15)	16% (n=15)	5% (n=2)	11% (n=11)	20% (n=6)
Evidence of physical violence to a student	10	5% (n=2)	9% (n=8)	4% (n=4)	15% (n=6)	9% (n=9)	3% (n=1)
Outside of school	9	5% (n=2)	8% (n=7)	2% (n=2)	18% (n=7)	7% (n=7)	7% (n=2)
Victim	7	5% (n=2)	6% (n=5)	4% (n=4)	8% (n=3)	4% (n=4)	10% (n=3)
Breaking school rules	7	7% (n=3)	5% (n=4)	4% (n=4)	8% (n=3)	6% (n=6)	3% (n=1)
Substance use	7	2% (n=1)	7% (n=6)	5% (n=5)	5% (n=2)	5% (n=5)	7% (n=2)
Evidence of abuse/harm to a student	5	5% (n=2)	3% (n=3)	3% (n=3)	5% (n=2)	3% (n=3)	7% (n=2)
Evidence of physical abuse to an adult	4	2% (n=1)	3% (n=3)	3% (n=3)	3% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	7% (n=2)
'Anti-social behaviour'	3	2% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	2% (n=2)	3% (n=1)	2% (n=2)	3% (n=1)

Excluded due to behaviour, truancy and behaviour concerns. Concerns in community. Early indicators of not coming back in timeframes. (15, female, non-racially minoritised, no disability, CCE & CSE, managed move to alternative provision and permanent exclusion)

Moved due to absence, going missing, not managing to go to school, reduced timetable didn't work so moved to alternative provision. (14, female, non-racially minoritised, no disability, CSE, fixed-period exclusion, reduced timetable)

School attendance noted in [panel] *referral and elsewhere, i.e., frequently absent from school and only attended a few times. Limited attendance. Incident at college that impacted going back.* (13, male, racially minoritised, disability, exclusion but not clear what type).

Analysis of the reasons for exclusion indicated a divide between the 'threat of' violence and harm to adults and students and 'evidence of' actual violence and harm. Instances of actual harm and violence were low, the three codes for 'evidence' of harm were present in the reasons for 17 children (as some children were coded across multiple reasons). The reasons described where 'evidence' was coded included:

Physical assault of another student, verbal abuse/threat to an adult, physical assault of another adult. (16, male, racially minoritised, disability, CCE, fixed-period exclusion)

Excluded from mainstream education for asking for a sexual image of a female peer and sharing the image. He was only 12 at the time and has [autism spectrum disorder]. *Placed in an alternative provider in the borough. That alternative provider is in a known gang area. It was however friendly with his home address area but a long way to travel. He was given an exclusion from that alternative provision for smelling of weed and behavioural concerns: one incident described him kicking a door.* (14, male, racially minoritised, disability. CCE, permanent exclusion and other exclusions)

Assaulting another student. (12, female, non-racially minoritised, no disability, CSE, fixed-period exclusion)

Analysis of the reasons for exclusion revealed that young people were excluded for reasons that could be directly linked to indicators of their experiences of extra-familial harm. These indicators were evidenced across codes (e.g., a reason for not attending or being late could be linked to their exploitation) but also directly indicated in reasons coded for 'victim' and 'outside of school':

Not attending the site due to risks, following an incident of serious youth violence one month before. […] *In 2019 school had issued a fixed-term exclusion for having a phone and school had requested an alternative provision. It was noted if exclusion is only for 5 days he would not need to attend an alternative provision. Concerns were raised retrospectively that the alternate provision was in a gang-affiliated area who were responsible for his* [family member's] *murder earlier that year.* (15, male, racially minoritised, no disability, CCE, fixed-period exclusion)

Brought a knife into school because of a rumour he was going to be stabbed with a protractor in school. (14, male, non-racially minoritised, no disability, CCE, fixed-period exclusion)

In 2016 the managed move was due to his behaviour at school; he became verbally abusive to staff and students, throwing stuff about, he threatened to stab his teacher, so there was a managed move to specialist provision. They were looking at the PRU but with the EHCP they decided to send him to speciality school. He was excluded from college after panel in 2022 due to behaviour, non-attendance and had been arrested 3 times and having a bladed article and college said they can't manage risk and he's not attending anyway so they are excluding. (16, male, racially minoritised, no disability, CCE, permanent exclusion and managed move).

In this final extract, the exclusion appeared to be related to arrests outside of school.

DISCUSSION

The vast majority (85%) of young people experiencing extra-familial harm had experienced exclusion. Considering the challenges that arose in accessing exclusion data by social care, it is likely that these figures are an under-representation of the true extent of exclusion. Unsurprisingly, 'hidden' exclusions were not reported (Done et al., 2021; Power & Taylor, 2020). Almost all participating authorities found it challenging to access information on children's education experiences. Despite exclusion and extra-familial harm (CCE and CSE) representing some of the most traumatic events that a young person can experience (Hickle, 2019; Timpson, 2019), particularly in combination, social work and education did not appear to have systems or approaches for working together to address the particular welfare needs that these experiences may set in motion. Practice across authorities was varied, but most had a very limited idea of what was happening at school to young people, and in places where conversations on/with education did happen, this was seen as extraordinary. Viewed through the dual lens of emotional and spatial containment (Bion, 1963; Kennan & Lukacs, 1997), the data represent several emotional, spatial and political practices that are played out within schools, to students experiencing some of the most extreme forms of violence and abuse. In the absence of an appropriate child protection system (Firmin, 2017), and support and resources for education to address extra-familial harm, young people are being spatially contained and restricted as a mechanism to emotionally contain school staff anxieties about how to address the 'risk' that children experiencing extra-familial harm may pose (Lloyd et.al., 2023). Drawing on these theories of containment, I discuss five themes from the data.

First, extra-familial harm is uncontained. It is 'out there': in our schools, on our streets and online. To manage this lack of containment, we reduce its complexity into individual wrongdoings in an attempt to contain it (Daniels et al., 2019). By comparison, intra-familial harm is seen to be 'contained'. It is held spatially within the familial home (Blunt, 2007). There is something about the bounded spatial nature of these forms of harm that allow us to distance ourselves from the reality of which harms pose the greatest threat to our children (Valentine, 1997). Extra-familial harm (e.g., knife crime, criminal exploitation and sexual violence) poses a threat to our children that feels uncontained and uncontrollable, especially when these events might be occurring within schools (Bilson et al., 2017). This is contradictory, however. Neglect, a form of 'intra-familial harm', is the most prevalent form of abuse children are likely to be impacted by (NSPCC, 2021). But in recent years, extra-familial harm

has come to represent a particular 'threat' and garnered increasing policy and practice focus (HM Government, 2018b; Wroe, 2019). This is not to say that extra-familial harm should not have this attention, and it is important to be critical of prevalence figures around forms of harm such as neglect (Bilson et al., 2017). However, the particular anxiety raised by extra-familial harm, which makes it feel rife, but also uncontained and unaddressed, can result in practices that cause broader structural, cultural and political issues to be individualised through punitive approaches—in this case, school exclusion. In short, it can feel safer to blame individual children's behaviour for these forms of harm, and keep them out of schools, than tackle the multi-faceted cultural, policy, system, social and economic challenges that may have created the contexts where violence and abuse can occur (Billingham & Irwin-Rogers, 2022; Parsons, 2005).

Second, exclusion is used to emotionally contain professional anxiety in the absence of appropriate child protection and education systems that can address extra-familial harm (Lefevre et al., 2024). In comparison to intra-familial harm, extra-familial harm is neither contained spatially nor procedurally within an appropriate child protection system (Firmin, 2020). While there are no easy fixes to intra-familial harm, when instances arise, educators and social workers have the backing of a child protection system, designed over decades, to address specific forms of harm by parents. Policy and practice responses to extra-familial harm are in their infancy (HM Government, 2018b). The threat and very real instances of violence and harm that can occur, between students, disrupt the boundaries of schools where harm can, and does, occur within the grounds of school itself (EVAW, 2017). To put it simply: extra-familial harm is scary. The thought of young people being stabbed or sexually assaulted at school by other students is understandably anxiety provoking. And while the causes of these forms of harm are complex and multi-faceted (Billingham & Irwin-Rogers, 2022), in the face of a lack of appropriate resourcing, policies and support, it is perhaps unsurprising that educators find ways to move the (perceived) risk outside the boundaries of school. But while exclusion may represent a temporary, or sometimes permanent, reprieve for staff from the fear this harm raises, it can be very 'uncontaining' for students and parents who must deal with the emotional and physical impacts this may have (Pyne, 2019), including on other students who are left behind in the schools. In many respects they become uncontained: physically forced out into the wider world where, as we saw in many of the reasons for exclusion, they may be exposed to broader threats and harm.

Third, exclusion creates spatial boundaries that seek to stop the 'threat' of extra-familial harm from particular children spreading to broader school populations (Nairn & Higgins, 2011; Teasley, 2013). When viewed through the lens of emotional and spatial containment, we can see that school exclusion offers a mechanism to contain professional anxieties about the threat of this form of harm via restricting the spatial movement of young people (Bion, 1963; Ruch, 2020). The exclusions young people in the survey experienced all involved their physical movement to other places, and containing those students who are thought to be at risk/risky—through bordering, removing, othering, and so on (Mountz et al., 2013). In some instances, this involved tighter bordering and containment through alternative providers, but in other senses the exclusions (e.g., permanent exclusion, reduced timetables and fixed-period exclusions) were less about spatial containment and more about hiding, bordering and restricting movement (Barker et al., 2010). Either way, these forms of exclusion focused on preventing young people being located physically in the school environment; stopping the potential threat and influence they may have to spread these forms of harm to other students. This is further compounded when we look at the reasons for exclusion. Young people were more likely to be excluded for behaviours that 'threatened' harm than 'incidents' of harm (although it is recognised that both cause harm). Professionals are offered emotional containment against the fear of what *could* happen, by taking steps to physically contain or restrict individual young people.

Fourth, containment is bound up with notions of identity. While school exclusion in 2022 might be a far cry from concerns over the spread of communism during the Cold War era, they both entail political actions and real-life implications that seek to create borders through positioning 'others' as a threat to the broader population (Dalby, 1988). It becomes unquestioned that a child carrying a knife for protection needs to be controlled rather than supported, because imagine if they hurt another student. It is not only the harm itself that requires containment, but the threat of extra-familial harm also becomes personified by its association with particular children (Williams, 2015). As such, mobility, containment, bordering and exclusion are bound up with power discourses shaped by ideas of gender, race, age and disability (Mountz et al., 2013). Boys were permanently excluded twice as often as girls. Girls appeared to be offered a larger range of 'options' (e.g., reduced timetables) than boys, whereas boys were more likely to be NEET—their physical whereabouts unknown. The high instance of exclusions used suggests that children with social care involvement are likely to be seen as more 'at risk' and 'a risk to' than children without this involvement. Viewing school exclusion as a geopolitical act moves us to consider what and whose interests we are protecting and where the physical boundaries of schools start and end, if we are excluding children from the internal space of schools for acts that take place beyond them.

Finally, what is it about the school context itself, and particularly the 'mainstream' environment, that feels so anxiety provoking? Increased pressures to demonstrate academic attainment, in a context of underfunding (Britton et al., 2020), mean that schools and teachers are facing increasingly pressurised working environments with high rates of burnout and struggles to retain teachers (Burrow et al., 2020). Teachers can feel individually responsible for the behaviour and attainment of their students (Frenzel et al., 2020). It makes sense then, perhaps, that professionals close ranks around those students whose 'behaviour' consumes so much time, disrupts other students and impacts grades. This is all happening within particularly gendered environments, where female teachers can face greater threats and actual violence, including sexual, than male teachers (NASUWT, 2023). Boys can be seen to pose the greatest threat and be particularly in need of control (Ofsted, 2021). As such, staff may create defensive practices to contain their anxiety (Menzies Lyth, 1988), in contexts that require them to both actually defend themselves physically from the threat of violence and also from senior leaders' and regulators' monitoring and assessment with regard to student attainment. Without safe and containing work environments (James, 2011), it is completely feasible to see why the idea of moving individual students away into alternative settings or elsewhere can feel like the safest option. Yet, despite the dominant discourse that extra-familial harm is a problem of alternative education providers (Commission on Young Lives, 2022), the data from this research showed that the majority of young people experiencing extra-familial harm were educated in mainstream settings. Extra-familial harm is an issue for all schools to tackle. While it may feel safer to consider the issue contained within the borders of these 'other' school settings, the reality is that this is an issue in all schools, including mainstream, and they need support and resources to address it.

CONCLUSION

The findings and analysis of this small data set evidence the dominance of punitive and exclusionary processes applied to young people who are already experiencing some of the most extreme forms of violence and abuse. Despite knowing that school exclusion can cause significant disruption to young people's lives, participating local authorities struggled to access information on young people's experiences of education; it was not prioritised. In the absence of appropriate systems and emotional support, educational professionals are using school exclusion to contain their own anxiety about the threat of extra-familial harm

by physically containing and restricting young people. This is not about blaming education-alists. This is a very reasonable response in the absence of containing environments and practical options. But these moves are very 'uncontaining', not only for the children and families directed impacted, but for the whole school community as well. When young people are excluded from education, these processes offer emotional and spatial containment for some, in the absence of appropriate responses to address the root causes of extra-familial harm and problems in the education and social care system. I make three recommendations for policy and practice based on the evidence presented in this research:

- Create systems, cultures and relationships within social care that value and explore the education experiences of young people facing extra-familial harm. For example, through ensuring that questions about education, and education representation, are facilitated in social care meetings such as those described in this research.
- Embed and sustain supervision models for school staff to promote staff welfare and provide emotional containment (TES, 2020).
- Develop and value relationships between education and social care colleagues that are realistic and sustainable.

This small study is the first of its kind that focuses explicitly on the education experiences of those experiencing extra-familial harm open to social care. It raises further avenues for research and practice: first, due to the small sample size, it is hard to draw conclusions about race and ethnicity and disability. A larger study could usefully interrogate the experiences of young people along these lines. Second, the study did not explore school professionals' own experiences of exclusion. A further study could explore the idea of containment with school staff.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT
The author reports no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
The participants of this study did not give written consent for their data to be shared publicly, so due to the sensitive nature of the research, supporting data are not available.

ETHICS STATEMENT
The research received ethical clearance via Durham University's research ethics process.

ORCID
Jenny Lloyd https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5114-2549

REFERENCES
Adams, R. (2016). *Government must take zero-tolerance approach to school sexual harassment*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/nov/30/government-must-take-zero-tolerance-approach-to-school-sexual-harassment

Arnez, J., & Condry, R. (2021). Criminological perspectives on school exclusion and youth offending. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *26*(1), 87–100.

Barker, J., Alldred, P., Watts, M., & Dodman, H. (2010). Pupils or prisoners? Institutional geographies and internal exclusion in UK secondary schools. *Area*, *42*(3), 378–386.

Berridge, D., Brodie, I., Pitts, J., Porteous, D., & Tarling, R. (2001). *The independent effects of permanent exclusion from school on the offending careers of young people*. RDS Occasional Paper No. 71. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate. https://troublesofyouth.pbworks.com/f/occ71-exclusion.pdf

Billingham, L., & Gillon, F. (2024). (Re)moving exclusions: School exclusion reduction in Glasgow and London. *British Educational Research Journal*, *50*(1), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3925

Billingham, L., & Irwin-Rogers, K. (2022). *Against youth violence: A social harm perspective*. Policy Press.

Bilson, A., Featherstone, B., & Martin, K. (2017). How child protection's 'investigative turn' impacts on poor and deprived communities. *Family Law*, *47*, 416–419.

Bion, W. R. (1963). *Elements of psychoanalysis*. Heinemann.

Blunt, A. (2007). Cultural geographies of migration: Mobility, transnationality and diaspora. *Progress in Human Geography*, *31*(5), 684–694.

Britton, J., Farquharson, C., Sibieta, L., Tahir, I., & Waltmann, B. (2020). *2020 Annual report on education spending in England*. Institute for Fiscal Studies. https://ifs.org.uk/publications/2020-annual-report-education-spending-england

Burrow, R., Williams, R., & Thomas, D. (2020). Stressed, depressed and exhausted: Six years as a teacher in UK state education. *Work, Employment and Society*, *34*(5), 949–958.

Carlen, P., Gleeson, D., & Wardhaugh, J. (1994). Truancy; the politics of compulsory schooling. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *42*(1), 95–96.

Cole, T., McCluskey, G., Daniels, H., Thompson, I., & Tawell, A. (2019). Factors associated with high and low levels of school exclusions: Comparing the English and wider UK experience. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *24*(4), 374–390.

Commission on Young Lives. (2022). *All together now: Inclusion not exclusion. Supporting all young people to succeed in school*. https://thecommissiononyounglives.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/COYL-Education-report-FINAL-APR-29-2022.pdf

Cooper, A., & Lees, A. (2018). Spotlit: Defences against anxiety in contemporary human service organizations. In D. Armstrong & M. Rustin (eds.), *Social defences against anxiety* (pp. 239–255). Routledge.

Dalby, S. (1988). Geopolitical discourse: The Soviet Union as other. *Alternatives*, *13*(4), 415–442.

Daniels, H., Thompson, I., & Tawell, A. (2019). *Practices of exclusion in cultures of inclusive schooling in the United Kingdom*. Facultad de Educación y Humanidades del Campus de Melilla.

Done, E. J., & Knowler, H. (2021). 'Off-rolling' and Foucault's art of visibility/invisibility: An exploratory study of senior leaders' views of 'strategic' school exclusion in southwest England. *British Educational Research Journal*, *47*(4), 1039–1055. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3709

Done, E. J., Knowler, H., & Armstrong, D. (2021). Grey' exclusions matter: Mapping illegal exclusionary practices and the implications for children with disabilities in England and Australia. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *21*, 36–44.

EVAW (2017). *"All day, every day": Legal obligations on schools to prevent and respond to sexual harassment and violence against girls*. End Violence Against Women.

Firmin, C. (2017). *Abuse between young people: A contextual account*. Routledge.

Firmin, C. (2020). *Contextual safeguarding and child protection: Rewriting the rules*. Routledge.

Frenzel, A. C., Fiedler, D., Marx, A. K., Reck, C., & Pekrun, R. (2020). Who enjoys teaching, and when? Between- and within-person evidence on teachers' appraisal–emotion links. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 1092.

Gabriel, D. (2020). Racial categorisation and terminology. *Black British Academics*, *August, 3*.

Gazeley, L. (2010). The role of school exclusion processes in the re-production of social and educational disadvantage. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *58*(3), 293–309.

Gill, K., Quilter-Pinner, H., & Swift, D. (2017). *Making the difference: Breaking the link between school exclusion and social exclusion*. Institute for Public Policy Research.

Gov.uk. (2019). *Teachers feel unsupported on classroom behaviour*, Gov.uk. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/teachers-feel-unsupported-on-classroom-behaviour

Graham, B., White, C., Edwards, A., Potter, S., & Street, C. (2019). *School exclusion: A literature review on the continued disproportionate exclusion of certain children*. Department for Education.

Hickle, K. (2019). Understanding trauma and its relevance to child sexual exploitation. In J. Pearce (ed.), *Child sexual exploitation: Why theory matters* (pp. 151–172). Policy Press.

HM Government. (2018a). *Serious youth violence strategy*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/698009/serious-violencestrategy.pdf

HM Government. (2018b). *Working together to safeguard children*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.UK/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/942454/Working_together_to_safeguard_children_inter_agency_guidance.pdf

James, C. (2011). The importance of affective containment for teacher effectiveness and successful educational change. In C. Day & J. Chi-Kin Lee (eds.), *New understandings of teachers' work: Emotions and educational change* (pp. 119–134). Springer.

Jay, M. A., McGrath-Lone, L., De Stavola, B., & Gilbert, R. (2023). Risk of school exclusion among adolescents receiving social care or special educational needs services: A whole-population administrative data cohort study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *144*, 106325.

Just for Law Kids. (2020). *Excluded, exploited, forgotten: Childhood criminal exploitation and school exclusions*. https://www.justforkidslaw.org/sites/default/files/fields/download/JfKL%20school%20exclusion%20and%20CCE_2.pdf

Kardefelt-Winther, D., & Maternowska, C. (2020). Addressing violence against children online and offline. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(3), 227–230.

Kennan, G. F., & Lukacs, J. (1997). *George F. Kennan and the origins of containment, 1944–1946: The Kennan–Lukacs correspondence*. University of Missouri Press.

Lawlor, D., & Webb, L. (2009). An interview with Isabel Menzies Lyth with a conceptual commentary. *Organisational and Social Dynamics*, *9*(1), 93–137.

Lees, A., Meyer, E., & Rafferty, J. (2013). From Menzies Lyth to Munro: The problem of managerialism. *British Journal of Social Work*, *43*(3), 542–558.

Lefevre, M., Huegler, N., Lloyd, J., Owens, R., Damman, J., Ruch, G., & Firmin, C. (2024). *Innovation in social care: New approaches for young people affected by extra-familial risks and harms*. Policy Press.

Lloyd, J., Hickle, K., Owens, R., & Peace, D. (2023). *Relationship-based practice and contextual safeguarding: Approaches to working with young people experiencing extra-familial risk and harm*. Children & Society.

McAra, L., & McVie, S. (2007). Youth justice? The impact of system contact on patterns of desistance from offending. *European Journal of Criminology*, *4*(3), 315–345.

McCluskey, G., Cole, T., Daniels, H., Thompson, I., & Tawell, A. (2019). Exclusion from school in Scotland and across the UK: Contrasts and questions. *British Educational Research Journal*, *45*(6), 1140–1159. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3555

Meiners, E. R. (2011). Ending the school-to-prison pipeline/building abolition futures. *The Urban Review*, *43*(4), 547–565.

Menzies Lyth, I. (1988). *Containing anxiety in institutions (selected essays volume 1)*. Free Association Books.

Messeter, T., & Soni, A. (2018). A systematic literature review of the 'managed move' process as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *23*(2), 169–185.

Ministry of Justice. (2018). *Examining the educational background of young knife possession offenders*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/716039/examining-the-educational-background-of-young-knife-possession-offenders.pdf

Mountz, A., Coddington, K., Catania, R. T., & Loyd, J. M. (2013). Conceptualizing detention: Mobility, containment, bordering, and exclusion. *Progress in Human Geography*, *37*(4), 522–541.

Nairn, K., & Higgins, J. (2011). The emotional geographies of neoliberal school reforms: Spaces of refuge and containment. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *4*(3), 180–186.

NASUWT. (2023). *Female teachers facing more frequent violence and abuse in Scottish schools*. https://www.nasuwt.org.uk/article-listing/female-teachers-more-frequent-violence-and-abuse.html#:~:text=While%20the%20figures%20show%20male,compared%20to%2029%25%20of%20males

National Crime Agency. (2018). *Intelligence assessment county lines drug supply, vulnerability and harm*. https://nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/who-we-are/publications/257-county-lines-drug-supply-vulnerability-and-harm-2018/fil

NSPCC. (2021). *Child neglect: Statistics briefing*. https://learning.nspcc.org.uk/research-resources/statistics-briefings/child-neglect/#:~:text=Neglect%20is%20the%20most%20common,protection%20register%20in%20the%20UK

Ofsted. (2021). *Review of sexual abuse in schools and colleges*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-sexual-abuse-in-schools-and-colleges/review-of-sexual-abuse-in-schools-and-colleges

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

Pinheiro, P. S. (2006). *Violence against children*. ATAR Roto Presse SA.

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

Power, S., & Taylor, C. (2020). Not in the classroom, but still on the register: Hidden forms of school exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(8), 867–881.

Pyne, J. (2019). Suspended attitudes: Exclusion and emotional disengagement from school. *Sociology of Education*, *92*(1), 59–82.

Ross, P. T., Hart-Johnson, T., Santen, S. A., & Zaidi, N. L. B. (2020). Considerations for using race and ethnicity as quantitative variables in medical education research. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *9*(5), 318–323.

Ruch, G. (2020). *Understanding the impact of social systems as defences in your organisation*. Department for Education. Research in Practice

Sablan, J. R. (2019). Can you really measure that? Combining critical race theory and quantitative methods. *American Educational Research Journal*, *56*(1), 178–203.

Skinner, B., Leavey, G., & Rothi, D. (2021). Managerialism and teacher professional identity: Impact on well-being among teachers in the UK. *Educational Review*, *73*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1556205

Teasley, C. (2013). Educating against the cultural politics and complicities of containment. In M. Miskovic (ed.), *Roma education in Europe: Practices, policies, and politics*. Routledge.

TES. (2020). *Why supervision is a must—for teachers at all levels*. https://www.tes.com/magazine/archive/why-supervision-must-teachers-all-levels#:~:text=Supervision%20is%20different%20from%20some,to%20support%20significant%20career%20transitions

Timpson, E. (2019). *Timpson review of school exclusion*. Dandy Booksellers Ltd.

Tseliou, F., Taylor, C., & Power, S. (2024). Recent trends in formal school exclusions in Wales. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *72*(3), 269–293.

United Nations. (2023). *UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General on violence against children*. https://violenceagainstchildren.un.org/

Valentine, G. (1997). "Oh yes I can." "Oh no you can't": Children and parents' understandings of kids' competence to negotiate public space safely. *Antipode*, *29*(1), 65–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00035

Williams, A. G., & Finlay, F. (2019). County lines: How gang crime is affecting our young people. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, *104*(8), 730–732.

Williams, P. (2015). Criminalising the other: Challenging the race–gang nexus. *Race & Class*, *56*(3), 18–35.

Wroe, L. (2019). *Contextual safeguarding and 'county lines'*. https://csnetwork.org.uk/assets/documents/Contextual-Safeguarding-and-County-Lines-Briefing_-Wroe-Oct-2019-FINAL.pdf